
Appendix H: Public Comments and Responses

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

Northwest Training and Testing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX H PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES.....H-1

H.1	Public Comments and Navy Responses	H-1
H.1.1	Federal Agencies	H-1
H.1.2	American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations.....	H-16
H.1.3	State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials	H-38
H.1.4	Non-Governmental Organizations	H-91
H.1.4.1	Form Letters and Petitions	H-258
H.1.5	Individuals	H-261

List of Figures

There are no figures in this appendix.

List of Tables

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials	H-2
Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations.....	H-16
Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials.....	H-38
Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations	H-91
Table H-5: Form Letters	H-258
Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public.....	H-261

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix H Public Comments and Responses

H.1 Public Comments and Navy Responses

Comments on the Draft Supplemental Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT) Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) were received via mail, at the public meetings either in writing or orally, and via the project website. The United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy) also received a number of form letters from the Center for Biological Diversity, the Friends of the Earth and the Noise Pollution Clearinghouse Non-Governmental Organizations as well as a petition submitted by the Washington Environmental Council and Washington Conservation Voters (see Section H.1.1.6 [Form Letters and Petitions]).

Comments covered a wide spectrum of thoughts, opinions, ideas, and concerns. The most commonly addressed themes included impacts to Southern Resident killer whales (SRKWs) and noise impacts due to Growler flight activities over the Olympic Peninsula.

Each row in the following table presents the identification of the commenter, the comment, and the Navy's response to the comment. Because many commenters touched on more than one topic, in some cases the commenter's topics were separated into individual comments, assigned a number, and responded to separately. The commenter's name or organization may be abbreviated when the comment is broken into more than one topic. For example, the comment by the Marine Mammal Commission cover several topics, so these are separated into subsequent comments named MMC-02, MMC-03, etc.

H.1.1 Federal Agencies

This section contains comments from federal agencies received during the public comment period and the Navy's response to those comments.

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Marine Mammal Commission (MMC)		
MMC-01	The Commission recommends that the Navy clarify whether and how it incorporated uncertainty in its density estimates for its animat modeling specific to NWTT and if uncertainty was not incorporated, re-estimate the numbers of marine mammal takes based on the uncertainty inherent in the density estimates provided in Department of the Navy (2019) or the underlying references (Jefferson et al. 2017, Smultea et al. 2017, NMFS SARs, etc.).	The Navy did incorporate animal abundance and group size uncertainty when seeding the animats in the Navy's Acoustic Effects Model as was done with other Navy Phase III Training and Testing impact analyses. As discussed in the technical report titled <i>Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing</i> (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018) available at www.nwtteis.com , marine mammal and sea turtle density data are provided as a 10x10 km grid in which each cell has a mean density and standard error. In the Navy's Acoustic Effects Model, species densities are distributed into simulation areas. Thirty distributions that vary based on the standard deviation of the density estimates are run per season for each species to account for statistical uncertainty in the density estimate.
MMC-02	Therefore, the Commission recommends that the Navy (1) revise the various densities for (a) northern fur seals based on the abundance estimate from 2015 that includes data from Bogoslof Island, (b) Steller sea lions, California sea lions, Guadalupe fur seals, and elephant seals based on growth rates up to at least 2020, and (c) harbor seals in the Strait of Juan de Fuca and the San Juan Islands based on 46 rather than 37 percent of the animals being in the water at a given time based on Huber et al. (2001) and (2) re-estimate the numbers of takes accordingly in the final SEIS and its LOA application.	(a) The Navy used the estimate provided by Bob DeLong/NMFS and did not integrate the 2015 data mentioned based on advice from SMEs at the NMFS Alaska Fisheries Science Center due to a volcanic eruption at the rookery on Bogoslof Island where a portion of the counts are made, which in the opinion of the Alaska Fisheries Science Center experts skewed the 2015 data, making it not the best available science. (b) The density estimates are based on sighting numbers from surveys over many years to encompass variation and are not future predictions. It would not be appropriate to base densities on growth rates. The densities do not incorporate abundances or estimates of growth rate since the abundances for population and their population trend (reduction or growth) are not directly applicable to the density within a given area. SMEs at the NMFS Alaska Fisheries Science Center advised in 2015 and again in 2019 that growth/decline rates provided in the SARs should not be used to project future population numbers for use in the Navy's analysis where abundance have been integrated into the analysis. (c) There were also specific haulout factors for other areas within the Study Area that gave lower estimates throughout the Inland Waters. Subject matter experts from the Alaska Fisheries Science Center and the Northwest Fisheries Science Center concurred with the Navy's use of 37 percent as being most representative. (2) No re-estimation required for the reasons stated in the responses above.

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
MMC-03	Therefore, the Commission recommends that the Navy provide the method(s) by which species-specific densities were calculated for Western Behm Canal and cite the primary literature from which those data originated in Navy (2019) for the final SEIS, as well as all technical reports that underpin its density databases for future Phase III and IV DSEISs and DEISs.	There were two primary sources of density data used to establish cetacean density estimates for Behm Canal: (1) U.S. Department of the Navy 2010 (Marine mammal occurrence/density report prepared in support of Navy activities at the Southeast Alaska Acoustic Measurement Facility), and (2) Density estimates derived by the National Marine Mammal Laboratory, Alaska Fisheries Science Center based on systematic surveys conducted in Southeast Alaska (e.g., Dahlheim et al. 2015). These sources were cited as appropriate in the species-specific sections of Department of the Navy (2019); methods by which species-specific density estimates were calculated are described in these reports. Multiple sources were used to establish pinniped density estimates for Behm Canal. All are cited as appropriate and methods described within the species-specific sections of Department of the Navy, 2019 (U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area: Technical report. Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. 258 pages).
MMC-04	The Commission understands that developing weighting functions and associated thresholds is an extensive process and that the Navy cannot amend them with each new published dataset. However, the Navy should discuss within the final SEIS, whether all newer data corroborate the current weighting functions and associated thresholds.	The Navy and NMFS thoroughly reviewed new information available since the development of the Phase III weighting functions and determined that no new research would fundamentally change the assessment of impacts or conclusions. Relevant new research is summarized in Section 3.4.2.1.1.2 (Hearing Loss). New research will be quantitatively incorporated into future auditory criteria, as appropriate.
MMC-05	For all these reasons, the Commission recommends that the Navy refrain from using cut-off distances in conjunction with the Bayesian BRFs and re-estimate the numbers of marine mammal takes based solely on the Bayesian BRFs. Use of cut-off distances could be perceived as an attempt to reduce the numbers of takes, which is discussed in a subsequent section of this letter.	The consideration of proximity (cut-off distances) was part of the criteria developed in consultation with NMFS and was applied within the Navy's acoustic effects model. Cut-off distances were used to better reflect the take potential for military readiness activities as defined in the MMPA. As stated in Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers), the derivation of the behavioral response functions and associated cut-off distances is provided in the technical report titled Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III). Briefly, much of the data used to derive the behavioral response functions was from nearby, scaled sources, thereby potentially confounding results since it is difficult to tell whether the focal marine mammal is reacting to the sound level or the proximity of the source and/or vessel amongst other potentially confounding contextual factors that are unlike actual Navy events for which the BRFs are being derived. To account for these non-

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		applicable contextual factors, all available data on marine mammal reactions to actual Navy activities and sound sources (or other large scale activities such as seismic surveys when information on proximity to sonar sources is not available for a given species group, i.e. harbor porpoises) were reviewed to find the farthest distance to which significant behavioral reactions were observed. These distances were rounded up to the nearest 5 or 10 km interval, and for moderate to large scale activities using multiple or louder sonar sources, these distances were greatly increased --- doubled in most cases. The Navy's BRFs applied within these distances is currently the best know method for providing the public and regulators with a more realistic (but still conservative where some uncertainties exist) estimate of impact and potential take under military readiness for the proposed actions within this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
MMC-06	The Navy provided no evidence that an animal would exhibit a significant behavioral response to two 5-lb charges detonated within a few minutes of each other but would not exhibit a similar response for a single detonation of 50 lbs., let alone detonations of more than 500 lbs. The Commission maintains that the Navy has not provided adequate justification for ignoring the possibility that single underwater detonations can cause a behavioral response and therefore again recommends that the Navy estimate and ultimately request authorization for behavior takes of marine mammals during all explosive activities, including those that involve single detonations.	<p>Marine mammals may be exposed to isolated impulses in their natural environment (e.g., lightning). There is no evidence to support the assertion that animals have significant behavioral responses (rising to the level of 'harassment' under the MMPA definition for military readiness activities) to temporally and spatially isolated explosions, regardless of charge size. Still, the analysis conservatively assumes that any modeled instance of temporally or spatially separated detonations occurring in a single 24-hour period would result in harassment under the MMPA for military readiness activities. Further, the criteria do not preclude the consideration of animals being behaviorally disturbed during single explosions if they are exposed above the TTS threshold, which is only 5 dB higher than the behavioral harassment threshold. The range to effect for TTS would be correlated to the size of the explosive.</p> <p>The Navy has been monitoring detonations since the 1990s and has not observed these types of reactions. To clarify, this monitoring has occurred under the monitoring plans developed specifically for shock trials, the detonations with the largest net explosive weight conducted by the Navy (no shock trials are proposed in this Study Area) rise to the level of 'harassment' under the MMPA for military readiness activities.</p>
MMC-07	The Commission notes that the constants and exponents associated with the impulse metrics for both onset mortality and onset slight lung injury have been amended from those used in TAP I and Phase II activities. The Navy did not explain why the constants and exponents have changed while the underlying data remain the same. Therefore, the Commission again recommends that the Navy in its final	The technical report titled <i>Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)</i> , available at www.nwttteis.com , provides the derivation of the explosive injury equations. The Navy points the Commission to this technical report for (1) why the constants and exponents for onset mortality and onset slight lung injury thresholds for Phase III have

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	SEIS (1) explain why the constants and exponents for onset mortality and onset slight lung injury thresholds for Phase III have been amended, (2) ensure that the modified equations are correct, and (3) specify any additional assumptions that were made.	been amended and (3) any additional assumptions that were made. The modified equations are correct.
MMC-08	The Commission recommends that the Navy use onset mortality, onset slight lung injury, and onset GI tract injury thresholds to estimate both the numbers of marine mammal takes and the respective ranges to effect.	The Navy used the range to 1 percent risk of mortality and injury (referred to as “onset” in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS) to inform the development of mitigation ranges for explosions. In all cases, the proposed mitigation ranges for explosives extend beyond the range to 1 percent risk of non-auditory injury, even for a small animal (representative mass = 5 kg). In the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has clarified that the “onset” non-auditory injury and mortality criteria are actually 1 percent risk criteria. Over-predicting impacts would occur with the use of 1 percent non-auditory injury risk criteria in the quantitative analysis. The Navy, in coordination with NMFS, has determined that the mean threshold of onset is a reasonable representation of a potential effect. Rather, ranges to effect based on 1 percent risk criteria were examined to ensure that explosive mitigation zones would encompass the range to any potential mortality or non-auditory injury, affording actual protection against these effects. Although the commenter implies that the Navy did not use extensive lung hemorrhage as indicative of mortality, that statement is incorrect. Extensive lung hemorrhage is assumed to result in mortality, and the explosive mortality criteria are based on extensive lung injury data [See the technical report titled Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)].
MMC-09	Therefore, the Commission again recommends that the Navy use passive and active acoustic monitoring, whenever practicable, to supplement visual monitoring during the implementation of its mitigation measures for all activities that could cause injury or mortality beyond those explosive activities for which passive acoustic monitoring already was proposed—at the very least, sonobuoys that are expended and active sources and hydrophones that are used during an activity should be monitored for the presence of marine mammals.	The Navy currently uses and will continue to use passive acoustic devices (e.g., remote acoustic sensors, expendable sonobuoys, passive acoustic sensors on submarines) to complement visual observations for marine mammals when passive acoustic assets are already participating in an activity, as discussed in Section 5.2.1.1 (Lookouts). As discussed in Section 5.5.3 (Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Devices), there are significant manpower and logistical constraints that make constructing and maintaining additional passive acoustic monitoring systems or platforms for each training and testing activity impractical. The Navy’s existing passive acoustic monitoring devices (e.g., sonobuoys) are designed, maintained, and allocated to specific training units or testing programs for specific mission-essential purposes. Reallocating these assets to different training unit or testing programs for the purpose of monitoring for marine mammals would prevent the Navy from using its equipment for its intended mission-essential

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>purpose. Diverting platforms that have integrated passive acoustic monitoring capabilities would impact their ability to meet their Title 10 requirements and reduce the service life of those systems. Furthermore, adding a passive acoustic monitoring capability to additional explosive activities (either by adding a passive acoustic monitoring device to a platform already participating in the activity, or by adding an additional platform to the activity) for mitigation is not practical. For example, all platforms participating in an explosive bombing exercise (e.g. firing aircraft, safety aircraft) must focus on situational awareness of the activity area and continuous coordination between multiple training components for safety and mission success. Therefore, it is impractical for participating platforms to divert their attention to non-mission essential tasks, such as deploying sonobuoys and monitoring for acoustic detections during the event (e.g., setting up a computer station). The Navy does not have available manpower or resources to allocate additional aircraft for the purpose of deploying, monitoring, and retrieving passive acoustic monitoring equipment during a bombing exercise.</p> <p>As stated in Section 5.5.3 (Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Devices) of the Navy's 2019 Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, to develop an estimated position for an individual marine mammal, the animal's vocalizations must be detected on at least three hydrophones. As stated in Section 5.2.1 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation Development), "Based on the number and type of passive acoustic devices that are typically used, passive acoustic detections do not provide range or bearing to a detected animal in order to determine its location or confirm its presence in a mitigation zone." The commenter took this sentence out of context to imply that the Navy indicated passive acoustic detections do not provide range or bearing to marine mammals in general. The Navy re-emphasizes that the passive acoustic monitoring devices typically used during its training and testing activities do not provide range or bearing to marine mammals, based on the number (e.g., one or two) and type of assets used.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 5.5.3 (Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring), although the Navy is continuing to improve its capabilities to use range instrumentation to aid in the passive acoustic detection of marine mammals, at this time it would not be effective or practical for the Navy to monitor instrumented ranges for real-time mitigation or to construct additional instrumented ranges as a tool to aid in the implementation of mitigation.</p>

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
MMC-10	Therefore, the Commission recommends that the Navy conduct additional pre-activity overflights, barring any safety issues (e.g., low fuel), before conducting any activities involving detonations.	As described in Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors) of the Navy's 2019 Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed a new mitigation for the Proposed Action requiring additional platforms already participating in explosive activities to support observations of the mitigation zone before, during, and after the activity while performing their regular duties. There are typically multiple platforms in the vicinity of activities that use explosives (e.g., safety aircraft). When available, having additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting biological resources.
MMC-11	The Commission recommends that the Navy conduct post-activity monitoring for activities involving medium- and large-caliber projectiles, missiles, rockets, and bombs.	As described in Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors) of the Navy's 2019 Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed a new mitigation measure for the Proposed Action requiring the Lookout to observe the mitigation zone after completion of explosive activities when practical. If additional platforms are supporting an explosive activity (e.g., providing range clearance), those assets will assist in the post-event visual observation of the area where detonations occurred. The Navy will continue to follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during the event, including during the post-activity observations.
MMC-12	Therefore, the Commission again recommends that the Navy (1) specify the total numbers of model-estimated Level A harassment (PTS) and mortality takes rather than reduce the estimated numbers of takes based on the Navy's post-model analyses and (2) include the model-estimated Level A harassment and mortality takes in its LOA application to inform NMFS's negligible impact determination analyses.	<p>As stated in Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers) and in Section 3.4.2.2.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives), the consideration of marine mammal avoidance and mitigation effectiveness is integral to the Navy's overall analysis of impacts from sonar and explosive sources.</p> <p>As described in the 2017 technical report titled Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing, animals in the Navy's acoustic effects model do not move horizontally or 'react' to sound in any way. The current best available science based on a growing body of behavioral response research shows that animals do in fact avoid the immediate area around sound sources to a distance of a few hundred meters or more depending upon the species. Avoidance to this distance greatly reduces the likelihood of impacts to hearing such as temporary and permanent threshold shift (TTS and PTS, respectively). Specifically, the ranges to PTS for most marine mammal groups are within a few tens of meters and the ranges for the most sensitive group, the HF cetaceans, average about 200 m, to a maximum of 270 m in limited cases; however HF cetaceans such as harbor porpoises, have been observed</p>

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>reacting to anthropogenic sound at greater distances than other species and are likely to avoid their zones to hearing impacts (TTS and PTS) as well.</p> <p>The Navy's acoustic effects model also does not consider procedural mitigation (i.e., power-down or shut-down of sonars, or ceasing explosive detonations when animals are detected in specified mitigation zones around a sound source or detonation location), which necessitates consideration of mitigation in the Navy's overall acoustic analysis process. Credit taken for mitigation effectiveness is extremely conservative. Not considering animal avoidance and mitigation effectiveness would lead to an overestimate of injurious impacts. The NMFS has concurred with the analytical approach used.</p>
<i>U.S. Department of Interior (DOI)</i>		
DOI-01	<p>The purpose and need states, "These proposed activities are generally consistent with those analyzed in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, and are representative of activities the military has conducted in the Study Area for decades" (pg 1-1). While this may be true given the Olympic Military Operating Areas (MOAs) were established by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in the late 70s, the difference between past activities and the proposed activities is not minor. The changes include an increase in the number and type (Growlers vs. Prowlers) of aircraft and an increase in training days and times over the Olympic MOA. Additional changes include the connected action of training utilizing emitters in park-adjacent U.S. Forest Service (USFS) areas, specifically concentrating the aircraft and noise disturbance within and immediately adjacent to western portions of Olympic National Park (OLYM), including portions of the western interior, and nearly the entire coastal portion, of the Daniel J. Evans Wilderness (Evans Wilderness). The Department recommends that this increased level of activities should be appropriately reflected in the FEIS.</p>	<p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year. When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. The Navy, along with other U.S. military forces, have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Olympic MOA, one of about 460 MOAs across the United States, was established in 1977. 3. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 4. An increase in the number of aircraft based in the area does not equate to a one-to-one increase in flights in the Olympic MOA; the Navy conducts many different types of training activities across a number of locations. 5. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 6. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers.

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.</p> <p>7. Electronic Warfare training, which may use emitters in park-adjacent U.S. Forest Service areas, typically occurs at higher altitudes, usually greater than 20,000 feet, while other training activities, about 30 percent involve a variety of maneuvers that may include a portion of flight time at lower elevations. The location of the emitters has no bearing on where the aircraft will fly during electronic warfare training flights; aircraft will standoff from the emitters, not congregate over or near them.</p>
DOI-02	<p>The Department – through the National Park Service (NPS) commented in phases I and II of this project noting the need to identify affected NPS units on all maps within the SEIS. The majority of the maps do not identify federal or tribal lands. For greater transparency and public understanding, the Department recommends that the maps included in the FEIS should depict the locations of all federal and tribal lands within the training and testing ranges for all three states.</p> <p>More specifically, the maps should, at minimum, identify the location and extent of OLYM. The only map included in the document that shows OLYM (and also shows Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve (EBLA)) is on page 3.12-21 (aside from those in Appendix J) in Volume 2 of the SEIS. Subsequently, the only references found for OLYM are within the cultural resources section of the affected environment as well as in Appendix J.</p>	<p>The Navy has depicted National Park Service units and other federal and tribal lands on all maps where appropriate and where it supports the discussion the maps were provided for. Each map in the document has a specific purpose, with some focused on other areas. Where aircraft noise is analyzed such as in Appendix J, and where recreation is discussed, such as in Section 3.12, the reader will find the appropriate areas depicted, including the Olympic National Park. The Navy is aware of the relationship of its activities to these areas, and analyzed them accordingly in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy agrees that maps identifying tribal lands would be useful in the discussion of American Indian and Alaska Native Traditional Resources and has added them in Section 3.11 accordingly.</p>
DOI-03	The Department recommends that the FEIS include an analysis that accurately reflects the presence of park visitors throughout the week, especially from May through September.	The description in Section 3.12.2.3.1 has been revised to reflect available information regarding park visitors.
DOI-04	The FEIS should include an analysis of the effect of the noise on visitors who come to the park specifically to experience the natural environment, including those natural sounds, and without the interruption of anthropogenic factors beyond the presence and subsequent noise of other park visitors.	The analysis in Section 3.12.3.2 (Airborne Noise) has been revised to reflect available information regarding park visitors.
DOI-05	The SEIS also states, “In a worst case scenario with an individual located at an elevation of 4,000-4,500 ft. and an EA-18G flying directly over that individual at an altitude of 6,000 MSL, the analysis shows that the maximum noise level would be 100.6 dBA, and noise at this level would last for an average of 0.12 second per flight. (pg 3.12-28)” From within the OLYM Headquarters building, located in Port Angeles, with an open office window near moderate traffic, the high school, and nearby residential areas, Growlers are seen flying over the area and the sound is	The duration of the Lmax metric is very brief as it represents the maximum level of a transient noise event, such as an aircraft flyover. However, the actual event will be heard for a longer duration depending on the altitude of the aircraft, distance to a receiver, local background sounds, and local atmospheric conditions. Text has been added to explain the difference between Lmax and audibility.

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	readily detectible for approximately 3 minutes at minimum. The Growlers can be heard on approach, as they fly over, and long after they're out of sight. So, either the modeling is incorrect or aircraft flies lower than the noted 10,000 ft. MSL (page 3.12-28 of the SEIS states that "multiple aircraft flying above the Olympic Peninsula would generate, on average, low level (37 dBA) noise, because more than 95 percent of overflights would occur above 10,000 ft. Mean Sea Level (MSL), placing the source of the noise, an aircraft, and the receptor, a person on the ground, thousands of feet apart.)."	
DOI-06	Additionally, averaging sounds over a 24-hour day-night period to assess cumulative sound levels within national park and wilderness land designations, is counter to what visitors actually experience on-the-ground. As properly noted in Appendix J, nighttime overflights have a greater adverse effect on the natural soundscape and visitor experience. Visitors, researchers, and staff tend to reference overflights by total number witnessed vs. 24-hour averages. Complaints have been shared in regard to low and loud flights occurring along the wilderness coast during the day and high and loud flights occurring over the interior wilderness at night. Researchers have noted that low flying Growlers have impacted their coastal studies due to wildlife being startled and suddenly dispersing.	<p>No cumulative noise metric has been recommended by NPS for looking at potential impacts to noise in a wilderness setting other than general statements about aircraft overflights.</p> <p>To avoid all potential for impacts identified by NPS general statements, the Navy would need to stop using the airspace, which would prevent the Navy from meeting its training and preparedness requirements.</p> <p>In terms of aircraft altitudes, the majority of time is spent above 10,000 ft MSL, but a portion of the flights occur at altitudes between 6,000 and 10,000 ft MSL.</p>
DOI-07	The FEIS should reflect the importance of aircraft keeping to their designated incoming flight path (depending on the width of that path), to control where aircraft are seen and heard.	All aircraft normally fly the planned flight path, and the flight path into the Olympic MOA is typically used by the EA-18G as planned. However, the transition airspace to and from the Olympic MOA is highly congested with commercial and general aviation traffic in addition to the EA-18G. FAA controls the airspace to and from the Olympic MOA, and during a normal weekday a mass of aircraft are departing or arriving from multiple airports on the Olympic Peninsula and surrounding Puget Sound. Military aircraft make up only about 7% of that traffic. The FAA has a planned traffic scheme and the EA-18Gs are safely blended into that traffic scheme. At times, due to the dynamic nature of the traffic scheme, aircraft are given air traffic control instructions that take them off their planned flight routes. These instructions must be followed unless the pilot deems the instruction unsafe. There are a number of reasons for air traffic control to issue instructions that take an aircraft off its planned flight route; e.g., safety, orderly flow of traffic, or a more expeditious route of flight. Any or all of the reasons could apply in a given situation.

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
DOI-08	“From 2015 through 2017, the average annual number of Navy EA-18G aircraft transits to and from the Olympic MOAs was 2,224. Under Alternative 1 [the preferred alternative], EA-18G transits to and from the Olympic MOAs are proposed to increase by 300 per year. This proposed increase equates to, on average, less than one additional transit per day over a calendar year.” We note that the proposal would result in roughly 7 total “events” per day, with much louder aircraft than previously experienced. A visitor who is in the park for 5 days would experience noise from military overflights at least 35 times in one visit.	The comparison of EA-18G as “much louder” to EA-6B noise levels in this paragraph appears to be a subjective evaluation between the old EA-6B operations and the new EA-18G operations. In fact, as shown in Table 4-3 of Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis for the Olympic Military Operations Areas) from the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, the EA-18G Growler is audible at shorter ranges than the EA-6B Prowler.
DOI-09	Page 3-20, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences - For overall noise from the EA-18G while training within the OMOA, the Appendix J noise analysis shows an increase of 11 dBA for a total of 37 dBA estimated for the preferred Alternative 1. The discussion in Appendix J did not appear to account for a baseline of 26 dBA, then an increase to 37 dBA, and so it is unclear where the initial measurement came from. The FEIS should clarify whether the 26 dBA is intended to measure natural ambient and 37 dBA is the proposed ambient under the preferred alternative. The FEIS should reflect that the increase of 11 dB to any soundscape would reduce the listening area for humans and visitors by 92% which would be a very significant impact on the soundscape and ability for wildlife to function and communicate in their environment.	This comment regards the proposed scenario as adding new operations to the area relative to the baseline scenario, which is not accurate. The proposed operations provide an increase to current operations that only raises the noise exposure from 36 to 37 dBA DNL, which aligns with the 13.5% increase in sorties/flight hours.
DOI-10	Appendix J, Page J-26, J.7 Acoustic Monitoring Report. The Department recommends that the FEIS provide the metric(s) for the natural daytime ambient acoustic baseline in the second paragraph (i.e., L50 or Leq).	Appendix J in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been revised to include the L _{A50} metric for clarity.
DOI-11	Appendix J.6.3 provides estimated L _{max} durations. As noted in the report, L _{max} may only occur for a fraction of a second. So as to provide more context about duration of jet noise, the FEIS should include the percent time above metrics at the threshold levels in Table J-18 per year (Table J-13) for all combined missions, and for the time period when the training exercises are occurring. This information will be more representative of what a national park visitor would actually experience.	Time Above is not feasible for noise calculations from MR_NMap, which is the noise model used, and approved by the FAA for these types of analyses. Operations at airfields have established flight patterns, which allow for detailed noise analysis, including metrics like percent time above. However, flight activities in special use airspace vary from sortie to sortie; there are no predictable flight paths within the MOA. Therefore, percent time above cannot be calculated for flight activities within special use airspace.
DOI-12	The Department recommends that the Navy provide soundscape monitoring assistance to capture real-time baseline sound levels with and without Growler overflights and continue to conduct on-the-ground monitoring for the duration (indefinitely) of all naval training and testing activities within and immediately adjacent to the Olympic MOA, wilderness area outside of the MOA, and especially along the park’s very	DoD’s position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses ¹ . The following text ² states DoD’s position regarding the preference for modeling:

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	popular wilderness coast. This would be a measured outcome and would provide transparency to the public regarding commitments made by the Navy with respect to the number, timing, and the extent of overflights in this specific area, as well as whether the aircraft regularly maintained the AGL and MSL levels as identified in the SEIS.	<p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
<i>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</i>		
EPA-01	We recommend that the Final Supplemental include revised information on Section 312(n) of the Clean Water Act, as set forth below. First, regarding Phase I of the Uniform Discharge Standards Rulemaking Process, we recommend replacing the phrase in the Draft Supplemental stating that, " ... the results of Phase I analysis concluded that discharges addressed under the Uniform National Discharge Standards program will not have adverse impacts to water quality; sediments, or other resources, including biological resources" with language from the EPA's website on the UNDS Rulemaking Process to avoid inaccurately characterizing the Phase I analysis. The EPA website states that: The Phase I Rule identified all discharges incidental to the normal operation of vessels of the Armed Forces and characterized each discharge to determine if it required control. The determination was	The language regarding the Uniform Discharge Standards has been revised in coordination with the EPA.

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>made based on the potential of the discharge to have an environmental impact. The rule determined the types of vessel discharges that require control by a marine pollution control device (MPCD) and those that do not require control. The EPA and the DOD identified 39 discharges, 25 of which would require control by an MPCD.⁷</p> <p>We also recommend revising the following sentence in the Draft Supplemental:</p> <p>The U.S. Navy adheres to regulations outlined in the Uniform National Discharge Standards program; as such, the analysis of impacts in this Supplemental will be limited to potential impacts from training and testing activities, including impacts from military expended materials, but not impacts from discharges addressed under the Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (incorporated into U.S. law as 33 U.S.C. sections 1901-1915) or the Uniform National Discharge Standards program.</p>	
EPA-02	<p>We recommend addressing potential UNDS-related water quality impacts in the EIS, rather than considering such impacts to be outside the scope of analysis. Doing so will ensure that potential water quality impacts from incidental vessel discharges during the proposed training and testing activities are disclosed to the public and decision makers, as contemplated by NEPA. Such impacts may be addressed by referencing the relevant Nature of Discharge Reports, which appear in the Phase I UNDS for Vessels of the Armed Forces Technical Development Document, and which address the environmental effects of the discharges identified as candidates for regulation under UNDS. ⁹ We recommend these revisions to the water quality section because - unless the Navy provides other information in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS - the best available information on potential water quality effects of certain incidental discharges is included in the UNDS Phase I Nature of Discharge reports.</p>	<p>The language regarding the Uniform Discharge Standards has been revised in coordination with the EPA.</p>
EPA-03	<p>Additional Noise Metrics</p> <p>While it is useful to understand the average sound level and the loudest events, we recommend two additional noise metrics that would further enhance public understanding and provide a clearer basis for decision makers when choosing a preferred alternative and considering potential mitigation. We specifically recommend additional metrics that more fully disclose the frequency and duration of aircraft overflight noise above certain levels.</p> <p>The two additional metrics we recommend are described in the</p>	<p>The additional metrics referenced in the DNWG Tech Bulletin are for NoiseMap (not MR_NMap). NoiseMap is for airfield noise analysis. Operations at airfields have established flight patterns, which allow for detailed noise analysis. MR_NMap is for noise analysis of special use airspace. Time Above (TA) is not feasible within MR_NMap and the variation within airspace operations.</p>

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	December 2009 Department of Defense Noise Working Group's Technical Bulletin - Using Supplemental Noise Metrics and Analysis Tools. Specifically, the "Number-of-Events Above" metric would provide a useful measure of the frequency of events and help answer questions of " ... how many aircraft fly over a given location or area at or above a selected threshold noise level." Similarly, the "Time Above a Specified Level" metric would provide a useful measure of the duration of noise exposure and help decision makers and the public understand the number of minutes that certain sound levels are exceeded. We note that, according to the DOD Technical Bulletin, time above analysis is usually conducted along with number above analysis to show both how many events occur above a selected threshold and the total duration of those events for a selected time-period.	
EPA-04	<p>Aircraft Noise and Social Resources</p> <p>According to the Draft Supplemental, the impact to social resources (including enjoyment of a natural setting such as the Olympic National Park) from aircraft overflights would be negligible because the training activities " ... would be temporary, of short duration, localized, and generally far enough from areas popular with tourists and residents ... " The Draft Supplemental does not sufficiently define "temporary," "short duration," "localized," and "areas popular with tourists and residents." Without definitions, it is unclear whether the conclusion that the airborne acoustics impacts to social resources would be negligible is accurate. We therefore recommend that the Final Supplemental define these terms in the context of noise impact to the social resource of quiet and natural places. We are providing thoughts on these terms for your consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary: Airborne noise (or any stressor/impact) would be considered temporary if it is expected to last for a limited time. • Short duration: Although the disturbance from an aircraft overflight may last only a few seconds relative to a fixed point, from an area-wide perspective the disturbance is longer (the aircraft leaves a track of noise). To better communicate the noise disturbance from aircraft overflights, please see our noise metrics recommendations, above. • Localized: Disturbance from one aircraft overflight has localized impacts on a fixed point. However, aircraft training and testing activities would be distributed throughout the MOA and the associated noise impacts would also be distributed throughout and potentially beyond the MOA. If the aircraft training and testing, and associated noise tended 	<p>The FEIS was updated to include definitions of the terms, "transient" (replacing "temporary"), "short duration," "localized," and "areas popular with tourists and residents" as the comment recommended. The suggested definitions for these terms provided in the comment were adopted, at least in part if not wholly, and introduced at the beginning of the discussion on noise impacts. Regarding the definitions of "short duration" and "localized," the suggested definitions are somewhat problematic given that the duration of the noise is typically very brief (seconds) and localized to a particular receiver (i.e., a person on the ground) and then abruptly no longer detectable or, presumably, no longer a disturbance at that one location. It is true that the same aircraft continues to fly over the NP generating noise with the potential to cause a noise disturbance on the ground in other locations during its flight. However, the initial disturbance and any subsequent disturbances are very brief and isolated spatially such that an associated disturbance, if one were to occur, on the ground would be equally brief and isolated. The fact that the aircraft continues to fly over the NP does not mean that noise from the aircraft is continuously causing a disturbance on the ground throughout the NP. The occurrence of a disturbance is dependent on a receiver (i.e., a person on the ground) being present and reacting to noise from the aircraft. A more distant noise, which is the most likely scenario, would not necessarily cause a disturbance. The phrase "areas popular with tourists and residents" is intended to refer to areas in the NP where people are more likely to be found (e.g., near the visitors center or on popular hiking trails). These areas are at lower elevations and would not experience peak sound levels from Navy aircraft and are also likely to have other sources of anthropogenic noise (e.g., noise</p>

Table H-1: Responses to Comments from Federal Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>to occur over only one or a few fixed points, they would then be considered localized.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas popular with tourists and residents: We suggest that, from the perspective of analyzing the potential significance of impacts in the MOAs, what matters is the proportion of activities impacting the MOA versus the proportion of activities occurring farther away. 	<p>from vehicles, other people talking and making sounds) such that the level of disturbance from aircraft noise may be reduced or less noticeable. By contrast, areas that would experience peak sound levels are at the highest elevations in the NP (above 4,000 ft.) and are less frequented by people.</p>
EPA-05	<p>Average Busy Day</p> <p>The Supplemental's characterization of the timing and duration of aircraft noise could be improved with additional information on impacts from an average busy training day. It is useful for decision makers and the public to understand average noise levels - including, for example, that 60 dBA would be exceeded less than two percent of the time during daytime and nighttime hours. Current descriptions of noise impacts from a daytime plus nighttime perspective, however, do not sufficiently capture the fact that, "Visitors to the national park, national forests, and wilderness areas on weekends or at night will rarely hear an EA-18G aircraft, because EA-18G training flights typically occur Monday through Friday and during daylight hours." Training flights may also be rare on holidays and Department of Defense 3-day and 4-day weekend schedules. Disclosure of the impact and exposure information from an average busy training day would help clarify that there may be periods of more focused flight activity and associated impacts.</p>	<p>The Average Busy Day is used for commercial airfields, is not applicable to military activities, and is not used by DoD. However, based on historical use, the Navy expects the average busy day in the Olympic MOA to be approximately 17 aircraft sorties.</p>

H.1.2 American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations

This section contains comments from American Indian Tribes, nations, and tribal organizations received during the public comment period and the Navy's response to those comments.

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
<i>Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria (Trinidad)</i>		
Trinidad-01	Thank you for contacting the Trinidad Rancheria and initiating consultation on this project. The project area is outside of the geographic area of concern for the Rancheria and therefore we have no interest in this project and no information to provide. However, I would be interested in a report after the project for our records.	Thank you. The Navy will keep you informed of future updates to this project.
<i>Intertribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council (ITSWC)</i>		
ITSWC-01	While the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area provides a measure of protection against harm from Navy training and testing, the Tribes urge the Navy to expand the prohibited activities to include use of sonar, considering the impact such devices have on the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals.	Training and testing with active sonar is essential to national security. The Navy uses active sonar during military readiness activities only when it is essential to training missions or testing program requirements since active sonar has the potential to alert opposing forces to the operating platform's presence. Passive sonar and other available sensors are used in concert with active sonar to the maximum extent practicable. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict certain activities or types of sonar year-round within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, seasonally within the Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area and Stonewall and Heceta Bank Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, and year-round in the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to help the Navy avoid potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. Additional information about the Navy's mitigation areas is presented in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
ITSWC-02	<p>1. Best Available Information</p> <p>One of the Navy’s rationales for updating the 2015 Final EIS with a supplemental EIS is the need to incorporate analyses based on the most current and best available science and analytical methods. The Tribes disagree with this rationale because “best available science” is not defined in the Draft SEIS. The working definition should take into account the Tribal Traditional Knowledge (sometimes referred to as “Traditional Ecological Knowledge” or “TEK”) of the Tribes. Since time immemorial, Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including the southern portion of the Navy’s Northwest Training and Testing Range. The deep-seated understanding of this environment, acquired and passed down for generations, is an epistemology that informs sustainable management, and ensures abundant, healthy and biologically diverse ecosystems. It represents a vitally important complement to the western science that the Navy is required to utilize when analyzing impacts to Tribal cultural, spiritual and marine resources. Tribal Traditional Knowledge should be meaningfully taken into account for this purpose, while fully respecting the need for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.</p>	<p>The Navy will continue to consult with the Tribes. Through Government-to-Government consultations, the Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.</p> <p>The Navy recognizes such requests for specific traditional knowledge in the format of planning for an individual action may be regarded as extractive. In the context of world events, the Navy also asks that the value of the scientific method also be respected, especially when the results of it are not laid bare by the current pandemic. The optimal situation is the integration of traditional knowledge. The Navy is committed to strike a complementary balance between the two ways of understanding and the integration of traditional knowledge built on mutual respect for both ways of understanding.</p> <p>As stated in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the term “traditional resources” is used to encompass protected tribal resources.</p>
ITSWC-03	<p>2. Marine Species Monitoring Program</p> <p>The Draft Supplemental EIS includes an environmental baseline against which to assess potential impacts of the training and testing is essential to a thorough environmental review. Draft SEIS at 3-2. Accuracy in the baseline in turn depends on a robust monitoring program that is designed to fully encompass the marine species populations in the Study Area. The Navy’s shift in priorities “towards assessing the potential response of individual species to training and testing activities” directly results from InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council et al v. National Marine Fisheries Service et al. The Tribes strongly urge the Navy to expand its application of this approach. Id.</p> <p>In addition, the Tribes require that the monitoring program be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural and spiritual resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species. Moreover, the courts have clarified that a finding of “negligible impact” does not fully satisfy the Navy’s obligation under the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and that the Navy is subject to an independent statutory requirement to ensure that mitigation measures</p>	<p>The Navy understands there may be limitations of the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act protecting cultural and spiritual resources. The Navy’s monitoring program does address impacts beyond the potential for harm at the population level. The Navy uses cutting edge research to improve the science in a number of areas, including marine mammal densities, species occurrence, exposure and response, and habitat use. The Navy has consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service pursuant to the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the resulting mitigation measures achieve the least practicable adverse impact.</p> <p>As a federal agency, the Navy owes a fiduciary duty to Indian tribes. The nature of that duty depends on the underlying substantive laws creating the duty. The Navy discharges its trust responsibility by complying with specific statutes, even when they require separate analysis and consideration of interconnected resources, which may not reflect a tribal perspective. The Navy is committed to address these challenges through good faith consultation in the context of the government-to-government relationships, which endures beyond consultations limited to a specific law or project.</p>

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	are sufficient to achieve the “least practicably adverse impact.” Natural Resources Defense Council v. Pritzker, 823 F. 3d 1125, 1133 (9th Cir. 2016). The Navy’s obligation under the federal trust responsibility to act in the best interests of Indian Tribes likewise includes the requirement to reduce impacts to the lowest possible level. See, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe v. Department of the Navy, 898 F. 2d 1410 (9th Cir. 1990) (a “no jeopardy” finding of the Endangered Species Act does not preclude a finding that the Navy breached its fiduciary duty to the Tribe to conserve water for the Tribe’s endangered fishery). To meet this standard, a more expansive definition of harm is required.	
ITSWC-04	<p>3. Environmental Consequences</p> <p>The Draft SEIS identifies three stressors to be analyzed: access, availability of marine resources or habitat, and loss or damage to Tribal fishing gear. Draft SEIS at 3-9. The Tribes note first that this list does not appear to be a set of stressors but rather a list of the kinds of resource-related issues implicated by the Navy’s training and testing. The list should be revised to address that confusion. Second, this list is insufficient to capture the unique relationship of Northern California Indian Tribes to the Pacific Ocean, as it seems geared more specifically to those Tribes in the Pacific Northwest that exercise off-reservation treaty fishing rights through access to Usual and Accustomed Fishing Grounds. The Tribes request the Navy to expand the list of “stressors” to include those parts of the Study Area offshore from Northern California that encompass cultural and spiritual resources of the Tribes, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, that will be impacted by the training and testing.</p>	<p>The Navy acknowledges the spiritual connections, as stated in Section 3.10.1 (Affected Environment) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, “Sociocultural elements, such as traditions, lifeways, religious practices, community values, and social institutions may be considered by some groups to be types of cultural resources, especially within tribal communities whose traditional interaction with the natural world is integral to their culture. However, the Navy has completed this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS within the framework of NEPA, providing impacts as determined using the best available science. As stated in Section 3.10.1, this supplement is organized “to consider cultural and historic elements of the human environment within and between the three following sections: Section 3.10 (Cultural Resources), Section 3.11 (American Indian and Alaska Native Traditional Resources), and Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). Combined, these sections seek to provide a full analysis of the potential impacts from the Proposed Action on sociocultural elements of American Indian/Alaska Native communities and American history.”</p>
ITSWC-05	<p>4. Climate Change and Water Quality</p> <p>The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Draft SEIS at 3.1-19 to 3.1-36. Based on the studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in the climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of the ocean waters will accelerate the corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts that remain after training and testing is complete. The cumulative effect of this dynamic should also be considered.</p>	<p>The Navy discusses ocean acidification in the context of climate change in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) and 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and includes information from scientific studies conducted since 2015. The Navy acknowledged in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) that “metals tend to dissociate” in more acidic ocean conditions. The Navy added a reference back to these two sections in the sections analyzing the impacts of explosives (Section 3.1.4.1) and metals (Section 3.1.4.2). Note that corrosion can also act to insulate ordnance and other metal items from contact with seawater and sediments, slowing or even halting further corrosion and movement of metals into the adjacent sediments and water column. The effects of climate change on the ocean environment, particularly effects specific to a particular region like ocean waters in the Pacific Northwest,</p>

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		continue to be researched and to evolve and are not necessarily predictable. For example, as described in Section 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality), increases in ocean acidity are believed to reduce the availability of carbonate in the water column, which is needed by organisms to generate calcium carbonate structures. However, increases in sea surface temperature associated with climate change appear to stimulate calcification at an even greater rate, essentially overriding the inhibiting effects of lower pH levels and leading to unexpected high abundance of cocolithophores (which build protective scales from calcium carbonate) in some ocean regions.
Lummi Indian Business Council (Lummi)		
Lummi-01	<p>1. DEIS Statement: Navy actions were not the sources for any of the identified threats in the report by the Southern Resident Orca Task Force (Office of the Washington Governor, 2018) (DEIS page 3.4-46). Lummi Response: The Navy's use of sonar equipment was raised as a concern at the very first SRKW Task Force meeting. As participants in the Washington State Governor's SRKW Task Force, we take exception to the erroneous statement in the DEIS that, "Navy actions were not the sources for any of the identified threats" in the report by the Southern Resident Orca Task Force (Office of the Washington Governor, 2018) (page 3.4-46). In point of fact, concerns about the Navy's use of sonar equipment impacting the Southern Residents was raised in the very first Orca Task Force meeting on May 1, 2018. In addition, the Task Force's final report recommended coordinating with the Navy to "discuss reduction of noise and disturbance affecting Southern Resident areas from military exercises and Navy aircraft." The final report went on to recommend that Governor Inslee:</p> <p>should meet with the U.S. Navy's Commanding Officer for the region that includes Washington state to address the acoustic and physical impacts to Southern Resident orcas from Naval exercises in waters and air of Washington state. The Governor should request the Navy participate on the Vessels working group in Year Two and identify actions to reduce the Navy's impacts to Southern Resident areas.</p>	<p>The Task Force Final Report did not identify Navy sonar among the major threats. The major threats identified in the report are a lack of prey, disturbance from noise and vessel traffic, and toxic contaminants in the waters they inhabit. The Navy, as acknowledged by the Governor's Task Force in 2018, was not previously requested to participate in the Task Force, and the Navy was not made aware of conversations held during meetings in 2018. The Navy has since been invited to take part and, as a result, a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Task Force's working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.</p>
Lummi-02	<p>2. DEIS Statement: The use of sonar and other transducers during training activities as described under [preferred] Alternative 1 will result in the unintentional taking of killer whales incidental to those activities (page 3.4-190). Lummi Response: This is not the first instance in the DEIS where the Navy adopts a cavalier and seemingly naïve attitude towards the complex</p>	<p>Behavioral response severity is described herein as "low," "moderate," or "high." These are derived from the Southall et al. (2007) severity scale. Some reactions estimated using the behavioral criteria are likely to be low severity, which are behavioral responses that fall within an animal's range of typical (baseline) behaviors and are unlikely to disrupt an individual to a point where natural behavior patterns are significantly altered or abandoned (e.g., an</p>

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>behavior of the <i>qwe lhol mechen</i>. It is widely known that harmful harassment to a single area-whether intentional or inadvertent will likely lead to a population-wide effect.</p> <p>The EIS Fact Sheet Booklet states that 99.84% of all estimated takes of marine mammals would be Level B harassment. This would include disrupting and altering natural behavior patterns such as feeding, surfacing, nursing, breeding, sheltering or migration. All of these activities, but in particular feeding, breeding, and nursing, are critical for the distressed SRKW population. Level B harassment that interferes with both feeding and breeding or displaces areas from preferred foraging areas is of significant concern and will further contribute to the Southern Resident orcas' low reproductive success.</p> <p>We are also concerned with new and increased impacts to Southern Resident orcas from mine explosives. It is well known that this can cause injury, disorientation, or death for an orca population. Moreover, the use of mid-frequency sonar can impact orca and other marine mammals within 2,000 square miles, an area well outside the reasonable area that even highly trained marine mammal observers are able to survey.</p>	<p>orientation or startle response). Responses estimated using the Navy's quantitative analysis are most likely to be moderate severity (e.g. alteration of a natural behavior pattern), which are not expected to lead to long-term consequences for the individual or population based on the nature of the Proposed Action (e.g., short-term, transient, temporary sound sources). Best available science indicates that based on the types of sound sources used by the Navy under the Proposed Action, the probability of high severity responses occurring is very low. Furthermore, no significant behavioral responses such as panic, stranding or other severe reactions have been observed during monitoring of actual training or testing activities.</p> <p>Since the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has incorporated new estimates of Southern Resident killer whale densities and distributions in the NWTT Offshore Area into the quantitative analysis of impacts. The revised density estimates are shown in the technical report U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area (amended September 20, 2019), available at www.nwtteis.com. As a result, the Navy has revised the number of harassment (behavioral and TTS) of Southern Resident killer whales due to sonar exposure in Appendix E (Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities) of this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing (a new testing activity in Phase III) is the only explosive activity in the NWTT Offshore Area that would occur within 50 NM from shore and within areas that Southern Resident killer whales may be present. The quantitative analysis of impacts predicts no incidental takes due to this activity after incorporating the above best available information about recent Southern Resident killer whale presence in the NWTT Offshore Area.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals), a single or even a few moderate TTS to an individual marine mammal per year are unlikely to have any long-term consequences for that individual. Based on the best available science, long-term consequences for marine mammal species or stocks, including Southern Resident killer whales, would not be expected from Navy training and testing activities under the Proposed Action.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy worked cooperatively with NMFS to develop a suite of mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on Southern Resident killer</p>

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		whales to the maximum extent practicable. The Navy developed numerous new mitigation measures for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS in areas particularly important to Southern Resident killer whales for feeding, breeding, and migration. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation whenever and wherever applicable active sonar and explosive activities occur in the Study Area. The active sonar mitigation zones (i.e., area of observation) include a 1,000 yd. and 500 yd. power down and/or a 200 yd. shut down, depending on the sonar source; therefore, Lookouts are not required to survey 2,000 square miles as the commenter suggests.
Lummi-03	<p>3. DEIS Statement: Long-term consequences to marine mammal populations from Vessels, in-water devices, military expended materials, and seafloor devices associated with Navy training and testing activities are not anticipated. The use of in-water electromagnetic devices and high-energy lasers have the potential to result in impacts on marine mammals but would not result in long-term impacts on marine mammal populations. Lummi Response: It is mystifying how the Navy can reach these conclusions on the long term impacts of the proposed activities on the SRKW. The fact that the Navy can come to these conclusions while stating that tests may present risks to individual marine mammals, "can cause injury or result in the death of an animal", or that "the numbers of marine mammals potentially impacted by explosives are small as compared to each species' respective abundance, long-term consequences for the species or stocks would not be expected," demonstrates a willful ignorance or a reductionist understanding and modeling of the complexity of orca communication and communality.</p> <p>a. The DEIS wording of would not result in long-term impacts" and "are not anticipated," are not substantiated by the Navy's own data and are conclusions that cannot be drawn from the information in the DEIS. There are documented cases in this region of U.S. and Canadian naval activities, including active sonar training and explosive testing, have caused—and continue to cause—direct short, near, and long-term harm to <i>qwe lhol mechen</i>.</p> <p>b. Every individual orca in the current SRKW population matters if the population is to avoid extinction. It is well documented that among the orca, with their strong, intergenerational bonds, the loss of one orca will also directly affects the others' chance of survival. Researcher Jeff Foster, for example, demonstrated that when a female resident orca dies, it increases the mortality risk of her male offspring under age 30 by 3.1 times, and the mortality risk of her male offspring over age 30 by 8.3 times.</p>	<p>Using best available science, the Navy's analysis predicts that no Southern Resident killer whales would be killed or experience PTS during Navy training and testing activities, including active sonar and explosives. As described in Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017h), the Navy's analysis incorporates conservative assumptions to account for uncertainty and therefore likely overestimates potential impacts of TTS and behavioral responses. As described in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals), a single or even a few minor TTS to an individual marine mammal per year are unlikely to have any long-term consequences for that individual. Based on the best available science, long-term consequences for marine mammal species or stocks, including Southern Resident killer whales, would not be expected from Navy training and testing activities under the Proposed Action. The Navy has been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and their salmon prey species. No significant behavioral responses such as panic, stranding or other severe reactions have been observed during monitoring of actual training or testing activities.</p> <p>In May 2003, killer whales in Haro Strait, Washington, exhibited what were believed by some observers to be aberrant behaviors, during which time the USS Shoup was in the vicinity and engaged in mid-frequency active sonar operations. Sound fields modeled for the USS Shoup transmissions (Fromm, 2009; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2005; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2004) estimated a mean received SPL of approximately 169 dB re 1 µPa at the location of the killer whales at the closest point of approach between the animals and the vessel (estimated SPLs ranged from 150 to 180 dB re 1 µPa). Per the Phase III behavioral response function for odontocetes, the estimated received level during this exposure would likely have resulted in a behavioral response. However, attributing the observed behaviors to any one cause is</p>

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>c. An active sonar training exercise conducted by the U.S. Navy in 2003 in the eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca and Haro Strait caused members of the SRKW J-pod to stop foraging. Their behavioral pattern became disoriented and they eventually grouped together in shallow water where they are at increased risk of stranding. (Sonar could clearly be heard above the water in a video recording of the incident.)</p> <p>d. A juvenile Southern Resident female was stranded in 2012 with evidence of trauma consistent with an explosion or high-pressure impact, a week after the Canadian Navy had been conducting sonar exercises in the region. Experts in underwater noise who continue to review her case believe that the most likely cause of death was an underwater military explosion.</p> <p>e. In 2017, explosives detonated by the Canadian Navy near a group of Southern Residents (L pod) caused the whales to group together suddenly and flee the area. These examples show that just one incident of training and testing activities impacting Southern Residents can cause significant harm, death, or displacement from preferred habitat.</p>	<p>problematic given there were six nearby whale watch vessels surrounding the pod, and subsequent research has demonstrated that “Southern Residents modify their behavior by increasing surface activity (breaches, tail slaps, and pectoral fin slaps) and swimming in more erratic paths when vessels are close” (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries, 2014). For more details about this incident, please refer to the <i>Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities</i> technical report (May 2017), available at www.nwtteis.com. Under the Proposed Action, the use of hull-mounted sonars in the Inland Waters portion of the Study Area is limited, and the Navy would follow the mitigations prescribed for the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation).</p> <p>The National Marine Fisheries Service investigated the stranding of Southern Resident killer whale L-112 (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-133). No U.S. Navy training activities involving sonar or explosives were conducted between 1 and 11 February 2012 in the Northwest Training Range Complex (which includes Washington, Oregon, and northern California). Other anthropogenic activity, including other U.S. military, Royal Canadian Navy, fishing, or construction activities, were also ruled out as potential causes of the observed injuries. The investigation was unable to determine the cause of the observed injuries, although blast injury was deemed unlikely. The Navy worked collaboratively with NMFS during the MMPA and ESA consultation processes to develop mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from Southern Resident killer whales to the maximum extent practicable. With implementation of mitigation, such as using Lookouts to observe for marine mammals before and during explosive activities, and avoiding explosives in key habitat areas, the Navy does not expect to cause “significant harm, death, or displacement from preferred habitat” to any individual Southern Resident killer whale, as was asserted by the commenter.</p>
Lummi-04	<p>f. The DEIS acknowledges the potential for marine mammals to experience non-auditory injury and mortality as a result of its activities. Nonetheless, the assumptions the Navy has made in modeling these types of harm result in 'take estimates' that both underestimate effects and are inconsistent with the Marine Mammal Protection Act.</p> <p>The DEIS also fails to account for the findings such as those contained in Wieland, M., A. Jones, and S. C. P. Renn. 2010. This study, like a number of others, found that because the SRKW are adjusting their behavior, "we must consider the very real possibility that engine noise is hindering their</p>	<p>In compliance with the regulations implementing the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Navy relied on best available science to estimate potential impacts on marine mammals, including marine mammal density data, acoustic impact criteria, and modeling of predicted effects incorporating emerging science since Phase II. Additionally, as described in Section 3.0.1.2 (Navy's Quantitative Analysis to Determine Impacts to Sea Turtles and Marine Mammals) in Chapter 3.0 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences), the Navy's analysis makes conservative assumptions when data is limited. The estimate of take, therefore, is unlikely to be under-</p>

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	ability to communicate, and may well impact their efficiency at using acoustics to forage and navigate, as well." The use of mid-frequency sonar has also been linked to separation of killer whale and calf from its group (Olson, JK, J Wood, RW Osborne, L Barrett-Lennard, S Larson. 2018). The SRKW simply cannot afford any further decrease in their already very low recruitment rates, an increase in distress in their foraging opportunities, or disorientation among its members.	estimated. The quantitative analysis predicts no mortalities or non-auditory injuries of any marine mammal species. The Navy considered the best available science in its analysis of each stressor, including the articles suggested by the commenter. Please note that Olson et al. 2018 was cited in Section 3.4.1.16.3, and Wieland et al., 2010 was incorporated in Section 3.4.1.7.4 of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service, as required under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act, and will implement a suite of mitigation to avoid potential impacts on Southern Resident killer whales under the Proposed Action to the maximum extent practicable.
Lummi-05	<p>6. DEIS Statement: Foraging during the spring-in Salish Sea by Southern Resident killer whales has declined in recent years as they shift their range and forage for Chinook salmon or other prey species elsewhere in response to reduced prey availability in that historically used inland waters foraging area. (DEIS p. 3.4-26).</p> <p>Lummi Response: In actual fact, Olson et al. (2018) noted that K and L pods have been increasing the duration of their stay in the inland waters by staying in the Salish Sea through the fall and into the early winter. Furthermore, any short-term variations in their presence in the Salish Sea should not be a rationale for exercising less caution in the inland waters. It is difficult to predict orca presence on a long-term or even annual basis, and the Navy should not assume that the shift outside of the Salish Sea in the spring and summer is a permanent change.</p> <p>Moreover, the DEIS fails to acknowledge that even spending time elsewhere, Southern Resident orcas are not getting enough food and are showing signs of malnutrition. The DEIS also implies that changes in the Southern Residents' presence in the Salish Sea mean that protections there are less important than they used to be. This is a misleading and dangerous, assumption; one of several that lead us to question to motives and aim of the DEIS. On the contrary, the inland waters remain a critical foraging area for the future of the SRKW. For that reason, tribal, state and federal governments are actively working to restore salmon populations in the inland waters as well as reduce vessel traffic noise.</p> <p>Additionally, the Navy should take into consideration that when the Southern Resident orcas are not in inland waters, they are likely to be in their offshore area, which is subject to additional training and testing activities that do not occur in the Salish Sea (see Southern Resident Killer</p>	<p>The inclusion of references from Shields et al., 2018 was not included to imply that impacts in the Inland Waters would be reduced or otherwise avoided because of the changing presence of Southern Resident killer whales within their summer-core habitat areas, but rather to present best available science on the species current status, including prey availability. This is a critical component of the environmental baseline the Navy then uses to estimate potential impacts resulting from the Navy's activities.</p> <p>As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The commenter incorrectly asserts that the Navy suggests that protective measures in the Salish Sea are less important; however, the Navy has not suggested that and does not consider that to be true. The mitigation measures developed for both NWTT Inland Waters and the NWTT Offshore Area for the Proposed Action represent an increase over the mitigation developed for the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Whale migration route at right). The Navy should consider additional mitigation and monitoring in the orcas' offshore habitat given the potential increased use of this area and the unique activities—such as active sonar—that take place in this portion of their range.	
Lummi-06	7. Additional and Related Lummi Comments a. Unless there is strategic alignment across tribal, state, and federal agencies, the SRKW are likely to go extinct within our lifetimes. The DEIS demonstrates an increase in the threat to the SRKW from ocean noise, direct harm, disorientation and displacement for an already stressed population. The Navy must consider the current crisis facing the endangered Southern Resident orcas and make new adjustments in its testing and training activities.	Please see response to Lummi-02 above. Navy agrees that alignment of efforts across all stakeholders is important. As NMFS has determined previously and as the current analysis presents, Navy's actions are not likely to contribute to the extinction of SRKW and has incorporated mitigation measures that are designed to avoid or reduce impacts to SRKW that may result from Navy's activities.
Lummi-07	b. The EIS should detail the times of year during which the proposed activities will take place. The Southern Resident orcas have exhibited seasonality in their movements, and information from tagging studies, coastal surveys, and passive acoustic monitoring allows some degree of prediction for when and where they may be traveling and foraging. Any overlap in their seasonal movements and the Navy's testing and training activities will increase impacts on these species. Information about timing should be made public in the EIS and the Navy should seek to adjust the timing of their activities to minimize such overlap. c. The intended duration of the EIS is not clear. It is not stated in this EIS whether the proposed activities were analyzed for impacts over a five-year time period or for the extended seven-year time period.	As stated in Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities), because of the nature of training and testing requirements for forces that must be ready to deploy at all times, activities could occur throughout the year. The Navy added additional details on seasonality and day/night requirements of its activities to Appendix A (Navy Activities Descriptions) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy did consider seasonal movements and behaviors of marine species in its effect analysis. The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species either seasonally or year-round in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitats, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). The duration of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS is for the foreseeable future, while the Marine Mammal Protection Act permits would be in place for seven years.
Lummi-08	d. The designation for Southern Resident orca critical habitat is likely to change later this year. The Navy should not make final decisions about training and testing in the potential new critical habitat areas off the coasts of Washington, Oregon and California until this designation has been made. The Navy should wait until NMFS makes its final designation for expanded critical habitat before pursuing activities that would adversely affect the area. Changes in the Navy's mitigation measures are likely to be necessary so that the proposed action does not "result in destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat." e. It is incumbent upon the Navy to be rigorous, transparent, and conservative in assessing potential impacts on these populations. 40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.22, 24 (requiring agencies, inter alia, to obtain information	The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and to ensure the professional integrity of their analyses).	
Makah Tribe (Makah)		
Makah-01	<p>1) Protection of Makah Trust Resources</p> <p>The Makah Tribe would bring to the Navy's attention the need to further review the impacts of the NWTT on the Makah Tribe's trust resources and the environments on which they depend. In order to more accurately evaluate impacts to fish, marine mammals, and other wildlife from the existing, new, and increased training and testing activities, we need the Navy to clarify the times of year in which the proposed activities will occur. These discussions should occur with our policy and technical staff to better assess impacts to tribal trust resources, especially those with seasonal movements and/or who rely on sound to feed, communicate, breed, and navigate (i.e., gray whales, humpback whales, halibut, salmon, rockfish, southern resident killer whales, etc.). The Makah Tribe has significant expertise in fisheries, marine mammals, cultural resource protection, vessel traffic safety, oil spill response, and policy development and are the most appropriate ones to determine potential impacts to the Makah Tribe. The Makah Tribe looks forward to working with the Navy to fully understand the scope and impacts of the proposed activities on our treaty resources.</p>	<p>As stated in Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities), because of the nature of training and testing requirements for forces that must be ready to deploy at all times, activities could occur throughout the year. The Navy added additional details on seasonality and day/night requirements of its activities to Appendix A (Navy Activities Descriptions) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy did consider seasonal movements and behaviors of marine species in its effect analysis. The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species either seasonally or year-round in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitats, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).</p> <p>Building on a foundation of over a decade of candid dialog about the Northwest Training Range Complex, prior training and testing planning (NWTT II), Electronic Warfare Range, and other actions potentially affecting Makah traditional territory and treaty resources, the Navy is committed to continuing good faith and meaningful consultation.</p>
Makah-02	<p>The Makah Tribal Council has been engaged on the Governor's SRKW Task Force in both the prey and vessels working groups, which provided a recommendation (Recommendation #25) for the Navy to "address the acoustic and physical impacts to Southern Resident orcas from Naval exercises in waters and air of Washington state. "For example, recent acoustic data from NOAA's hydrophone network show high use of the Cape Flattery Offshore area by southern resident killer whales (SRKW) in the spring compared to other areas of the coast. As such, we recommend this area be removed for sonar and explosive testing and training to avoid impacts or incidental take of SRKW, as well as other tribal trust resources. Acoustic, or noise impacts of vessel traffic, have also been demonstrated to negatively impact orca behavior, echolocation, and foraging success. Primary sources of acoustic impacts include sonar, acoustic devices, vessel traffic, and construction. Killer whales use echolocation to locate prey, communicate, and navigate underwater. Underwater anthropogenic noise can impair SRKW ability to successfully engage in these important behaviors and/or cause them to compensate in an energetically expensive manner.</p>	<p>The Navy-funded research presented in Emmons et al. 2019 was considered in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, but the report was not cited because it was still in the process of being edited by the authors and had not been finalized. The report has since been finalized and is cited in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy does not frequently conduct training or testing activities in the location of the Cape Flattery Offshore hydrophone since that area is highly utilized by commercial vessel traffic, making it an undesirable location for the Navy to conduct activities, especially sonar training or testing.</p> <p>The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on Southern Resident killer whales and other marine species in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitat areas, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed a new mitigation area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, which encompasses waters off Cape Flattery, as recommended by the commenter. The Navy's mitigation now includes annual limits on hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and prohibits explosive Mine Countermeasures and Neutralization Testing in the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. All other explosive</p>

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		activities are required to be conducted 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. In addition, the Navy developed a new mitigation to issue annual awareness notification messages to alert ships and aircraft to the possible presence of increased concentrations of Southern Resident killer whales seasonally, which will further help avoid potential impacts from vessel movements and training and testing activities on this species.
Makah-03	The Makah Tribal Council recommends including sonar as a prohibited activity within 50nm mitigation area as sonar negatively impacts marine mammals, a trust resource of the Makah Tribe.	<p>Training and testing with active sonar is essential to national security. The Navy uses active sonar during military readiness activities only when it is essential to training missions or testing program requirements since active sonar has the potential to alert opposing forces to the operating platform's presence. Passive sonar and other available sensors are used in concert with active sonar to the maximum extent practicable.</p> <p>The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict certain activities or types of sonar year-round within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, seasonally within the Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area and Stonewall and Heceta Bank Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, and year-round in the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to help the Navy avoid potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed a new mitigation area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, in part to reduce potential impacts from active sonar on Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy will conduct a maximum combined total of 33 hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar during testing annually within 20 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Mitigation Area. Additional geographic mitigation for active sonar beyond what is detailed in Section K.3 (Mitigation Areas to be Implemented), such as prohibiting all active sonar within 50 NM from shore, would be impractical to implement for the reasons described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) and Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar).</p>

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Makah-04	2) Adequate Spill Response and Clean up Preparedness Any changes in testing or movement of Naval vessels needs to be accompanied by appropriately scaled improvements in oil spill response and other potential hazardous materials. The Makah Tribe is willing to work with the Navy to determine whether or not the Navy is adequately prepared to address a response to hazardous materials in our marine area, considering the recent incident of 4,000 gallons of sewage spilled into Puget Sound in March, 2019. The Makah Tribe has experienced over 1 million gallons of oil spilled in our treaty area since the early 1970s; we have witnessed firsthand the devastating effects of oil spilled by the General Mieggs, the Nesstucca barge and the Tenyo Mam. While we recognize that there has been progress towards reducing the risk of oil spills or spills of other hazardous materials, we remain concerned about risks of catastrophic spills and, in particular, the limited capability to clean up spills, especially in remote areas such as the Washington Coast.	The Navy takes very seriously its response to oil spills and is committed to maintain a clean environment, even after a spill might occur. The Navy's policy is to respond to Navy spills and to undertake direct and immediate action to minimize the spill's effect. The Navy owns and maintains a large supply of spill response equipment throughout their facilities in the Puget Sound area, and has a well-trained full-time staff that that can rapidly respond to a spill, regardless of its source. The Navy is a spill response resource in Puget Sound that can support other agencies as needed during oil spills in this area.
Makah-05	3) Testing and Training new technology and Environmental Research Within the SEIS, the Navy is proposing the use of high-energy lasers, kinetic energy weapons, and biodegradable polymer, the effects of which are unknown. The Makah Tribal Council recommends the Navy conduct rigorous testing and monitoring of these new technologies to assess and avoid impacts to fish, marine mammals, wildlife, and Makah's treaty protected trust resources. We would also like to be updated on the results of these monitoring efforts to ensure the protection of our trust resources. Additionally, the Navy Northwest has funded, and will continue to fund, research in this region. The Makah Tribal Council is interested in becoming more involved in the development of the research objectives and the research design for ongoing, planned, and future research off of the Washington coast.	<p>The Navy's use of high-energy lasers, kinetic energy weapons, and biodegradable polymer, while new to the NWTT Study Area, have been tested on other Navy ranges and evaluated in previous environmental documents. Their use in the NWTT Study Area has been thoroughly analyzed in this NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS for impacts specific to their use in this environment. In each case, as described throughout Chapter 3, impacts are expected to be minimal to undetectable.</p> <p>As a federal agency, the Navy owes a fiduciary duty to Indian tribes. The nature of that duty depends on the underlying substantive laws creating the duty. The Navy discharges its trust responsibility by complying with specific statutes, even when they require separate analysis and consideration of interconnected resources, which may not reflect a tribal perspective. The Navy is committed to address these challenges through good faith consultation in the context of the government-to-government relationship with the Makah Tribe, which endures beyond consultations limited to a specific law or project.</p> <p>Marine species monitoring reports are available on the Navy's Marine Species Monitoring website (https://www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/). The Navy looks forward to engaging with the tribe to discuss future research projects.</p>
Makah-06	4) Inclusion of Tribal and Traditional Knowledge The Navy should expand their use of data and information to include tribal and traditional knowledge. The Makah Tribe has lived on the Washington	The Navy is committed to pursuing optimal management processes and results in a supportive environment of mutual respect, collaboration, and confidentiality. However, it also must be recognized that such a goal is

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	coast since time immemorial, as such our knowledge would enhance the SEIS and complement the western science used. The Navy should solicit and include traditional knowledge and assessments from tribes when analyzing the NWTT impacts to tribal cultural, ceremonial, spiritual, and economic marine resources, as determined by each Tribe. The Makah Tribal Council recommends that in order for the SEIS to be complete, tribal traditional knowledge and impacts as determined by the Makah Tribe should be taken into account in a meaningful and respectful manner, while respecting the need for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.	challenging owing to the Navy's role and mission. For the current action, the Navy is not fulfilling the role of resource manager. While subject to the same fiduciary and trust responsibilities shared by all federal agencies, the Navy differs from land and resource managing agencies who are better positioned to develop optimal integration of traditional knowledge into meaningful resource management. Through the government-to-government consultation process, the Navy considers tribal and traditional knowledge provided in its monitoring program while maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality. Resource management is best achieved when traditional knowledge is integrated into a management process, and not just a source of information for a particular project or program.
Makah-07	5) Climate Change Impacts The Makah Tribal Council believes the current SEIS is deeply flawed by under representing the importance of and the impact upon marine areas, habitats, and species as well as how projected climate and ocean changes are and may affect these resources. Our oceans are experiencing multiple environmental stressors, including temperature increases, ocean acidification, hypoxia, and harmful algal blooms. Washington State is projected to be hit especially hard by ocean acidification due to strong natural upwelling processes, resulting in significant impacts to pteropods, juvenile crab, shellfish, finfish, deep-sea corals, etc. A cumulative impacts analysis of NWTT needs to incorporate changing ocean conditions, treaty-reserved rights, coastal communities, and existing industries (i.e., commercial, subsistence, and recreational fishing as well as tourism) as well as thorough consideration of alternatives. The Makah Tribal Council also recommends the Navy conduct water quality testing to determine the impact of the NWTT, especially explosives and explosives byproducts, in the face of changing ocean conditions.	In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy considered the multiple stressors on the marine environment described in the comment, and thoroughly analyzed the potential impacts to marine areas and habitats (Section 3.3, Marine Habitats), species (Section 3.4, Marine Mammals; Section 3.5 Sea Turtles; Section 3.6 Birds; Section 3.7, Marine Vegetation; Section 3.8, Marine Invertebrates; and Section 3.9, Fishes), and climate/ocean changes (Section 3.1.3.6, Climate Change and Marine Water Quality). The Navy evaluated other impacts to water quality in Section 3.1.4.1. In the analysis, the Navy considered water quality testing at various sites where expended materials were much more concentrated than any conditions that could be found in NWTT.
Makah-08	6) Meaningful Consultation The Makah Tribe is a sovereign tribal government with reserved rights under the Treaty of Neah Bay. The Makah Tribal Council believes the Navy has not conducted comprehensive and meaningful consultation with the Makah Tribal Council in the development of the NWTT SEIS. Notification letters and limited discussions are not meaningful consultation. The Navy has outlined that they will work to "to ensure that timely notice and appropriate consultation with tribes occurs prior to taking any actions that may have the potential to significantly affect protected tribal resources, treaty rights, or Indian lands protected by a statute, regulation or executive order. 16	Building on a foundation of over a decade of candid dialog about the Northwest Training Range Complex, prior training and testing planning (NWTT II), Electronic Warfare Range, and other actions potentially affecting Makah traditional territory and treaty resources, the Navy is committed to pursuing optimal management processes and results in a supportive environment of mutual respect, collaboration, and confidentiality. However, it also must be recognized that such a goal is challenging owing to the Navy's role and mission. For the current action, the Navy is not fulfilling the role of resource manager.

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>"In addition to the National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106, requirements for impacts to cultural resources, the Makah Tribe emphasizes that fish, marine mammals, seabirds, invertebrates, etc. are cultural and trust resources and we should be consulted as a cooperating agency with the Navy and other federal agencies in determining impacts under the Marine Mammal Protection Act, Endangered Species Act, Magnuson-Stevens Act, etc. as we are co-managers of the resources. We request the Navy conduct more meaningful consultation with the Makah Tribe prior to finalizing the SEIS.</p> <p>The Makah Tribal Council is also interested in including the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) in our consultation request, as NOAA's consultation in reviewing this SEIS did not include consultation with the Makah Tribe on the impacts to treaty resources, including, but not limited to, fisheries, marine mammals, and the habitats they depend on.</p> <p>The Makah Tribal Council understands, given our unique legal, spiritual, and cultural connection to the ocean, there is a disproportionate and unacceptable risk to the Makah Tribe and our treaty protected resources. The Makah Tribal Council requests formal government-to-government consultation with the Navy and NOAA on this draft SEIS. We recommend informal staff meetings occur prior to the formal consultation taking place. The SEIS needs to incorporate more input from the Makah Tribe, a coastal treaty tribe with extensive ocean history, knowledge, and dependence, to aid the Navy in meeting their federal trust responsibility to the Makah Tribe.</p>	
Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe (PGST)		
PGST-01	<p>The Supplemental DEIS/OEIS proposes to increase the number of pier side sonar testing events at Bangor from 67 events per year to < 174 events per year; the number of unmanned underwater vehicle tests at Dabob Bay from 253 events per year to < 400 events; and the number of NEPM torpedoes tested at Dabob Bay from 41 events per year to 61 events per year, in addition to other increases in the tempo and intensity of training and testing activities throughout the Puget Sound. Every five years, as the Navy increases the existing NWTT exercises and adds new exercises, the environmental impacts to natural and cultural resources will increase. The Tribe is concerned that these NWTT activities will directly, indirectly and cumulatively impact tribal access and treaty resources within its usual and accustomed fishing area. We are concerned that the NWTT program</p>	<p>Each analysis is unique. Some activities have increased, some have decreased, some are new, and some have been deleted. The proposed activities have been analyzed, and despite the increases in some activities, and based on current science, training and testing activities in the Inland Waters do not contribute significantly to long-term impacts on marine habitats, marine sediment, water chemistry or air quality; so there would be no change in the conclusions regardless of the number of activities.</p> <p>In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy analyzed the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to sediments, water quality, air quality, and marine habitat. (See Sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and Chapter 4.)</p>

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	incrementally threatens the Tribe's treaty right leading to damaged marine sediment, declining water and air quality, and degraded marine habitat.	
PGST-02	<p>Cumulative effects from increased acoustic sonar and other acoustic devices, underwater explosions, weapons firing, aircraft noise, vessel noise, electromagnetic signals, target strikes, in-water device strikes, expended materials, seafloor devices, cables and wires, release of air pollutants, explosives, metals, chemicals and other materials, physical disturbance, limited accessibility, underwater energy and physical interactions will impact natural and cultural resources and tribal fisheries in the Tribe's usual and accustomed area. The NWTT explosions and byproducts of explosions and combusted propellants, as well as unexploded ordnance, non-combusted propellant, metals, chemicals and other materials will have impacts to water quality. Increased criteria pollutant emissions and hazardous air pollutant emissions from vessels, aircraft and munitions will impact air quality. Acoustic stressors (underwater detonations) and physical disturbance or strikes (interactions with vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, or seafloor devices) will affect marine habitats.</p> <p>Potential impacts include localized disturbance of the seafloor, cratering of softbottom sediments, and structural damage to hard-bottom habitats. Impacts on marine mammals may include mortality, injury, and disturbance or behavioral modification, caused by underwater explosions or vessel strikes, sonar use, noise and pollution. Cumulative impacts to sea turtles may include mortality, injury, disturbance or behavior modification caused by underwater explosions, vessel strikes, sonar use, noise, pollution and habitat loss.</p> <p>Impacts to birds may include mortality, injury, disturbance or behavioral modification from underwater explosions, air strikes or vessel strikes, noise, pollution, and habitat loss. NWTT activities such as underwater explosions, interactions with vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials or seafloor devices could also affect marine vegetation, including localized disturbance and mortality. Acoustic stressors (tactical acoustic sonar, other acoustic devices, pile driving, underwater explosions, weapons firing noise, aircraft noise, vessel noise), electromagnetic stressors, physical disturbance or strikes (vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials, seafloor devices), entanglement (cables and wires, parachutes), and ingestion (military expended materials) may affect marine invertebrates. Underwater explosions or vessel strikes, sonar use,</p>	All of the concerns listed in the comment were analyzed in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Chapter 3 includes analysis of potential direct and indirect impacts to resources and Chapter 4 analyzes cumulative impacts.

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	noise and pollution may cause fish mortality, injury, disturbance or behavioral modification.	
PGST-03	In addition to the NWT exercises, the increased vessel traffic associated with these exercises will have a significant cumulative effect. Vessel activity from all projects in aggregate will impact tribal fisheries and access to traditional fishing and harvesting areas throughout Hood Canal. Cumulative vessel traffic limits harvesting and fishing during scheduled fish and shellfish openings, by requiring that fishing boats leave or stay away from particular areas of the Hood Canal to avoid vessel activity. Tribal fishers and harvesters also face the increased threat of lost or damaged gear from increase vessel traffic through fishing and harvesting areas.	Navy vessel traffic in the Study Area is not expected to increase. As shown in Table 3.0-12, activities that include vessels could increase slightly for testing activities, and decrease for training activities, but that is a function of more activities being conducted aboard the vessels while they are underway, not an increase in the level of vessel activity.
PGST-04	Having promised to secure the Tribes their fisheries, the Navy has a fiduciary duty to fulfill that promise and protect the Tribe's treaty rights. Exercising that trust responsibility requires the Navy to analyze and select action alternatives that do not add to the collective impact of the Navy's actions on the Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe's treaty rights. The Navy should consider the cumulative impacts of vessel traffic, waves, and wakes, the cumulative destruction of habitat, stresses on aquatic species, risks of spills and releases, and other impacts from vessel activities on the Tribe's fisheries. In the aggregate, the Navy's projects and many other activities in the Hood Canal have a significant effect on the timing, location, quality and quantity of harvest for tribal members. The DEIS/OEIS for the proposed NWT should take account of contributions toward the cumulative effects of activities encroaching on tribal resources and fisheries within the PGST's usual and accustomed areas.	The Navy reviewed its analysis of cumulative effects on tribal resources and fisheries in Section 4.4.11 and believes the analysis presented appropriately addressed the concerns expressed in the comment.
Potter Valley Tribe (Potter Valley)		
Potter Valley-01	My biggest concern is health problems and the effect the testing has on the marine life. Also growing up I see a dramatic change in the marine life. When I was younger I can remember smelt fish flopping all over the beaches when it was running season. Now we are lucky to even get a gallon ziploc bag full. Same goes with the abalone. Where is it all disappearing to? Etc!	Potential impacts of Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The analysis, which is based on the best available science, indicates that Navy activities are not expected to result in population-level impacts on marine species. Information about general threats to fish from non-Navy activities is presented in Section 3.9.2.2 (General Threats). As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy will implement mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from training and testing activities on marine species, including fish. In cooperation with NMFS during the MMPA and ESA consultation processes, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to further avoid potential impacts on fish from the Proposed Action.

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
<i>Squaxin Island Tribe (Squaxin)</i>		
Squaxin-01	While the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area provides a measure of protection against harm from Navy training and testing, the Tribe urges the Navy to expand the prohibited activities to include use of sonar , considering the impact such devices have on the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals.	Training and testing with active sonar is essential to national security. The Navy uses active sonar during military readiness activities only when it is essential to training missions or testing program requirements since active sonar has the potential to alert opposing forces to the operating platform's presence. Passive sonar and other available sensors are used in concert with active sonar to the maximum extent practicable. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict certain activities or types of sonar year-round within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, seasonally within the Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area and Stonewall and Heceta Bank Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, and year-round in the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to help the Navy avoid potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. Additional information about the Navy's mitigation areas is presented in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
Squaxin-02	The Tribe requests that the Navy's monitoring program be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully consider the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species. In addition, impacts upon already depressed populations may not adequately address the concomitant impacts on Tribal rights and resources.	<p>The Navy understands there may be limitations of the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act protecting cultural and spiritual resources. The Navy's monitoring program does address impacts beyond the potential for harm at the population level. The Navy uses cutting edge research to improve the science in a number of areas, including marine mammal densities, species occurrence, exposure and response, and habitat use. The Navy has consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service pursuant to the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the resulting mitigation measures achieve the least practicable adverse impact.</p> <p>The Navy recognizes and respects the significance the Squaxin Tribe ascribes to natural resources and properties of traditional or customary religious or cultural importance, and as they relate to tribal rights and protected tribal resources. The Navy follows DoD and Navy policies and instructions for protecting natural and cultural resources to the fullest extent possible while meeting its mission. As a federal agency, the Navy owes a fiduciary duty to Indian tribes. The nature of that duty depends on the underlying substantive laws creating the duty. The Navy discharges its trust responsibility by complying with specific statutes, even when they require separate analysis</p>

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		and consideration of interconnected resources, which may not reflect a tribal perspective. The Navy is committed to address these challenges through good faith consultation in the context of the government-to-government relationship with the Squaxin Tribe, which endures beyond consultations limited to a specific law or project.
Squaxin-03	To evaluate the impacts to fish and wildlife species from existing, new, and increased training and testing activities more accurately, we request that the Navy clarify the times of year in which proposed activities will occur. This is especially important when assessing impacts to fish and wildlife, which have seasonal movements and behaviors that will greatly determine whether Navy activities significantly affect each species in the proposed areas.	As stated in Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities), because of the nature of training and testing requirements for forces that must be ready to deploy at all times, activities could occur throughout the year. The Navy added additional details on seasonality and day/night requirements of its activities to Appendix A (Navy Activities Descriptions) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy did consider seasonal movements and behaviors of marine species in its effect analysis. The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species either seasonally or year-round in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitats, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
Suquamish Tribe (Suquamish)		
Suquamish-01	The time period of activities specified in the 2019 DSEIS is "beyond 2020 into the reasonable foreseeable future". A specific time period should be defined to fully evaluate training-specific and cumulative impacts of these proposed activities.	The duration of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS is for the foreseeable future. The analysis would remain valid unless the Navy makes substantial changes in the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns, or there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts. The Marine Mammal Protection Act permits would be in place for seven years.
Suquamish-02	Marine Debris The Tribe is concerned of unrecovered training and testing materials associated with these training activities. These materials may include, but are not limited to, sonobuoys, remote operated vehicles, torpedoes, targets, and associated lithium batteries. On August 20, 2018, a floating mine was discovered in waters adjacent to the Port Madison Indian Reservation and required the deployment of Navy officials and emergency response personnel. Although the floating mine was determined to be one of two mines left unrecovered from a previous training activity and considered marine debris, it had a direct effect on the Suquamish community. <u>The Tribe requests that the 2019 SEIS include detailed Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) protocols to recover and account for all training and testing materials placed into the inland waters of Salish Sea, including Dabob Bay.</u> The SOP protocols for recovery should not be limited to physical debris such as mines or lithium batteries, but should also	Thank you for your comment regarding the recovery of training and testing materials. Relative to the August 2018 discovery of a test and evaluation exercise shape, the Navy has taken actions to verify location of and, where appropriate, recover, exercise shapes within the Port Orchard reach. Although operating procedures addressing varying circumstances are properly under the cognizance of individual commands, in its 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has expressly identified some common elements relating to retrieval of materials placed in water. For more information, including information on retrieval of exercise torpedoes and items with lithium batteries, please see Section 3.1 of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and section 2.3.3.3 of the 2019 Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	provide a detailed account for the recovery of toxic liquids such as unspent torpedo OTTO fuel.	
Suquamish-03	<p>NWTT Impacts to the Southern Resident Killer Whale SRKW depend on sound to navigate, find food, and communicate with each other. Underwater noise from sonar, training technologies implemented during training, and vessels can impair communication, mask echolocation signals, modify behavior, and permanently damage hearing sensitivity among SRKW. These impacts carries both energetic and physiological costs to SRKW; requiring the whales to expend more energy to communicate and locate prey.</p> <p>NMFS prepared a Biological Opinion (Bi Op) in 2015 assessing NWTT impacts on Killer Whales and issued Letters of Authorization for incidental take of three distinct Killer Whale populations, including the SRKW through the year 2020. Since the 2015 Bi Op, NMFS has designated SRKW as a "Species in the Spotlight" and emerging science has further refined the assessment of underwater noise impacts on the declining SRKW population 1 2 3. <u>The Tribe requests that impacts of NWTT activities on SRKW are reevaluated with a detailed analysis of training-specific and cumulative impacts to SRKW.</u></p>	<p>Utilizing the latest science and technology, the Navy completed extensive analyses and computer-based modeling to determine impacts and develop science-based protective measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on marine life, including southern resident killer whales. Specific to the quantitative analysis of potential impacts to southern resident killer whales, the Navy used the latest best available science to predict the abundance and distribution of the stock and data from controlled sonar exposures to killer whales was used to derive the behavioral response functions. All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Behavioral responses by southern resident killer whales are predicted by the Navy's acoustic effects model. Based on these results, individual animals are expected to be exposed to these levels on average about once per year. Research cited in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS indicates that behavioral responses by marine mammals exposed to underwater sound vary from no response to an immediate change in behavior (e.g., change in swimming direction). Behavioral changes are temporary and not necessarily repeated. Animals frequently return to and continue their prior behavior after the initial interruption. The Navy has addressed recent research on possible long-term effects in Section 3.4.2.1.1.7 (Long-Term Consequences) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Based on this research, long-term effects to individuals and populations from short-term, intermittent noise exposures are not anticipated.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy will implement mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from training and testing activities on marine species, including Southern Resident killer whales to the maximum extent practicable. In cooperation with NMFS during the MMPA and ESA consultation processes, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to further avoid potential impacts on Southern Resident killer whales.</p>
Suquamish-04	<p>Alternatives to Real-life Training and Testing The Tribe requests that the 2019 SEIS consider virtual training and testing activities within alternatives to avoid or minimize impacts to habitat, biota, and Treaty-reserved fishing activities affected from training activities.</p>	<p>Regarding the use of virtual training and testing, or simulation, Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>In addition, see the discussion in Section 2.4.1.4 (Simulated Training and</p>

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Testing Only) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that discusses the need for live training specifically for aircrews.
Yurok Tribe (Yurok)		
Yurok-01	The adequacy of the assessment of Tribal cultural impacts as well as environmental impacts from the Navy's training and testing activities is especially important because these activities take place in the Pacific Ocean, which holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes and is critically important for the wellbeing of all people and lifeforms on this planet. The Navy should work meaningfully with the Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities.	The Navy recognizes and respects the significance the Yurok Tribe ascribes to natural resources and properties of traditional or customary religious or cultural importance, and as they relate to tribal rights and protected tribal resources.
Yurok-02	The Navy should prohibit use of sonar within the 50-mile mitigation area. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals.	Training and testing with active sonar is essential to national security. The Navy uses active sonar during military readiness activities only when it is essential to training missions or testing program requirements since active sonar has the potential to alert opposing forces to the operating platform's presence. Passive sonar and other available sensors are used in concert with active sonar to the maximum extent practicable. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict certain activities or types of sonar year-round within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, seasonally within the Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area and Stonewall and Heceta Bank Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, and year-round in the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to help the Navy avoid potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy also developed a new mitigation area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, in part to reduce potential impacts from active sonar on Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy will conduct a maximum combined total of 33 hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar during testing annually within 20 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Mitigation

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Area. Additional geographic mitigation for active sonar beyond what is detailed in Section K.3 (Mitigation Areas to be Implemented), such as prohibiting all active sonar within 50 NM from shore, would be impractical to implement for the reasons described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) and Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar).
Yurok-03	The “best available science” referenced in the draft SEIS should be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy’s NWTRC.	The Navy is committed to pursuing optimal management processes and results in a supportive environment of mutual respect, collaboration, and confidentiality. However, it also must be recognized that such a goal is challenging owing to the Navy’s role and mission. For the current action, the Navy is not fulfilling the role of resource manager. While subject to the same fiduciary and trust responsibilities shared by all federal agencies, the Navy differs from land and resource managing agencies who are better positioned to develop optimal integration of traditional knowledge into meaningful resource management. Through the government-to-government consultation process, the Navy considers tribal and traditional knowledge provided in its monitoring program while maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality. Resource management is best achieved when traditional knowledge is integrated into a management process, and not just a source of information for a particular project or program.
Yurok-04	The Navy’s monitoring program should be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.	The Navy understands there may be limitations of the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act protecting cultural and spiritual resources. The Navy’s monitoring program does address impacts beyond the potential for harm at the population level. The Navy uses cutting edge research to improve the science in a number of areas, including marine mammal densities, species occurrence, exposure and response, and habitat use. The Navy has consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service pursuant to the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the resulting mitigation measures achieve the least practicable adverse impact. The Navy recognizes and respects the significance the Yurok Tribe ascribes to natural resources and properties of traditional or customary religious or cultural importance, and as they relate to tribal rights and protected tribal resources. The Navy follows DoD and Navy policies and instructions for protecting natural and cultural resources to the fullest extent possible while meeting its mission. As a federal agency, the Navy owes a fiduciary duty to Indian tribes. The nature of that duty depends on the underlying substantive laws creating the duty. The Navy discharges its trust responsibility by complying with specific statutes, even when they require separate analysis and consideration of interconnected resources, which may not reflect a tribal

Table H-2: Responses to Comments from American Indian Tribes, Nations, and Tribal Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		perspective. The Navy is committed to address these challenges through good faith consultation in the context of the government-to-government relationship with the Yurok Tribe, which endures beyond consultations limited to a specific law or project.
Yurok-05	The Navy should expand its list of environmental “stressors” to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing.	The Navy acknowledges the spiritual connections, as stated in Section 3.10.1 (Affected Environment) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, “Sociocultural elements, such as traditions, lifeways, religious practices, community values, and social institutions may be considered by some groups to be types of cultural resources, especially within tribal communities whose traditional interaction with the natural world is integral to their culture. As stated in Section 3.10.1, this supplement is organized “to consider cultural and historic elements of the human environment within and between the three following sections: Section 3.10 (Cultural Resources), Section 3.11 (American Indian and Alaska Native Traditional Resources), and Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). Combined, these sections seek to provide a full analysis of the potential impacts from the Proposed Action on sociocultural elements of American Indian/Alaska Native communities and American history.”
Yurok-06	The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy’s 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.	The Navy discusses ocean acidification in the context of climate change in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) and 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality) of the SEIS and includes information from scientific studies conducted since 2015. The Navy acknowledged in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) that “metals tend to dissociate” in more acidic ocean conditions. The Navy added a reference back to these two sections in the sections analyzing the impacts of explosives (Section 3.1.4.1) and metals (Section 3.1.4.2). Note that corrosion can also act to insulate ordnance and other metal items from contact with seawater and sediments, slowing or even halting further corrosion and movement of metals into the adjacent sediments and water column. The effects of climate change on the ocean environment, particularly effects specific to a particular region like ocean waters in the Pacific Northwest, continue to be researched and to evolve and are not necessarily predictable. For example, as described in Section 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality), increases in ocean acidity are believed to reduce the availability of carbonate in the water column, which is needed by organisms to generate calcium carbonate structures. However, increases in sea surface temperature associated with climate change appear to stimulate calcification at an even greater rate, essentially overriding the inhibiting effects of lower pH levels and leading to unexpected high abundance of cocolithophores (which build protective scales from calcium carbonate) in some ocean regions.

H.1.3 State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials

This section contains comments from state and local agencies and elected officials received during the public comment period and the Navy's response to those comments.

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)		
DTSC-01	Our unit recently received a Responsible Agency Review/Interested Party Document from your department. The documents we received were delayed as they were sent to an incorrect address (Supervising Environmental Planner). Our CEQA unit processes all Responsible Agency Reviews and all reviews/documents should be addressed as follows: Department of Toxic Substances Control, Region 1 Attention: Dave Kereazis Permitting Division-CEQA 8800 Cal Center Drive, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95826	Thank you. The Navy has updated its mailing list for this project.
City of Fort Bragg		
Fort Bragg-01	There are a number of reasons why we oppose testing of this type. First and foremost, we are not convinced of the need to jeopardize and expose our living systems to Naval weapons testing. It is 2019, and technology has progressed well beyond the early technology of WWII. We believe testing today can be simulated in a controlled environment in labs and with giant water tanks. The US Defense Department should re-evaluate these outdated methods of testing.	Regarding the use of simulation, Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, see the discussion in Section 2.4.1.4 (Simulated Training and Testing Only) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that discusses the need for live training specifically for aircrews.

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Fort Bragg-02	<p>Second, please understand we are a coastal town that depends on healthy oceanic ecosystems to support our fishing, tourism and marine science research industries. The importance of protecting our marine sea life cannot be understated. Our oceanic ecosystems continue to be compromised by warming sea temperatures from global warming, pollution, and overfishing. Sonar and explosive testing only further stresses this frail ecosystem.</p> <p>Again, both the Council and our Community oppose any kind of sonar or explosives testing that could harm marine life, including the whales.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations or other marine species in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy will implement mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from training and testing activities on marine species. Wildlife-dependent tourism activities, such as wildlife viewing, or whale watching, are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism and Recreation). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p> <p>As described in Section 3.10 (Cultural Resources), Section 3.12 (Socioeconomics), and Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) of the EIS/OEIS, the Navy's proposed activities are fully compatible with other uses of the ocean space, especially off the coast of Northern California where proposed activities are rare.</p>
Island County Commissioner		
Island-01	<p>Alternatives should reflect updated best available science as they measure for these impacts, as well as reflect the growing dangers to Western Washington's Southern Resident Orca populations. There is no room for intentional "collateral damage" to this threatened species. The recent Governor's Orca Task Force findings make that clear. For this reason, a supplement appears to be warranted.</p> <p>A supplemental EIS should be required to reflect impacts to local marine life from continued or increased military activities as proposed.</p>	<p>The Navy's analysis was completed using the best available, peer-reviewed science. The Navy continues to pursue new scientific data, collected through professional studies and verified through credible, recognized sources. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has conducted active sonar and explosives training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Island-02	The DEIS does not adequately address impacts to the broader, vital, marine food web. This is another reason that a supplement is strongly called for and should consider these impacts as well as the stated impacts to prey.	The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS analyzed potential impacts to every component of the food web. See analysis of impacts to marine vegetation, marine invertebrates, and fishes (Sections 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9, respectively).
Island-03	The anecdotal impacts of noise may be subjective, yet the Navy's use of day/night averaging for episodic sounds is equally ineffective in measuring actual impacts of jet flights, or creating adequate mitigation for those impacts. Accurate and ongoing noise monitoring is needed. The current 400% increase in Growler activity has increased the stress response experienced by many. I concur with and support the Washington State Department of Health's (DOH) substantial comments during the 2017 DEIS Growler expansion proposal. The DOH called for updated and increased research on the public health risks of noise and a departure from day/night averaging as a basis for measuring impacts and determining mitigation measures. With the Growler's unique combination of high power, low-frequency sound, the human and non-human impacts are even less understood. Real time measurements are necessary to begin data-based assessments.	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Island-04	Page ES-10 states: "The use of explosive munitions in the water or near the water's surface present a risk to marine mammals located in close proximity to the explosion, because the resulting shock waves can cause injury or result in the death of an animal. If a marine mammal is located farther from an explosion, the impulsive, broadband sounds introduced into the marine environment may cause permanent or temporary hearing threshold shifts, auditory masking, physiological stress, or behavioral	The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from explosives on marine mammals wherever and whenever explosives are used in the Study Area. The Navy conservatively assessed the likelihood that Lookouts would be able to visually observe the range to mortality for impulsive sources for each training or testing scenario. This is influenced by the size of the predicted impact ranges, location of the mitigation zone in proximity to the observation platform, type of observation

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>responses. Because most estimated impacts from explosions are behavioral responses or temporary hearing threshold shifts, and because the numbers of marine mammals potentially impacted by explosives are small as compared to each species' respective abundance, long-term consequences for the species or stocks would not be expected... The use of explosive munitions in the water or near the water's surface present a risk to marine mammals located in close proximity to the explosion, because the resulting shock waves can cause injury or result in the death of an animal."</p> <p>This analysis is based upon the assumption that testing and training activities can minimize impacts to orca and other marine mammals by restricting operations when they are visible. Given the wide distribution of marine mammals, and the varying depths at which they are found, relying solely on sightlines is outdated, inadequate and of very limited efficacy.</p>	<p>platform (e.g., pier, small boat, large vessel, helicopter, fixed-wing aircraft), and number of Lookouts. The Navy also considered the objectives of each training and testing scenario to determine the opportunities for and capabilities of Lookouts to continuously visually observe the impact range.</p> <p>In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals to the maximum extent practicable. For example, the Navy will restrict all but one type of explosive activity from occurring within 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area year-round, which will help the Navy avoid potential impacts from explosives on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy also developed a new mitigation area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, in part to reduce potential impacts from explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing on Southern Resident killer whales. New mitigation prohibits the Navy from conducting explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing in the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Mitigation Area. Outside of those locations, the Navy also added a new mitigation requirement to limit the number of events seasonally, and to limit the amount of explosives used during explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing annually and over a 7-year period. Additional geographic mitigation for explosives beyond what is detailed in Section K.3 (Mitigation Areas to be Implemented), such as prohibiting all explosives within 50 NM from shore, would be impractical to implement for the reasons described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) and Section 5.5.3 (Explosives).</p>
Island-05	<p>Page 3-26 "Explosions in Water" states, "Explosive detonations during training and testing involving the use of high-explosive munitions, including bombs, missiles, and naval gun shells, could occur in the air or near the water's surface. Explosive detonations associated with torpedoes and explosive sonobuoys would occur in the water column; mines and demolition charges could be detonated in the water column or on the ocean bottom. Detonations would typically occur in waters greater than 200 ft. in depth, and greater than 50 NM from shore, with the exception of mine countermeasure and neutralization testing proposed in the Offshore Area, and existing mine warfare areas in Inland Waters (i.e., Crescent Harbor and Hood Canal Explosive Ordnance Disposal Training Ranges)". All of the areas identified for these Navy activities are frequented by Orca</p>	<p>Using the best available science, the Navy has thoroughly assessed the potential impacts associated with the proposed training and testing activities. The analysis for impacts to marine mammals is contained in Section 3.4.2.2.2 (for explosive detonations), Section 3.4.2.3.2 (for high-energy lasers), and in Sections 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9 (for marine vegetation, marine invertebrates, and fishes) as components of the food web.</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	and other whales for feeding, mating and communication. With 400 explosive detonations/ year, including Naval Gunfire Muzzle Blasts at 200 dB and high energy lasers, the DEIS does not adequately assess the impacts to fragile marine mammal populations, and the food web they depend upon.	
Island-06	Executive Summary, page ES-7, section 3.1, the DEIS states: “Explosives and explosives byproducts, metals, chemicals, and other materials expended during training and testing described in this Supplemental could result in short-term and long-term impacts on sediments and water quality. Some chemical, physical, or biological changes in sediment or water quality could be measurable, but most would be negligible. Regulatory thresholds and guidelines established for measuring impacts on sediment and water quality would not be exceeded.” The Navy must be held to the same basic framework of the National Environmental Policy Act that the environment will be protected from negative impacts of proposed federal activities. It is unacceptable to use an analysis of possible environmental consequences using words like “could result” and “could be measurable” and this does not met the requirements of NEPA, particularly Section 1502.2(d) the requirement of environmental studies to evaluate environmental impacts. The public is left unclear as to which regulatory thresholds would be exceeded, or which guidelines would be followed for the myriad components of explosives, metals and chemical and the myriad species and habitat affected in these marine environments.	The complete analysis of potential impacts on water is found in Section 3.1.4 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The section quoted in the comment is only a brief summary of the complete analysis.
Jefferson County Board of Commissioners		
Jeff Co-01	However, until recently, little collaboration or communication was initiated by the Navy while impacts to the County and particularly to our East Jefferson County region have increased significantly. Examples of these impacts include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purchase of conservation easements on thousands of acres of land, permanently extinguishing development rights without consultation with the county to determine long-term land use planning and tax implications. • Our transportation corridors are greatly affected by openings and closures of the Hood Canal Bridge, seemingly with little regard given to the resultant traffic backups, timing during peak usage, and impacts to local residents, travelers and businesses. 	The conservation easements referred to in the comment are outside the scope of this action. The Hood Canal Bridge closures and impacts to traffic were analyzed in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Section 3.12.3.4 - Secondary Impacts). Bridge closures related to the Navy’s proposed activities are not expected to increase from those currently occurring.
Jeff Co-02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High impacts with little benefit to our tax base. Jefferson County supports a small installation, Naval Magazine Indian Island, which houses no service members and employs a very limited number of largely out-of-County civilians. With 88% of the proposed activities directly affecting Jefferson 	As described in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources), the Navy’s activities are expected to have a negligible impact on socioeconomic resources in the Study Area, including Jefferson County.

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	County, this level of impact is extraordinarily high in proportion to the economic benefit provided. This is especially obvious when compared to the boost to the tax base in neighboring Island and Kitsap Counties, home to the larger installations performing the proposed activities.	
Jeff Co-03	<p>1. The recent increase in Growler activity warrants new and more accurate noise measurement, monitoring and greater considerations to impact minimization. While the impacts of noise on people and communities may be highly subjective, the use of night/day averaging for episodic sounds is wholly ineffective in measuring impacts of jet flights. We receive complaints regularly from residents of Port Townsend, Marrowstone Island and the Western coast who are distressed by jet noise. The current 400% increase in Growler activity has increased the stress response experienced by many. This is especially true in a region that is rural, and the expectation of quiet is high. We request a departure from current modelling and averaging and request accurate, episodic, on-the-ground monitoring to provide accurate data.</p> <p>Additionally, we concur with and support the Washington State Department of Health's substantial comments during the 2017 DEIS for the expansion of the Growler program calling for updated and increased research on the public health risks of noise and a departure from day/night averaging as a basis for measuring impacts and determining mitigation measures. With the Growler's unique combination of high power and low-frequency sound, the human and non-human impacts are even less understood.</p>	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Jeff Co-04	<p>2. Impacts to the highly endangered Southern Resident Orca are understated. While the DEIS contains thorough research on marine mammals, the current crisis as identified by Governor Inslee and his appointed Orca Task Force is not acknowledged, nor are the peer-reviewed strategies considered. In fact, the word "Orca" is not found until page 306. It may be that this draft was too far along to be inclusive of the now well-</p>	<p>To align with the scientific community, the Supplemental EIS/OEIS uses the term "killer whale" instead of "Orca." Killer whales, and specifically the Southern Resident killer whales, are analyzed thoroughly in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy is fully aware of the Governor's Task Force and the plight of the Southern Resident killer whale. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>documented serious condition of Western Washington's Southern Resident Orca population. In this instance, a Supplement would clearly be warranted.</p> <p>Southern Resident Orca survival requires a complex ecosystem approach to how we all use the maritime environment. The food web that supports orca is linked to forage fish, small bottom feeders, eel grass and other habitats that support healthy prey species like Chinook, Chum and Coho. The DEIS does an inadequate job of including these well-established facets of the local environment. Again, a Supplement is strongly called for and should consider these impacts as well as the stated impacts to prey.</p> <p>Page ES-10 states:</p> <p>"The use of explosive munitions in the water or near the water's surface present a risk to marine mammals located in close proximity to the explosion, because the resulting shock waves can cause injury or result in the death of an animal. If a marine mammal is located farther from an explosion, the impulsive, broadband sounds introduced into the marine environment may cause permanent or temporary hearing threshold shifts, auditory masking, physiological stress, or behavioral responses. Because most estimated impacts from explosions are behavioral responses or temporary hearing threshold shifts, and because the numbers of marine mammals potentially impacted by explosives are small as compared to each species' respective abundance, long-term consequences for the species or stocks would not be expected... The use of explosive munitions in the water or near the water's surface present a risk to marine mammals located in close proximity to the explosion, because the resulting shock waves can cause injury or result in the death of an animal."</p>	<p>Southern Resident killer whales. Based on comments received, the Navy has provided more information on potential prey impacts to Southern Resident killer whales in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. This discussion can be found in Section 3.4.2.1.2.3 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers During the Action Alternatives). The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS analyzed potential impacts to every component of the food web. See analysis of impacts to marine vegetation, marine invertebrates, and fishes (Sections 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9, respectively). Stresses, including behavioral reactions that may divert a Southern Resident killer whale from important behaviors such as feeding, were included in the Navy's analysis.</p>
Jeff Co-05	<p>Further, the DEIS appears to operate from the assumption that testing and training activities can minimize impacts to Southern Resident Orca and other marine mammals by not performing operations where they are visible. Given the wide distribution of marine mammals, and the varying depths at which they are found, relying solely on sightlines is outdated, of very limited efficacy and is wholly inadequate.</p>	<p>The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals wherever and whenever applicable acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors are used in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict all but one type of explosive activity from occurring within 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area year-round, which will help the Navy avoid potential impacts from explosives on marine mammals in important foraging, breeding, and migration areas. Additionally, the Navy developed the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to enhance protections of Southern Resident Killer Whales throughout NWTT Inland Waters. Information about the Navy's</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		mitigation areas is presented in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
Jeff Co-06	<p><u>Explosions</u>: Page 3-26 "<i>Explosions in Water</i>" states, "<i>Explosive detonations during training and testing involving the use of high-explosive munitions, including bombs, missiles, and naval gun shells, could occur in the air or near the water's surface. Explosive detonations associated with torpedoes and explosive sonobuoys would occur in the water column; mines and demolition charges could be detonated in the water column or on the ocean bottom. Detonations would typically occur in waters greater than 200 ft. in depth, and greater than 50 NM from shore, with the exception of mine countermeasure and neutralization testing proposed in the Offshore Area, and existing mine warfare areas in Inland Waters (i.e., Crescent Harbor and Hood Canal Explosive Ordnance Disposal Training Ranges)</i>".</p> <p>All of the horizons affected by these activities are used by Orca and other whales for feeding, mating and communication. With 400 explosive detonations/ year, including Naval Gunfire Muzzle Blasts at 200 dB and high energy lasers, ensuring these will not directly nor indirectly impact exquisitely sensitive orca and other marine mammals is paramount. The DEIS does an inadequate job of assessing these impacts.</p>	<p>In the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has conducted its analysis with the understanding of the presence of marine life as mentioned in the comment. Using the best available science, the Navy has thoroughly assessed the potential impacts associated with the proposed training and testing activities. The analysis for impacts to marine mammals is contained in Section 3.4.2.2.2 (for explosive detonations) and Section 3.4.2.3.2 (for high-energy lasers).</p>
Jeff Co-07	<p>3. Sediments and Water Quality regulatory frameworks not identified</p> <p>Jefferson County and its businesses and residents are required to maintain high water quality standards via a strict federal and state regulatory framework to maintain public and environmental health. In the Executive Summary, page ES-7, section 3.1, the DEIS states:</p> <p><i>"Explosives and explosives byproducts, metals, chemicals, and other materials expended during training and testing described in this Supplemental could result in short-term and long-term impacts on sediments and water quality. Some chemical, physical, or biological changes in sediment or water quality could be measurable, but most would be negligible. Regulatory thresholds and guidelines established for measuring impacts on sediment and water quality would not be exceeded."</i></p> <p>The Navy, through this DEIS, is held to the basic framework of the National Environmental Policy Act whose policy is to assure the people of this nation that the environment will be protected from environmental impacts of proposed federal activities. Publishing an analysis of possible environmental consequences using words like "could result" and "could be measurable" is unacceptable and does not met the requirements of NEPA, particularly Section 1502.2(d) the requirement of environmental studies to evaluate environmental impacts. It is unclear which regulatory thresholds</p>	<p>The complete analysis of potential impacts on water is found in Section 3.1.4 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The section quoted in the comment is only a brief summary of the complete analysis. Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) concludes, based upon the best available science, that chemical, physical, and biological changes to sediment or water quality would be measurable but below applicable standards, regulations, and guidelines, and would be within the existing conditions or designated uses. The Navy's training and testing activities are in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations concerning the impact of military expended materials and associated chemical constituents in the ocean environment.</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	would not be exceeded, nor which guidelines would be followed for the myriad components of explosives, metals and chemical and the myriad infauna, epifaunal and benthic communities of affected marine environments. A Supplemental EIS is clearly warranted to assess impacts and analyze mitigating factors for impacts to sediments and water quality.	
Jeff Co-08	<p>4. Assess and Include Carbon Emissions in FSEIS</p> <p>As stated on page 31 of the Executive Summary, Energy Requirements and Conservation Potential of Alternatives and Mitigation Measures, "Resources that will be permanently and continually consumed by project implementation include water, electricity, natural gas, and fossil fuels; however, the amount and rate of consumption of these resources would not result in significant environmental impacts or the unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources."</p> <p>This County and many residents are deeply concerned about the local impacts of climate change, particularly sea level rise to our coastal communities, the impacts of ocean acidification on the shellfish industry, and increased risk of wildfire to our forested region. While the NEPA/EIS process does not yet require the consideration of impacts of burning of fossil fuels and resulting addition of carbon to the atmosphere, Jefferson County has, and continues to, inventory its greenhouse gas emissions in an effort to reduce them given the harmful and detrimental impacts. Similarly, we request the Navy report use and emissions in the FSEIS.</p> <p>While the DEIS does not include such figures, it is estimated that Growlers use approximately 1300 gal/ flight. If 2300 flights are flown in a year, that equates to 2,990,000 gallons of jet fuel consumed annually, just for the Growler program alone. If using standard jet fuel, which emits 21 lbs. of carbon/ gallon, this represents the addition of 62,790,000 pounds of carbon into the atmosphere locally. This is a significant contribution to a major environmental threat that should be assessed in this DEIS.</p>	The Navy completed an analysis of carbon emissions in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. See Section 3.2.3.2 (Greenhouse Gases and Climate).
Jeff Co-09	<p>5. Aircraft Transit Map does not include Jefferson County International Airport</p> <p>Figure 2.3-1, on page 2-18, does not include Port of Port Townsend Airport, Jefferson County's only international and FAA-regulated air field. Please include it in future versions.</p>	Thank you. The figure has been revised to include Jefferson County International Airport.
Jeff Co-10	<p>6. Socioeconomic Resources, including tourism and transportation, are impacted</p> <p>Section 3.12 on page ES-24 states, "<i>Impacts on socioeconomic resources are expected to be minor because inaccessibility to areas of co-use would be localized and temporary, the Navy's strict standard operating procedures</i></p>	Section 3.12 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS analyzes training and testing activities occurring in the Study Area and considered all potential stressors related to socioeconomic resources including (1) Accessibility (to the ocean and the airspace); (2) Airborne acoustics; (3) Physical disturbance and strike (aircraft, vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials); and

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>would minimize physical disturbance and strikes of commercial and recreational watercraft, most airborne activities would occur well out to sea far from tourism and recreation locations, aircraft activities in the Olympic MOAs are expected to have negligible impacts on socioeconomic resources, and impacts to commercially important marine species are not expected ... There would be no disproportionately high impacts or adverse effects on any low-income populations or minority populations."</p> <p>Jefferson County requests ongoing consultation to discuss impacts to socioeconomic resources. Navy Testing and Training represent significant challenges to both local tourism and transportation sectors, neither of which are adequately represented in the DEIS.</p> <p>With increased Growler activity in Port Townsend, over the Olympic National Park, a UNESCO World Heritage Site, and at the Pacific Coast (home of the Olympic National Marine Sanctuary), tourists who frequent these areas (and locals alike) are experiencing unexpected levels of jet noise. This is particularly felt where there is an expectation for quiet, such as in wilderness areas and at night. While impacts from Growler activity are difficult to link to decrease in tourism revenues, constituents in the tourism industry have complained that customers are deterred and choose to leave prematurely due to noise. With tourism one of the largest sectors of the economy here, this impact is critical to assess and mitigate.</p>	<p>(4) Secondary (availability of resources). The analysis in Section 3.12.3.2 (Airborne Noise) has been revised to reflect available information regarding park visitors. The Navy is committed to being a good neighbor with the communities surrounding our installations and in proximity to where training and testing activities occur. Navy leadership will continue to meet with Jefferson County officials to discuss their concerns as requested.</p>
Jeff Co-11	<p>Additionally, closures of the Hood Canal Bridge for the passage of submarines seems to be increasing and continues during high traffic periods, such as Sunday afternoons when thousands of vehicles are attempting to leave the Olympic Peninsula. As injury traffic incidents increase on State Route 104, long back-ups and delays due to submarine closures are less tolerated and further implicated in the inaccessibility of Jefferson County, a huge blow to both doing business and tourism here. We request further collaboration to limit bridge impacts and to mitigate impacts to tourism in Olympic National Park and its 4 million visitors annually.</p>	<p>The Hood Canal Bridge closures and impacts to traffic were analyzed in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Section 3.12.3.4, Secondary Impacts). Bridge closures related to the Navy's proposed activities are not expected to increase from those currently occurring.</p>
Jeff Co-12	<p>7. Discussions regarding the No Action alternative. We recommend that this DEIS base the No Action alternative on the same No Action standard that was used in the 2015 EIS. Curiously, this DEIS uses a different No Action standard, one that is not even fully explored. The No Action alternative is then dismissed as unacceptable to the Navy's mission and declared not viable. We believe in this instance, the same No Action standards should be used in the No Action alternative analysis. In 1981, the Council on Environmental Quality published guidance on the</p>	<p>In regards to providing a No Action Alternative as was used in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy applied a scenario where no authorizations or permits are issued, the Navy's training and testing activities do not take place, and the resulting environmental effects from taking no action were compared with the effects of the Proposed Action (refer to Section 2.4.2.1, No Action Alternative, of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS). This approach supports NMFS' regulatory process by presenting the scenario where no authorization will be issued. Additionally, this approach responds to comments submitted</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	"no action" alternative to include such cases meaning the proposed activity would not take place and any benefit or consequence of this "no action" alternative should be included in the analysis. "This [no action] analysis provides a benchmark, enabling decisionmakers to compare the magnitude of environmental effects of the action alternatives." (Yost, Nicholas, General Counsel. "Memorandum for Federal NEPA Liaisons, General, State and Local Officials and Other Persons Involved in the NEPA Process. 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508.1981 CEQ. Washington DC). We support that this DEIS compare the impacts in this manner such that the full magnitude of environmental effects is available regarding all action alternatives. We believe the DEIS does not provide sufficient discussion of the no action alternative. Once again, a Supplemental DEIS is warranted.	at various stages regarding the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and during the scoping process of this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. However, Section 2.4.1 (Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration) has been expanded in this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include a "Status Quo" Alternative. This alternative considers no change to the training and testing activities as approved in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and the Navy consulting with NMFS under the MMPA. The Navy determined that this alternative did not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action after thorough consideration.
Jeff Co-13	8. Mitigation measures. Since this is a Phase 3 DEIS we believe it is important to summarize the methods and outcomes of mitigation measures deployed for Phase 1 (2010-2015) and for Phase 2 (2015-2020). This would greatly illuminate the more or different mitigation measures that Phase 3 should address. The DEIS discusses mitigation basically in two categories - procedural mitigation measures and mitigation areas. Procedural mitigation is described in lengthy detail across all training and testing activities. Mitigation areas are discussed in Appendix K and describe geographic areas in which more procedures would be followed during training and testing in these areas (coastal, Puget Sound and Straits). We are confused how a mitigation area that triggers more procedures differs from procedural mitigation and moreover what if any impact avoidance technique beyond "obtaining permission from the appropriate designated Command authority prior to commencing the exercise" is going to be included. We find the mitigation areas not materially different from procedural mitigation and are concerned that fauna of the littoral zone will experience significant negative impacts through procedures that do not avoid or minimize impacts. Other mitigations referred to are "through the permitting process" ostensibly in consultation with the NMFS and USFWS. We understand however that all permitting decisions are to be based on mitigation measures published in the EIS so are not able to assess what, if any, additional impact minimizations from permitting there are.	<p>As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the mitigation measures developed for both NWTT Inland Waters and the NWTT Offshore Area for the Proposed Action represent an increase over the mitigation developed for the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS. The Navy works cooperatively with NMFS and the USFWS to develop mitigation specific to each Proposed Action. As discussed in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives), the Navy developed its reporting requirements in conjunction with NMFS to be consistent with mission requirements and balance the usefulness of the information to be collected with the practicality of collecting it. The Navy does not maintain records of every instance of mitigation implementation for the reasons described in Section 5.5.7 (Reporting Requirements).</p> <p>The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals wherever and whenever applicable acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors are used in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals in areas that are particularly important for biological life processes, such as feeding and migration. For example, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy will restrict all but one type of explosive activity from occurring within 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area year-round, which will help the Navy avoid potential impacts from explosives on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. The Navy included several new geographic mitigation measures in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS that were developed in coordination with the USFWS or NMFS during the MMPA or ESA consultation processes. For example, the</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Navy strengthened its mitigation measures for active sonar, explosives, and physical disturbance and strike stressors within the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area. Mitigation area requirements (e.g., prohibiting activities from occurring within an area) are materially different than procedural mitigation requirements (e.g., ceasing explosive activities when marine mammals are observed within a specified distance from the detonation location).
<i>Mendocino County Board of Supervisors</i>		
Mend Co-01	The Mendocino County Board of Supervisors believes that sonar and explosive testing off the Mendocino Coast is detrimental to fauna of the oceanic ecosystem on which we rely. This fragile ecosystem supports migrating whales and a wide variety of sea life and is a key economic source for our county and must not be damaged in any way. We do not want this testing in our coastal waters and believe that all coastal waters should be off limits to this type of testing. Mitigations must be in place to limit possible harm to marine life.	<p>Potential impacts from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Based on the analysis in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS and monitoring conducted during actual training and testing events, population-level impacts are not expected to result from the Proposed Action. Monitoring reports are publicly available on the U.S. Navy's Marine Species Monitoring website (www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/) and from the NMFS Office of Protected Resources website (www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental.htm#applications).</p> <p>As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy will implement mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential impacts from training and testing activities on marine species, including marine mammals to the maximum extent practicable. In cooperation with NMFS during the MMPA and ESA consultation processes, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to further avoid potential impacts on Southern Resident killer whales, fish, and other marine species.</p>
<i>Port Townsend Mayor</i>		
Port Townsend-01	<p>1. The recent increase in Growler activity warrants new and more accurate noise measurement, monitoring and greater considerations to impact minimization. While the impacts of noise on people and communities may be highly subjective, the use of night/day averaging for episodic sounds is wholly ineffective in measuring impacts of jet flights. We receive complaints regularly from residents of Port Townsend, Marrowstone Island and the Western coast who are distressed by jet noise. The current 400% increase in Growler activity has increased the stress response experienced by many. This is especially true in a region that is rural, and the expectation of quiet is high. We request a departure from current modelling and averaging and request accurate, episodic, on-the-ground monitoring to provide accurate data.</p> <p>Additionally, we concur with and support the Washington State</p>	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Department of Health's substantial comments during the 2017 DEIS for the expansion of the Growler program calling for updated and increased research on the public health risks of noise and a departure from day/night averaging as a basis for measuring impacts and determining mitigation measures. With the Growler's unique combination of high power and low-frequency sound, the human and non-human impacts are even less understood. These impacts potentially more severely impact low-income residents who lack the means to harden their homes against these impacts.	<p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Port Townsend-02	<p>2. Impacts to the highly endangered Southern Resident Orca are understated. While the DEIS contains thorough research on marine mammals, the current crisis as identified by Governor Inslee and his appointed Orca Task Force is not acknowledged, nor are the peer-reviewed strategies considered. In fact, the word "Orca" is not found until page 306. It may be that this draft was too far along to be inclusive of the now well-documented serious condition of Western Washington's Southern Resident Orca population. In this instance, a Supplement would clearly be warranted.</p> <p>Southern Resident Orca survival requires a complex ecosystem approach to how we all use the maritime environment. The food web that supports orca is linked to forage fish, small bottom feeders, eel grass and other habitats that support healthy prey species like Chinook, Chum and Coho. The DEIS does an inadequate job of including these well-established facets of the local environment. Again, a Supplement is strongly called for and should consider these impacts as well as the stated impacts to prey.</p> <p>Page ES-10 states: "The use of explosive munitions in the water or near the water's surface present a risk to marine mammals located in close proximity to the explosion, because the resulting shock waves can cause injury or result in the death of an animal. If a marine mammal is located farther from an explosion, the impulsive, broadband sounds introduced into the marine environment may cause permanent or temporary hearing threshold shifts,</p>	<p>To align with the scientific community, the Supplemental EIS/OEIS uses the term "killer whale" instead of "Orca." Killer whales, and specifically the Southern Resident killer whales, are analyzed thoroughly in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy is fully aware of the Governor's Task Force and the plight of the Southern Resident killer whale. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. Based on comments received, the Navy has provided more information on potential prey impacts to Southern Resident killer whales in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. This discussion can be found in Section 3.4.2.1.2.3 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers During the Action Alternatives). The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS analyzed potential impacts to every component of the food web. See analysis of impacts to marine vegetation, marine invertebrates, and fishes (Sections 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9, respectively). Stresses, including behavioral reactions that may divert a Southern Resident killer whale from important behaviors such as feeding, were included in the Navy's analysis.</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	auditory masking, physiological stress, or behavioral responses. Because most estimated impacts from explosions are behavioral responses or temporary hearing threshold shifts, and because the numbers of marine mammals potentially impacted by explosives are small as compared to each species' respective abundance, long-term consequences for the species or stocks would not be expected... The use of explosive munitions in the water or near the water's surface present a risk to marine mammals located in close proximity to the explosion, because the resulting shock waves can cause injury or result in the death of an animal."	
Port Townsend-03	Further, the DEIS appears to operate from the assumption that testing and training activities can minimize impacts to Southern Resident Orca and other marine mammals by not performing operations where they are visible. Given the wide distribution of marine mammals, and the varying depths at which they are found, relying solely on sightlines is outdated, of very limited efficacy and is wholly inadequate.	The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals wherever and whenever applicable acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors are used in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict all but one type of explosive activity from occurring within 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area year-round, which will help the Navy avoid potential impacts from explosives on marine mammals in important foraging, breeding, and migration areas. Additionally, the Navy developed the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to enhance protections of Southern Resident Killer Whales throughout NWTT Inland Waters. Information about the Navy's mitigation areas is presented in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
Port Townsend-04	Explosions: Page 3-26 "Explosions in Water" states, "Explosive detonations during training and testing involving the use of high-explosive munitions, including bombs, missiles, and naval gun shells, could occur in the air or near the water's surface. Explosive detonations associated with torpedoes and explosive sonobuoys would occur in the water column; mines and demolition charges could be detonated in the water column or on the ocean bottom. Detonations would typically occur in waters greater than 200 ft. in depth, and greater than 50 NM from shore, with the exception of mine countermeasure and neutralization testing proposed in the Offshore Area, and existing mine warfare areas in Inland Waters (i.e., Crescent Harbor and Hood Canal Explosive Ordnance Disposal Training Ranges)". All of the horizons affected by these activities are used by Orca and other whales for feeding, mating and communication. With 400 explosive detonations/ year, including Naval Gunfire Muzzle Blasts at 200 dB and high energy lasers, ensuring these will not directly nor indirectly impact	In the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has conducted its analysis with the understanding of the presence of marine life as mentioned in the comment. Using the best available science, the Navy has thoroughly assessed the potential impacts associated with the proposed training and testing activities. The analysis for impacts to marine mammals is contained in Section 3.4.2.2.2 (for explosive detonations) and Section 3.4.2.3.2 (for high-energy lasers).

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	exquisitely sensitive orca and other marine mammals is paramount. The DEIS does an inadequate job of assessing these impacts.	
Port Townsend-05	<p>3. Sediments and Water Quality regulatory frameworks not identified Jefferson County and its businesses and residents are required to maintain high water quality standards via a strict federal and state regulatory framework to maintain public and environmental health. In the Executive Summary, page ES-7, section 3.1, the DEIS states:</p> <p><i>"Explosives and explosives byproducts, metals, chemicals, and other materials expended during training and testing described in this Supplemental could result in short-term and long-term impacts on sediments and water quality. Some chemical, physical, or biological changes in sediment or water quality could be measurable, but most would be negligible. Regulatory thresholds and guidelines established for measuring impacts on sediment and water quality would not be exceeded."</i></p> <p>The Navy, through this DEIS, is held to the basic framework of the National Environmental Policy Act whose policy is to assure the people of this nation that the environment will be protected from environmental impacts of proposed federal activities. Publishing an analysis of possible environmental consequences using words like "could result" and "could be measurable" is unacceptable and does not met the requirements of NEPA, particularly Section 1502.2(d) the requirement of environmental studies to evaluate environmental impacts. It is unclear which regulatory thresholds would not be exceeded, nor which guidelines would be followed for the myriad components of explosives, metals and chemical and the myriad infauna, epifaunal and benthic communities of affected marine environments. A Supplemental EIS is clearly warranted to assess impacts and analyze mitigating factors for impacts to sediments and water quality.</p>	<p>The complete analysis of potential impacts on water is found in Section 3.1.4 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The section quoted in the comment is only a brief summary of the complete analysis. Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) concludes, based upon the best available science, that chemical, physical, and biological changes to sediment or water quality would be measurable but below applicable standards, regulations, and guidelines, and would be within the existing conditions or designated uses. The Navy's training and testing activities are in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations concerning the impact of military expended materials and associated chemical constituents in the ocean environment.</p>
Port Townsend-06	<p>4. Assess and Include Carbon Emissions in FSEIS</p> <p>As stated on page 31 of the Executive Summary, Energy Requirements and Conservation Potential of Alternatives and Mitigation Measures, "Resources that will be permanently and continually consumed by project implementation include water, electricity, natural gas, and fossil fuels; however, the amount and rate of consumption of these resources would not result in significant environmental impacts or the unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources."</p> <p>This County and many residents are deeply concerned about the local impacts of climate change, particularly sea level rise to our coastal communities, the impacts of ocean acidification on the shellfish industry, and increased risk of wildfire to our forested region. While the NEPA/EIS</p>	<p>The Navy completed an analysis of carbon emissions in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. See Section 3.2.3.2 (Greenhouse Gases and Climate).</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>process does not yet require the consideration of impacts of burning of fossil fuels and resulting addition of carbon to the atmosphere, Jefferson County has, and continues to, inventory its greenhouse gas emissions in an effort to reduce them given the harmful and detrimental impacts. Similarly, we request the Navy report use and emissions in the FSEIS.</p> <p>While the DEIS does not include such figures, it is estimated that Growlers use approximately 1300 gal/ flight. If 2300 flights are flown in a year, that equates to 2,990,000 gallons of jet fuel consumed annually, just for the Growler program alone. If using standard jet fuel, which emits 21 lbs. of carbon/ gallon, this represents the addition of 62,790,000 pounds of carbon into the atmosphere locally. This is a significant contribution to a major environmental threat that should be assessed in this DEIS.</p>	
Port Townsend-07	<p>5. Aircraft Transit Map does not include Jefferson County International Airport</p> <p>Figure 2.3-1, on page 2-18, does not include Port of Port Townsend Airport, Jefferson County's only international and FAA-regulated air field. Please include it in future versions.</p>	Thank you. The figure has been revised to include Jefferson County International Airport.
Port Townsend-08	<p>6. Socioeconomic Resources, including tourism and transportation, are impacted</p> <p>Section 3.12 on page ES-24 states, <i>"Impacts on socioeconomic resources are expected to be minor because inaccessibility to areas of co-use would be localized and temporary, the Navy's strict standard operating procedures would minimize physical disturbance and strikes of commercial and recreational watercraft, most airborne activities would occur well out to sea far from tourism and recreation locations, aircraft activities in the Olympic MOAs are expected to have negligible impacts on socioeconomic resources, and impacts to commercially important marine species are not expected ... There would be no disproportionately high impacts or adverse effects on any low-income populations or minority populations."</i></p> <p>Along with Jefferson County, Port Townsend requests ongoing consultation to discuss impacts to socioeconomic resources. Navy Testing and Training represent significant challenges to both local tourism and transportation sectors, neither of which are adequately represented in the DEIS.</p> <p>With increased Growler activity in Port Townsend, over the Olympic National Park, a UNESCO World Heritage Site, and at the Pacific Coast (home of the Olympic National Marine Sanctuary), tourists who frequent these areas (and locals alike) are experiencing unexpected levels of jet noise. This is particularly felt where there is an expectation for quiet, such as in wilderness areas and at night. While impacts from Growler activity are</p>	<p>Section 3.12 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS analyzes training and testing activities occurring in the Study Area and considered all potential stressors related to socioeconomic resources including (1) Accessibility (to the ocean and the airspace); (2) Airborne acoustics; (3) Physical disturbance and strike (aircraft, vessels and in-water devices, military expended materials); and (4) Secondary (availability of resources). The analysis in Section 3.12.3.2 (Airborne Noise) has been revised to reflect available information regarding park visitors. The Navy is committed to being a good neighbor with the communities surrounding our installations and in proximity to where training and testing activities occur. Navy leadership will continue to meet with Jefferson County officials to discuss their concerns as requested.</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	difficult to link to decrease in tourism revenues, constituents in the tourism industry have complained that customers are deterred and choose to leave prematurely due to noise. With tourism one of the largest sectors of the economy here, this impact is critical to assess and mitigate.	
Port Townsend-09	Additionally, closures of the Hood Canal Bridge for the passage of submarines seems to be increasing and continues during high traffic periods, such as Sunday afternoons when thousands of vehicles are attempting to leave the Olympic Peninsula. As injury traffic incidents increase on State Route 104, long back-ups and delays due to submarine closures are less tolerated and further implicated in the inaccessibility of Jefferson County, a huge blow to both doing business and tourism here. We request further collaboration to limit bridge impacts and to mitigate impacts to tourism in Olympic National Park and its 4 million visitors annually.	The Hood Canal Bridge closures and impacts to traffic were analyzed in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Section 3.12.3.4 - Secondary Impacts). Bridge closures related to the Navy's proposed activities are not expected to increase from those currently occurring.
Port Townsend-10	7. Discussions regarding the No Action alternative. The DEIS dismisses wholesale the concept of a No Action alternative other than maintain existing levels of testing, training, explosions and warfare exercises. In 1981, the Council on Environmental Quality published guidance on the "no action" alternative to include such cases meaning the proposed activity would not take place and any benefit or consequence of this "no action" alternative should be included in the analysis. "This [no action] analysis provides a benchmark, enabling decisionmakers to compare the magnitude of environmental effects of the action alternatives." (Yost, Nicholas, General Counsel. "Memorandum for Federal NEPA Liaisons, General, State and Local Officials and Other Persons Involved in the NEPA Process. CFR Parts 1500-1508.1981 CEQ. Washington DC). We believe the DEIS does not provide sufficient discussion of the no action alternative such that the magnitude of environmental effects is available regarding all action alternatives. Once again, a Supplemental DEIS is warranted.	In regards to providing a No Action Alternative as was used in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy applied a scenario where no authorizations or permits are issued, the Navy's training and testing activities do not take place, and the resulting environmental effects from taking no action were compared with the effects of the Proposed Action (refer to Section 2.4.2.1 [No Action Alternative] of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS). This approach supports NMFS' regulatory process by presenting the scenario where no authorization will be issued. Additionally, this approach responds to comments submitted at various stages regarding the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and during the scoping process of this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. However, Section 2.4.1 (Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration) has been expanded in this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include a "Status Quo" Alternative. This alternative considers no change to the training and testing activities as approved in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and the Navy consulting with NMFS under the MMPA. The Navy determined that this alternative did not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action after thorough consideration.
Port Townsend-11	8. Mitigation measures. Since this is a Phase 3 DEIS we believe it is important to summarize the methods and outcomes of mitigation measures deployed for Phase 1 (2010-2015) and for Phase 2 (2015-2020). This would greatly illuminate the more or different mitigation measures that Phase 3 should address. The DEIS discusses mitigation basically in two categories - procedural mitigation measures and mitigation areas. Procedural mitigation is described in lengthy detail across all training and testing activities. Mitigation areas are discussed in Appendix K and describe	As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the mitigation measures developed for both NWTT Inland Waters and the NWTT Offshore Area for the Proposed Action represent an increase over the mitigation developed for the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS. The Navy works cooperatively with NMFS and the USFWS to develop mitigation specific to each Proposed Action. As discussed in Section 5.1.2.2 (Monitoring, Research, and Reporting Initiatives), the Navy developed its reporting requirements in conjunction with NMFS to be consistent with mission requirements and balance the usefulness of the

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>geographic areas in which more procedures would be followed during training and testing in these areas (coastal, Puget Sound and Straits). We are confused how a mitigation area that triggers more procedures differs from procedural mitigation and moreover what if any impact avoidance technique beyond "obtaining permission from the appropriate designated Command authority prior to commencing the exercise" is going to be included. We find the mitigation areas not materially different from procedural mitigation and are concerned that fauna of the littoral zone will experience significant negative impacts through procedures that do not avoid or minimize impacts. Other mitigations referred to are "through the permitting process" ostensibly in consultation with the NMFS and USFWS. We understand however that all permitting decisions are to be based on mitigation measures published in the EIS so are not able to assess what, if any, additional impact minimizations from permitting there are.</p>	<p>information to be collected with the practicality of collecting it. The Navy does not maintain records of every instance of mitigation implementation for the reasons described in Section 5.5.7 (Reporting Requirements).</p> <p>The Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals wherever and whenever applicable acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors are used in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals in areas that are particularly important for biological life processes, such as feeding and migration. For example, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy will restrict all but one type of explosive activity from occurring within 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area year-round, which will help the Navy avoid potential impacts from explosives on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. The Navy included several new geographic mitigation measures in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS that were developed in coordination with the USFWS or NMFS during the MMPA or ESA consultation processes. For example, the Navy strengthened its mitigation measures for active sonar, explosives, and physical disturbance and strike stressors within the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area. Mitigation area requirements (e.g., prohibiting activities from occurring within an area) are materially different than procedural mitigation requirements (e.g., ceasing explosive activities when marine mammals are observed within a specified distance from the detonation location).</p>
<i>Puget Sound Partnership</i>		
PSP-01	<p>Concern: (1) Recent acoustic monitoring evidence shows considerable temporal and spatial overlap between high-use testing areas for active sonar and explosives and high-use areas by SRKWs off the north coast of Washington—which current and proposed activities do not appear to recognize.</p> <p>The Draft EIS does not appear to integrate the latest analyses from NOAA's hydrophone network that were provided to the Navy in March (Emmons et al. 2019). One key takeaway from the report is that SRKWs show disproportionately high use of the Cape Flattery Offshore (CFO) area in spring compared to other areas of the coast. Extrapolating from four years of recent data (Fig. 18), it appears that annually, on average, SRKWs are detected near CFO about 4 days in April, and about 2 days per month in</p>	<p>The Navy-funded research presented in Emmons et al. 2019 was considered in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, but the report was not cited because it was still in the process of being edited by the authors and had not been finalized. The report has since been finalized and is cited in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>In their comment, Puget Sound Partnership indicates that the Cape Flattery Offshore region is a "high use" area for the Navy based on findings from Emmons et al. 2019 and asks that the Navy considers moving activities away from the Cape Flattery area in the spring (April, May, and June) when SRKW detections were highest. The Navy would like to clarify that it does not frequently conduct training or testing activities in the location of the Cape Flattery Offshore hydrophone since that area is highly utilized by commercial</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>May and June. Moreover, those totals are likely to reflect lower-than-actual use because SRKWs now travel in smaller groups and smaller groups are more likely to be silent. The frequency and consistency in SRKW use is comparable to or exceeds levels seen in Puget Sound’s designated “critical habitat” at various times of year. The same acoustic monitoring results show the CFO area to have the highest evidence of mid-frequency sonar and explosions along the Washington coast—also in spring. To minimize potential adverse effects on SRKWs, such testing and training should be moved to another location or another season, or both.</p> <p>The Draft EIS proposes new activities that would substantially increase the amount of testing of explosives in the water column in/near that area (i.e., >1800 tests of HF4 Mine detection, classification, and neutralization). While those activities would likely use relatively small munitions, Table 3.0-7 also indicates that both alternatives would authorize use of a few much larger explosives in the offshore area. Given the higher force and impact-spread of large explosives, and the potential to mortally wound SRKWs in an area of heightened SRKW use – we suggest fundamentally examining the timing and/or placement of explosives testing, especially to avoid the spring season and to re-examine the findings that both alternatives would not result in (or significantly risk) the incidental taking of killer whales.</p>	<p>vessel traffic, making it an undesirable location for the Navy to conduct activities, especially sonar training or testing.</p> <p>Emmons et al. 2019 reported a number of detections at Cape Flattery Offshore, but this was not normalized for effort, which was also highest at the Cape Flattery Offshore hydrophone location. This would have the effect of overstating detections in that area. Emmons et al. 2019 reported on detections of MFA sonar, but did not distinguish between various sources (U.S. versus Canadian navies, among other users). Historically, the annual usage of MF1 sonar by the U.S. Navy in the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (which overlaps with the Cape Flattery Offshore hydrophone) over the last 10 years has been minimal.</p> <p>The commenter asked the Navy to “re-examine the findings that both alternatives would not result in (or significantly risk) the incidental taking of killer whales.” The paragraph leading into this request indicates confusion regarding more than “1,800 tests.” For clarification, the Navy’s Proposed Action does not include 1,800 explosive testing events, but rather 1,800 hours of high-frequency acoustic testing during non-explosive mine detection, classification, and neutralization systems. The Navy re-examined its effects analysis and affirmed that explosives used under the Proposed Action will not result in incidental taking of Southern Resident killer whales, as discussed in Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals).</p> <p>As described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy developed new mitigation for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on Southern Resident killer whales and other marine species in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitat areas. For example, the Navy developed a new mitigation area known as the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, which encompasses waters off Cape Flattery as recommended by the commenter. The Navy’s mitigation now includes annual limits on hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and prohibits explosive Mine Countermeasures and Neutralization Testing in the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. All other explosive activities are required to be conducted 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. In addition, the Navy developed a new mitigation to issue annual awareness notification messages to alert ships and aircraft to the possible presence of increased concentrations of Southern Resident killer whales seasonally, which will</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		further help avoid potential impacts from vessel movements and training and testing activities on this species.
PSP-02	<p>Concern (2): Potentially widespread opportunity for mitigation of testing exercises conducted at night may be missed.</p> <p>Emmons et al. (2019) report that roughly one quarter of the explosions detected in spring near Cape Flattery Offshore occurred at night. The Draft EIS does not appear to indicate the time of day for current and proposed testing activities for active sonar and the use of explosives in mine neutralization, etc. In the Draft EIS, Table 5.6-1 describes the use of what appears to be lookouts in the daytime, while section 5.5.4 covers “Thermal Detection Systems.” However, there doesn’t appear to be any description of whether or how the Navy might deploy marine mammal lookouts during training and testing at night. Due to the contrast between cold, ocean water and large, higher-temperature dorsal fins (and blows) of orcas—the potential for detecting and avoiding orcas at night using night-vision optics or other thermal imaging technology seems high. We urge the Navy to (A) provide more information on which exercises (and/or what percentage) are expected to occur at night and (B) require spotters to use night-vision optics or similar mitigation during nighttime testing and training, particularly when using explosives and active sonar.</p>	<p>The U.S. Navy has not used explosives in or near the Cape Flattery area in the past; therefore, detections reported by Emmons et al. 2019 should not be incorrectly attributed to U.S. Navy training and testing. In waters off Alaska, Washington, and California, passive acoustic monitoring efforts since 2009 have documented the routine use of non-military explosives at-sea (Baumann-Pickering et al., 2013; Debich et al., 2014; Emmons et al., 2019a; Kerosky et al., 2013; Rice et al., 2015; Trickey et al., 2015; Wiggins et al., 2019). Based on the spectral properties of the recorded sounds and their correspondence with known fishing seasons or activity, the source of these explosions has been linked to the use of explosive marine mammal deterrents known as “seal bombs,” which are intended to be used by commercial fishers to deter marine mammals, particularly pinnipeds, from preying upon their catch and to prevent marine mammals from interacting and potentially becoming entangled with fishing gear (Baumann-Pickering et al., 2013; Bland, 2017; (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015; Wiggins et al., 2019).</p> <p>The Navy added additional details on seasonality and day/night requirements of its activities to Appendix A (Navy Activities Descriptions) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy developed mitigation to not conduct explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing at night, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and suggested by the commenter. As described in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar), the Navy has a requirement to conduct some active sonar training and testing at night due to environmental differences between day and night and varying weather conditions that affect sound propagation and the detection capabilities of sonar. Temperature layers that move up and down in the water column and ambient noise levels can vary significantly between night and day. This affects sound propagation and could affect how sonar systems function and are operated. It would not be practical to develop mitigation to prohibit all active sonar activities from being conducted at night due to impacts on mission requirements; however, after sunset and prior to sunrise, Lookouts and other Navy watch personnel employ night visual search techniques, which could include the use of night vision devices, as described in Section 5.2.1 (Procedural Mitigation Development).</p> <p>Analysis of the potential for thermal detection systems as a mitigation tool was presented in Section 5.5.4 (Thermal Detection Systems and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Office of Naval</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Research Marine Mammals and Biology program funded a project (2013–2018) to test the thermal limits of infrared-based automatic whale detection technology. The Navy has also been investigating the use of thermal detection systems with automated marine mammal detection algorithms for future mitigation during training and testing, including on autonomous platforms. For example, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency funded six initial studies to test and evaluate infrared-based thermal detection technologies and algorithms to automatically detect marine mammals on an unmanned surface vehicle. Based on the outcome of these initial studies, the Navy is planning additional follow-on efforts and testing. The Navy plans to continue researching thermal detection systems to determine their effectiveness and compatibility with Navy applications. If the technology matures to the state where thermal detection is determined to be an effective mitigation tool during training and testing, the Navy will assess the practicality of using the technology during training and testing events and retrofitting its observation platforms with thermal detection devices. The Navy will provide information to NMFS about the status and findings of Navy-funded thermal detection studies and any associated practicality assessments at the annual adaptive management meetings. Information about the Navy’s adaptive management program is included in Section 5.1.2.2.1.1 (Adaptive Management).
PSP-03	Concern (3): A new category of sonar tests with hundreds of repetitions has been proposed, but has not been adequately described in the Draft EIS. The draft EIS describes an additional 257 tests of a “Weapon-emulating sonar source.” However a word search of the document revealed no clarification of what that activity is, or where and when it would occur. We believe that should be clarified before review by NOAA/NMFS.	The comment is referring to the description provided in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Table 3.0-2) of the HF9 sonar source. This sound source is proposed to be used approximately 257 hours per year, mostly in the Inland Waters of Puget Sound with some minimal use (less than 10 hours) in the Western Behm Canal, Alaska. The description in Table 3.0-2 has been revised in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to clarify that HF9 sonar sources are active sources which emulate the acoustic signals produced by lightweight torpedoes.
PSP-04	Concern (4): Although the cumulative total amount of time that mid frequency sonar (MFS) may be used off the north coast is relatively low per year (33 hours), each use likely has a multiplicative effect on the disturbance to SRKWs. The MFS pulses emitted by the Navy on any given day may range from minutes to hours (Emmons et al. 2019), and the EIS suggests that the cumulative annual total is likely to be less than 33 hours. Although the total use of MFS is not high, each occurrence has the potential to trigger SRKWs to abandon an area for an entire day or more (as seen in other cetaceans’ reactions to MFS per Tyack et al. 2011). The Draft EIS asserts that a	The Navy does not generally schedule training and testing near Cape Flattery due to the high volume of commercial vessel traffic in that portion of the Study Area. The Navy developed procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals from active sonar whenever and wherever training or testing activities occur within the Study Area, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation). The Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid potential impacts in important foraging, breeding, and migration areas, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). The Navy developed new mitigation for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from mid-frequency

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	significant behavioral response is expected for toothed whales, like orcas, out to 16 km. This means that intermittent Navy MFS testing repeatedly casts a wide, harsh underwater noise that could displace/deter/delay SRKWs from entering a large, preferred area. This could lead to the cumulative loss of many days of potentially productive foraging and cost SRKWs lost energy—via extra calories expended to exit an area to avoid the noise (Williams et al. 2017), and in lost foraging opportunities. We suggest that MFS testing not be done in/near CFO or other areas where SRKWs are regularly found, and shift such testing to distant-and-deep offshore waters. We hope that you find these comments helpful in your EIS process. Please contact me or my staff with any questions. The Partnership looks forward to continuing to work with the Navy to ensure protections for Southern Resident Killer Whales, the environment and our national security.	active sonar on Southern Resident killer whales to the maximum extent practicable. The Navy will conduct a maximum combined total of 33 hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar during testing annually within 20 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Mitigation Area.
San Juan County Council		
SJCC-01	Training Area Map The training area map is inaccurate. It depicts NASWI as well south of San Juan County. It is actually due east of the south end of Lopez Island. This is important because almost all air operations impact the soundscape on Lopez and San Juan Islands. It distorts where operations will occur.	The maps in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS are accurate and no changes are necessary. It is likely that the map the commenter is looking at is (as are all aviation maps) based on Magnetic North, while the maps used in this document use True North. There is a significant magnetic variation in the area (approximately 18 degrees), so comparing magnetic north-based maps and true north-based maps would appear to show a discrepancy of almost 20 degrees. If the Supplemental EIS/OEIS maps were rotated 18 degrees to account for the magnetic variation, the southern end of Lopez Island would appear to be due west of NASWI.
SJCC-02	Training Area/ Flight Operations In the record of decision for additional Growlers based at NASWI, the focus of increased flight operations was on the field carrier landing practice (FCLP). Please clarify if the number of flight operations in the training area is in addition to those stated in the record of decision for NASWI.	The EA-18G flight activities proposed in the NWTT EIS/OEIS include those that transit to and operate in the Olympic MOA or offshore in W-237. The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been revised to clarify that the increased number of proposed activities in these areas results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year (see Note 2 on Table 2.5-1).
SJCC-03	Sound Growler operations produce large amounts of noise. The DEIS relies on noise “modeling” not “testing” which understates the magnitude and length of time of the noise as well as the impacts on wildlife and humans. Ground tests have shown that the actual sound impact is above levels allowed in state statute in both decibels and duration. Occurrences that last several minutes can harm marine and land animals. We ask that actual testing and measurements be done.	DoD’s position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses ¹ . The following text ² states DoD’s position regarding the preference for modeling: 5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
SJCC-04	<p>Sonar</p> <p>Southern Resident Killer Whales are an endangered species and on the brink of extinction. Governor Jay Inslee convened a task force last year, which San Juan County participated to find solutions. After many meetings, a series of short and long term recommendations were made. The recommendations are backed by science. Studies show that certain sonar frequencies interfere with the whales’ ability to locate prey. The whales then move on without feeding. It is not accurate to state that there will be no long-term effects from sonar. For obvious reasons sonar levels are not described in the DEIS, however [sic]</p>	<p>In 2019, a team of Navy Officers and biologists participated with the Governor of Washington’s Southern Resident Killer Whale Task Force, including the Prey Working Group and Vessels Working Group. As described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy has incorporated Southern Resident killer whale mitigation recommendations made by the Task Force into the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to the maximum extent practical, and will continue to engage with future protection and recovery efforts of this priority species.</p> <p>Although the hearing range of killer whales overlaps with some frequencies used in sonar, sonar use is unlikely to interfere with the whale’s ability to locate prey because 1) killer whales are able to distinguish and preferentially attend to sounds with different source locations (i.e., spatial release from masking), and 2) because of the low-duty cycles that are used by most sonars. As stated in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Section 3.4.1.1.4, Masking, subsection entitled “Masking by Sonar and Other Transducers”), masking due to high-duty cycle sonars is likely analogous to masking produced by other continuous sources (e.g., vessel noise), and will likely have similar short-term consequences. These may include changes to vocalization amplitude and frequency and behavioral impacts such as avoidance of the area and interruptions to foraging or other essential behaviors. Long-term consequences (e.g., changes to vocal behavior and vocalization structure, abandonment of habitat if masking occurs frequently enough to significantly</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		impair communication, and a potential decrease in recruitment if masking interferes with reproductive activities or mother-calf communication) are not expected to occur for reasons described in Section 3.4.2.1.2.3 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the Action Alternatives) subsection "Killer Whales."
SJCC-05	Explosives Pg ES-10 As stated above orcas populations are very low. Many of the task force recommendations were to reduce stressors on the whales. Stresses alter feeding patterns, which are already precariously dependent on Chinook salmon, a federally listed endangered species. It is imperative that the Navy as well as the private and public sectors, impose no further threats to this iconic population.	The Navy's proposed activities and their potential to impact the Southern Resident killer whale are thoroughly analyzed in the appropriate section of the document, Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals). The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS analyzed potential impacts to every component of the food web, including Chinook salmon (see analysis of impacts to fishes in Section 3.9). Stresses, including behavioral reactions that may divert a Southern Resident killer whale from important behaviors such as feeding, were included in the Navy's analysis.
SJCC-06	Further, the DEIS appears to operate from the assumption that testing and training activities can minimize impacts to orca and other marine mammals by not performing operations where they are visible. Relying solely on sightlines is outdated, of very limited efficacy, and seems wholly inadequate. It is out of sync with the purpose of the training area which is to test the most up to date equipment.	The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals wherever and whenever applicable acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors are used in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict all but one type of explosive activity from occurring within 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area year-round, which will help the Navy avoid potential impacts from explosives on marine mammals in important foraging, breeding, and migration areas. Additionally, the Navy developed the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to enhance protections of Southern Resident Killer Whales throughout NWTT Inland Waters. Information about the Navy's mitigation areas is presented in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
SJCC-07	Socioeconomic Resources, including tourism are impacted Tourism is affected by Growler operations. Deception Pass State Park has tracked and quantified the amount of cancelled reservations and camping fees returned directly linked to extensive Growler operations from NASWI. This should be examined impact determined.	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include aircraft flights in the vicinity of Deception Pass State Park. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources.
Seattle Mayor (letter)		
Seattle-01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Draft EIS does not appear to integrate the latest analysis from NOAA's hydrophone network that were provided to the Navy in March. This research indicates that the Navy is already altering the soundscape in areas where orcas are present and to minimize adverse effects on Southern 	The Navy-funded research presented in Emmons et al. 2019 was considered in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, but the report was not cited because it was still in the process of being edited by the authors and had not been

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	resident orcas, testing and training in the Cape Flattery Offshore should be reexamined and potentially moved.	<p>finalized. The report has since been finalized and is cited in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy does not frequently conduct training or testing activities in the location of the Cape Flattery Offshore hydrophone since that area is highly utilized by commercial vessel traffic, making it an undesirable location for the Navy to conduct activities, especially sonar training or testing.</p> <p>The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on Southern Resident killer whales and other marine species in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitat areas, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed a new mitigation area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, which encompasses waters off Cape Flattery, as recommended by the commenter. The Navy's mitigation now includes annual limits on hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and prohibits explosive Mine Countermeasures and Neutralization Testing in the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. All other explosive activities are required to be conducted 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. In addition, the Navy developed a new mitigation to issue annual awareness notification messages to alert ships and aircraft to the possible presence of increased concentrations of Southern Resident killer whales seasonally, which will further help avoid potential impacts from vessel movements and training and testing activities on this species.</p>
Seattle-02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Draft EIS does not appear to reflect the fact that the Southern resident orca critical habitat is likely to expand later this year. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is committed to proposing a rule to expand the designation of critical habitat off Washington, Oregon, and California by early October 2019. The Navy will need to adjust its plans accordingly. 	<p>The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Seattle-03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Draft EIS inaccurately states that Governor Inslee's Orca Task Force did not identify Navy actions as a source for any of the identified threats to Southern resident orca. Recommendation #25 from the Task Force report outlines the need to "address the acoustic and physical impacts to 	<p>The Task Force Final Report did not identify Navy sonar among the major threats. The major threats identified in the report are a lack of prey, disturbance from noise and vessel traffic, and toxic contaminants in the waters they inhabit. The Navy, as acknowledged by the Governor's Task Force</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Southern Resident orcas from Naval exercises in waters and air of Washington state.”	in 2018, was not previously requested to participate in the Task Force. The Navy has since been invited to take part and, as a result, a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Task Force’s working groups on prey and vessel traffic, to develop solutions to issues pointed out in recommendation #25. The Navy participated in the Governor’s Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.
Seattle-04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy should clarify and potentially adjust the times of year in which proposed activities will occur. This is especially important when assessing impacts to fish and wildlife, which have seasonal movements and behaviors that will greatly determine whether Navy activities significantly affect each species in the proposed areas (e.g. rockfish, Southern resident orca). 	As stated in Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities), because of the nature of training and testing requirements for forces that must be ready to deploy at all times, activities could occur throughout the year. The Navy added additional details on seasonality and day/night requirements of its activities to Appendix A (Navy Activities Descriptions) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy did consider seasonal movements and behaviors of marine species in its effect analysis. The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species either seasonally or year-round in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitats, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
Seattle-05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whale report alert systems should be used for real-time sightings and advance warnings, complementing the limited visual range of lookouts. There are new real-time whale presence alert systems that the Navy should use to expand and speed up their awareness of likely imminent presence of Southern resident orcas beyond what the lookouts can do visually. 	The Navy developed new mitigation for Navy biologists to initiate communication with the appropriate marine mammal detection networks in NWTT Inland Waters prior to conducting explosive mine neutralization activities involving the use of Navy divers, Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training, Civilian Port Defense – Homeland Security Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Exercises, and Small Boat Attack Exercises. This mitigation will help the Navy plan activities in a way that minimizes the potential for exposure of Southern Resident killer whales, as described in Section K.3.3 (Mitigation Areas for Marine Species in NWTT Inland Waters). The Navy will also continue to assess the practicality of other available monitoring techniques as technologies advance.
Seattle-06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy should include rigorous analysis, testing, and monitoring of newer technologies outlined in the Draft EIS—such as high-energy lasers, kinetic energy weapons, and biodegradable polymer—as these are new and their effects are unknown. 	The Navy’s use of high-energy lasers, kinetic energy weapons, and biodegradable polymer, while new to the NWTT Study Area, have been tested on other Navy ranges and evaluated in previous environmental documents. Their use in the NWTT Study Area has been thoroughly analyzed in this NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS for impacts specific to their use in this environment. In

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		each case, as described throughout Chapter 3, impacts are expected to be minimal to undetectable.
Seattle-07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy should prioritize an increase in protections to reduce noise and disturbance affecting the Southern resident orca immediately. Many other agencies and operators are taking new, meaningful steps to reduce noise and disturbance affecting Southern resident orcas. There are documented cases in this region of United States and Canadian naval activities—including active sonar training and explosive testing—causing direct harm, death, or displacement to the Southern resident orcas. Given the dire situation, it is critical the Navy immediately stop or adjust these activities. The City of Seattle is bringing forward a resolution (draft attached to this letter) to express its concerns with the Navy’s proposed activities and underscore our commitment to working with our partners to ensure protections for Southern resident orcas and the restoration of Puget Sound. Our orcas face incredible environmental pressures, and we must do better protecting these irreplaceable members of our region. I call on the U.S. Navy to do their part to keep our waters healthy and safe for all sea life in the Puget Sound. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Sincerely, Jenny A. Durkan Mayor of Seattle 	<p>As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy developed several new mitigation measures for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on Southern Resident killer whales and other marine species in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitat areas. For example, in the NWT Offshore Area, the Navy developed a new mitigation area known as the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area where it will limit annual hours of hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and will prohibit explosive Mine Countermeasures and Neutralization Testing.</p> <p>As described in Section K.3.3. (Mitigation Areas for Marine Species in NWT Inland Waters), the Navy also developed enhanced mitigation measures in NWT Inland Waters for Southern Resident killer whales, gray whales, and other marine species for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy’s new Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area requirements will result in training and testing activities being conducted in NWT Inland Waters only when necessitated by mission-essential training or testing program requirements. Furthermore, the Navy will implement additional geographic mitigation for activities that are conducted in the mitigation area as applicable, such as seasonal awareness messages, communication with sighting information networks, limitations on the type and location of active sonar and explosive activities, and prohibition of live fire activities. The Navy’s mitigation as described in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS represents the maximum level of mitigation practical to implement under the Proposed Action, and any further mitigation in NWT Inland Waters would be impractical due to implications for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements for the reasons described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).</p>
Seattle-08	Section 1. The City of Seattle requests the Navy reconsider aspects of its Northwest testing and training proposal and take meaningful steps to reduce noise and disturbance affecting marine mammals, including the Southern resident orca.	Several new mitigation measures developed in cooperation with NMFS during the ESA and MMPA consultation process will help the Navy reduce potential impacts from active sonar and explosives. For example, as described in Section 5.3.3.6 (Explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Activities), the Navy is reducing the total number of explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing detonations over the course of a 7-year period from 180 to 108 for bin E4 and from 25 to 15 for bin E7. This reduction in the total number of allowable detonations will result in a reduction in potential impacts on Southern Resident killer whales and their

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		prey fish species. The Navy also developed a new mitigation to conduct a maximum combined total of 33 hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar during testing annually within 20 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Mitigation Area.
Seattle-09	Section 2. The City of Seattle urges the Navy to use the most recent science about Puget Sound marine mammals in its analysis to prevent further harm to endangered Southern resident orcas, endangered Western North Pacific humpback whales, and other marine animals impacted by its activities.	The Navy will continue to use the best available science in the analysis of impacts resulting from its activities.
Seattle-10	Section 3. The City of Seattle urges the Navy to expand habitat protections and cease training and testing activities when endangered Southern resident orcas, endangered Western North Pacific humpback whales, and other priority marine animals are present.	In addition to the numerous mitigation areas developed, the Navy will continue to implement procedural mitigation whenever and wherever applicable activities occur in the Study Area. Procedural mitigation involves powering down or shutting down active sonar, and ceasing explosive or non-explosive activities if a marine mammal is observed within a specified distance from a sound source or target location.
Seattle-11	Section 4. The City of Seattle affirms its continued support for the collective work of the scientific community, environmental organizations, agency partners, and the work of Puget Sound tribes, to restore and protect Puget Sound and to reduce critical threats to the survival of Southern resident orcas, including diminished salmon, toxic contaminants, and disturbance from noise and vessel traffic.	The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.
<i>Washington Counsel for Environmental Protection</i>		
WCEP-01	<p>The Navy Should Consider an Alternative that Would Minimize Environmental Impacts</p> <p>To ensure that it considers an adequate range of alternatives, the Navy should develop and consider in detail an alternative designed to reduce impacts to marine mammals, fish, and other wildlife while also meeting the Navy's training, testing, and military readiness needs. At a minimum, this alternative should limit the amount of impulsive sound to reduce impacts on marine mammals and Endangered Species Act listed species, decrease sonar exposure at-sea and pier side, and incorporate seasonal and/or geographical restrictions to reduce impacts on wildlife, including tufted puffin, marbled murrelets, ESA-listed rockfish and salmon, harbor porpoises, and Southern Resident killer whales.</p> <p>The Navy's current range of alternatives fails to analyze an alternative that would minimize impacts to marine mammals, fish, and other wildlife. Instead, the two action alternatives are the same or very similar with</p>	The Navy's alternatives were developed in order to satisfy the Navy's purpose and need related to fulfilling its Title 10 requirements. The Navy has explored and evaluated all reasonable alternatives. Details regarding the development of reasonable alternatives are provided in Section 2.4 (Action Alternatives Development) and Section 2.4.2 (Alternatives Carried Forward). Consistent with 40 C.F.R. 1502.14, the Navy proposes a robust suite of mitigation measures, including geographic mitigation areas, which will be implemented in both action alternatives (i.e., whichever alternative is selected). These mitigation measures, as well as standard operating procedures that the Navy routinely employs, are discussed in detail and specifically inform the decision maker and the public how the Navy can avoid or minimize adverse impacts.

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	respect to many training and testing activities. For example, both Alternative 1 and 2 include the same number of air combat maneuvers, maritime patrol aircraft tracking exercises, 16 aircraft electronic warfare training exercises, anti-submarine warfare testing activities, torpedo testing, unmanned aerial system testing, acoustic component testing in inland waters, radar and other system testing, semi-stationary equipment testing in inland waters, simulant testing, track testing, intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance electronic warfare triton testing, and high-energy laser testing. In addition, the two action alternatives contemplate the same maximum level of training and testing activities for surface-to-air missile exercises, submarine torpedo exercises submarine tracking exercises, precision anchoring, and unmanned underwater vehicle testing in the offshore area. The two action alternatives also apply the same mitigation measures, which the Navy contends is the "maximum level of mitigation that is practicable for the Navy to implement when balanced against impacts to safety, sustainability, and the ability to continue meeting its mission requirements." Given the similarity between these two action alternatives, they do not provide sufficient information for the Navy and NFMS to engage in informed decisionmaking. Accordingly, the Navy should develop and consider an alternative that contemplates a level of training and testing that will reduce impacts to marine mammals and other wildlife consistent with the purpose and need of the proposed action.	
WCEP-02	<p>To satisfy its NEPA obligations, the Navy should revise its analysis of environmental impacts to better reflect the impacts of its training and testing operations. In particular, the Navy should more thoroughly analyze the environmental impacts of its use of emerging technologies, including the use of unmanned underwater systems in Puget Sound and off the Washington coastline and the use of sonar, high-energy lasers, payload systems, kinetic energy weapons, and biodegradable polymers. Moreover, the Navy should clarify any time-of-year restrictions on its training and testing activities to provide a better understanding of the potential impacts to marine mammals, fish, and other wildlife.</p> <p>In addition, the Navy should engage in a more robust analysis of the impacts of mid-frequency sonar and mine explosives to marine mammals, fish, and other wildlife. As WDFW observed, mid-frequency sonar can impact wildlife within 2,000 square miles and mine explosives can cause death or injury. Although these activities may impact a wide range of wildlife, the impact of these activities on endangered Southern Resident killer whales is of particular concern, given their dangerously low</p>	<p>The thorough analysis requested in this comment is included in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS and in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS that this document supplements. As stated in Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities), because of the nature of training and testing requirements for forces that must be ready to deploy at all times, activities could occur throughout the year. The Navy added additional details on seasonality and day/night requirements of its activities to Appendix A (Navy Activities Descriptions) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy did consider seasonal movements and behaviors of marine species in its effect analysis. The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species either seasonally or year-round in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitats, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	population size and the significant efforts of the State, Tribes, and Washingtonians to ensure orca survival.	the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
WCEP-03	The Navy's revised analysis also should respond to the concerns expressed by WDFW in Appendix A to its comments, including concerns about impacts of underwater explosions on tufted puffins; impacts of noise, sonar, and other disturbances from Navy activities on Southern Resident killer whales; impacts to short-tailed albatross from ingestion of post-explosive target fragments, debris, and other materials; impacts to marbled murrelets from underwater sound pressure levels and in-water and above-water explosions, and increased vessel traffic; disruptions to ESA-listed rockfish reproductive activities; and the accuracy of estimates of marine mammal densities in the action area.	The Navy responded to the concerns expressed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife below. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
WCEP-04	Finally, the Navy should engage in a more robust analysis of the noise impacts from its increased aircraft operations in Puget Sound and across the Olympic Peninsula. Both action alternatives consider significant increase in aircraft training activity. These aircraft activities affect communities, rural areas, and pristine landscapes across the Northwest, including in and around Olympic National Park, off the Washington Coast, and in Puget Sound.	The Navy is proposing an increase in training flights in the Olympic MOA by approximately 300 total flights per year by 2023; approximately 1 additional flight per day. The Navy conducted a thorough analysis of the impacts of the additional flight activity in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
WCEP-05	The Navy should revise its discussion of mitigation measure to fairly evaluate the environmental consequences of its proposed training and testing activities. Specifically, the Navy's mitigation measures should be modified to establish seasonal limits on Navy activities in certain areas to reduce risks to marine mammals, fish, and wildlife; encompass marine preserves, marine protected areas, and other conservation areas as mitigation areas; include efforts to increase forage fish populations for marine mammals; avoid the release of plastics into the environment; and carefully test and monitor the implementation of new technologies that may have unanticipated impacts on marine mammals, fish, and other wildlife.	Discussions about the level of benefit of the Navy's mitigation measures are presented throughout Section 5.3 (Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from applicable acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors on marine species wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals, sea turtles, birds, and fish in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict all but one type of explosive activity from occurring within 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area year-round, which will help the Navy avoid potential impacts from explosives on marine species in important foraging and migration areas. Within the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area, during Mine Neutralization – Explosive Ordnance Disposal Training activities, the Navy will implement

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>seasonal mitigation to avoid potential impacts on fish. For example, at the Crescent Harbor Explosive Ordnance Disposal Range, the Navy will conduct explosive activities at least 1,000 m from the closest point of land to avoid or reduce impacts on fish (e.g., bull trout and juvenile Chinook salmon) in nearshore habitat areas. At the Hood Canal Explosive Ordnance Disposal Range, the Navy will implement seasonal restrictions on explosive charge sizes to avoid impacts on juvenile and adult Hood Canal summer-run chum and Puget Sound Chinook. The Navy worked cooperatively with NMFS and the USFWS during the MMPA and ESA consultation processes and determined that the mitigation developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS is the maximum level of mitigation that is practical for the Navy to implement under the Proposed Action.</p> <p>In NWTT Inland Waters, the Navy's expanded suite of mitigation developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS will help avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine protected area resources located within or along the shoreline of the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area, such as the San Juan Islands Marine Preserve, San Juan Island National Historical Park, San Juan County/Cypress Island Marine Biological Preserve, Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve, Protection Island National Wildlife Refuge, Dungeness National Wildlife Refuge, Zella M. Schultz/Protection Island Seabird Sanctuary, and Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge. For example, the Navy's mitigation requires explosives to be limited to two designated Explosive Ordnance Disposal ranges in NWTT Inland Waters, neither of which overlap marine protected areas.</p> <p>In the NWTT Offshore Area, mitigation within the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area and Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Mitigation Area will also help the Navy avoid or reduce potential impacts from explosives and other Navy activities on marine protected area resources. The Flattery Rocks National Wildlife Refuge, Quillayute Needles National Wildlife Refuge, and Copalis National Wildlife Refuge are located in the nearshore portion of the Study Area that abuts the Washington shoreline, well within 12 NM from shore. Additional information on marine protected areas is presented in Section 6.1.2 (Marine Protected Areas) of this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Through its marine species research and monitoring programs, the Navy is one of the nation's largest sponsors of scientific research on and monitoring of marine species. Detailed information on these programs is provided in Section 3.0.1.1.1 (Marine Species Monitoring and Research Programs). Navy</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		research programs focus on investments in basic and applied research that increase fundamental knowledge and advance naval technological capabilities. Navy monitoring programs focus on the potential impacts of training and testing activities on biological resources. For example, the Navy Living Marine Resources Program is sponsoring an ongoing study on hearing and estimated acoustic impacts in three species of auk, which will help the Navy refine its assessment of potential impacts from training and testing activities on seabirds, including the marbled murrelet. The Navy has also sponsored several projects on seabird density and distribution to improve baseline knowledge about ESA-listed seabirds in the Study Area. Additionally, for decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that significantly benefit Southern Residents.
<i>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife</i>		
WDFW-01	To evaluate the impacts to fish and wildlife species from existing, new, and increased training and testing activities more accurately, we request the Navy clarify the times of year in which proposed activities will occur. This is especially important when assessing impacts to fish and wildlife, which have seasonal movements and behaviors that will greatly determine whether Navy activities significantly affect each species in the proposed areas (e.g. Tufted puffin, rockfish, Southern Resident killer whale).	As stated in Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities), because of the nature of training and testing requirements for forces that must be ready to deploy at all times, activities could occur throughout the year. The Navy added additional details on seasonality and day/night requirements of its activities to Appendix A (Navy Activities Descriptions) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy did consider seasonal movements and behaviors of marine species in its effect analysis. The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species either seasonally or year-round in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitats, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
WDFW-02	The Draft EIS inaccurately states that Governor Inslee's Orca Task Force did not identify Navy actions as a source for any of the identified threats to SRKW. Recommendation #25 from the Task Force report outlines the need to "address the acoustic and physical impacts to Southern Resident orcas from Naval exercises in waters and air of Washington state." WDFW appreciates the Navy's recent engagement in the Task Force process and welcomes continued coordination and engagement to identify and implement measures to minimize impacts to SRKW.	The Task Force Final Report did not identify Navy sonar among the major threats. The major threats identified in the report are a lack of prey, disturbance from noise and vessel traffic, and toxic contaminants in the waters they inhabit. The Navy, as acknowledged by the Governor's Task Force in 2018, was not previously requested to participate in the Task Force. The Navy has since been invited to take part and, as a result, a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Task Force's working groups on prey and vessel traffic, to develop solutions to issues pointed out in recommendation #25. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.
WDFW-03	<p>Our major concerns for new and increased impacts to SRKW lie around the use of midfrequency sonar, which can impact wildlife within 2,000 square miles, and mine explosives, which could cause immediate injury or death. Since SRKW travel in larger pods, it is unlikely that Navy activities would affect only one or two individual animals. However, in this declining and endangered population, even the loss of one single SRKW could greatly undermine recovery efforts for decades. We request that the Navy: 1) use the latest, most seasonally specific distribution and hotspot information for SRKWs in their analysis of proposed activities, 2) clarify the timing of their proposed activities to better understand potential impacts to SRKW, and 3) accomplish Navy objectives while minimizing impacts to SRKW by shifting these most concerning activities in time and space. In particular, we encourage the Navy to integrate recent acoustic monitoring evidence from NOAA's hydrophone network (Emmons et al. 2019) into their planning efforts. This information shows considerable temporal and spatial overlap between high-use testing areas for active sonar and explosives and high-use areas by SRKWs off the north coast of Washington-which current and proposed activities do not appear to recognize. One key takeaway from the report is that SRKWs show disproportionately high use of the Cape Flattery Offshore area in spring compared to other areas of the coast. To minimize potential adverse effects on SRKWs, sonar and explosives testing and training should be moved to another location or another season, or both. In addition, we request that the Navy re-examine the finding that neither alternatives would not result in (or significantly risk) the incidental taking of killer whales.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar and explosives training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. The Navy's analysis was completed using the latest information, the best available, peer-reviewed science, and includes results from recently completed acoustic modeling. The Navy continues to pursue new scientific data, collected through professional studies and verified through credible, recognized sources. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy-funded research presented in Emmons et al. 2019 was considered in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, but the report was not cited because it was still in the process of being edited by the authors and had not been finalized. The report has since been finalized and is cited in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy added additional details on seasonality and day/night requirements of its activities to Appendix A (Navy Activities Descriptions) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy did consider seasonal movements and behaviors of marine species in its effect analysis. The Navy does not generally schedule training and testing near Cape Flattery due to the high volume of commercial vessel traffic in that portion of the Study Area.</p> <p>The commenter asked the Navy to "re-examine the findings that both alternatives would not result in (or significantly risk) the incidental taking of killer whales." The Navy re-examined its effects analysis and affirmed that explosives used under the Proposed Action will not result in incidental taking of Southern Resident killer whales, as discussed in Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals). Since the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has incorporated new estimates of Southern Resident killer whale densities and distributions in the NWT Offshore Area into the quantitative analysis of impacts. The revised density estimates are shown in the technical report <i>U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area (amended September 20, 2019)</i>, available at www.nwtteis.com. As a result, the Navy has revised the number of behavioral takes of Southern Resident killer whales in Appendix E (Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on Southern Resident killer whales and other marine species in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitat areas, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed a new mitigation area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, which encompasses waters off Cape Flattery, as recommended by the commenter. The Navy's mitigation now includes annual limits on hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and prohibits explosive Mine Countermeasures and Neutralization Testing in the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. All other explosive activities are required to be conducted 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. In addition, the Navy developed a new mitigation to issue annual awareness notification messages to alert ships and aircraft to the possible presence of increased concentrations of Southern Resident killer whales seasonally, which will further help avoid potential impacts from vessel movements and training and testing activities on this species.</p>
WDFW-04	Underwater acoustic testing and electronic warfare may have significant impacts to fish behavior and migration (e.g. salmon and forage fish) or result in auditory injury to the threatened marbled murrelet. Similarly, surface and underwater explosions could directly impact short-tailed albatross, marbled murrelets, or tufted puffins, all of which forage in offshore areas greater than 30-50 nautical miles from shore, especially seasonally. These potential impacts also include the ingestion of post-explosive fragments and debris at the surface, and disturbance caused by high underwater sound pressure levels (barotrauma). WDFW encourages a more thorough analysis using recent data on distributions (See Appendix A for suggestions) and reconsideration of increases of these activities where they are most likely to coincide in space and time with these sensitive fish and birds.	The Navy did conduct a thorough analysis, using the best available science. Please see Section 3.6 (Birds) and Section 3.9 (Fishes).
WDFW-05	Finally, the use of high-energy lasers, kinetic energy weapons, and biodegradable polymer outlined in the EIS are new and their effects are unknown. It is critical that the Navy pair these new technologies, which are potential energy and entanglement stressors or sources of mortality, with rigorous testing and monitoring to avoid impacts to fish and wildlife. We hope that you find these comments helpful in your EIS process and	The Navy's use of high-energy lasers, kinetic energy weapons, and biodegradable polymer, while new to the NWTT Study Area, have been tested on other Navy ranges and evaluated in previous environmental documents. Their use in the NWTT Study Area has been thoroughly analyzed in this NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS for impacts specific to their use in this environment.

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	welcome any questions regarding our comments. WDFW looks forward to continuing to cooperate with the Navy to ensure protections for Washington's fish and wildlife.	
WDFW-06	Underwater explosions may impact foraging Tufted Puffins, which often forage at the continental shelf break >50 km offshore; see Menza et al. (2016). Tufted Puffin foraging activity during the breeding season overlaps the area where explosive training activity could occur. The report by Menza et al. (https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/9329) provides similar maps for several bird and mammal species. This information should be used when evaluating potential impacts of activities on species of conservation concern. The USFWS is currently evaluating whether or not to list the Puffin under the ESA.	The Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes an analysis of potential impacts to marine birds found in the NWTT Study Area. The Navy has consulted with USFWS on Federally protected species, including diving birds such as the marbled murrelet. The information from Menza et al., 2016 was incorporated into the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As noted above, all but one of the offshore proposed activities using explosives are conducted at least 50 nautical miles (92.6 km) offshore, well outside the shelf break.
WDFW-07	Underwater explosions may impact foraging Tufted Puffins, which often forage >50 km offshore	See previous response.
WDFW-08	"Navy actions were not the sources for any of the identified threats" in the SRKW Task Force report." This statement is incorrect. Recommendation #25 from the Task Force outlining the need to "address the acoustic and physical impacts to Southern Resident orcas from Naval exercises in waters and air of Washington state." Early in the Task Force process several members and the Vessels working group indicated the need for direct engagement with the Navy, which was reinforced in hundreds of public comments on the draft report. "Recommendation 25: Coordinate with the Navy in 2019 to discuss reduction of noise and disturbance affecting Southern Resident orcas from military exercises and Navy aircraft. Implementation details: The governor should meet with the U.S. Navy's Commanding Officer for the region that includes Washington state to address the acoustic and physical impacts to Southern Resident orcas from Naval exercises in waters and air of Washington state. The governor should request the Navy participate on the Vessels working group in Year Two and identify actions to reduce the Navy's impacts to Southern Resident orcas."	The Task Force Final Report did not identify Navy sonar among the major threats. The major threats identified in the report are a lack of prey, disturbance from noise and vessel traffic, and toxic contaminants in the waters they inhabit. The Navy, as acknowledged by the Governor's Task Force in 2018, was not previously requested to participate in the Task Force. The Navy has since been invited to take part and, as a result, a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Task Force's working groups on prey and vessel traffic, to develop solutions to issues pointed out in recommendation #25. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.
WDFW-09	Throughout the EIS, the number of Southern Resident killer whales needs to be updated. There are currently 74 adult individuals and one young of the year (not usually counted until 1 year of age).	There are several sources of abundance numbers for marine mammal species. For consistency, the Navy uses abundance numbers of Southern Resident killer whales (as well as other marine mammal species) provided by NMFS in the most recent Stock Assessment Report. The Navy tracks this species closely and will continue to use the most recent available data.

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
WDFW-10	<p>Omitted from EIS</p> <p><i>Wieland, M, A. Jones, and S. C. P. Renn. 2010. Changing durations of southern resident killer whale 23 (Orcinus orca) discrete calls between two periods spanning 28 years. Mar. Mam. Sci. 26(1): 195-201.</i></p> <p>"The increase of mean durations of discrete calls demonstrated here indicates that the Southern Residents are making a behavioral adjustment as a result of vessel noise. Because they are adjusting their vocal behavior, we must consider the very real possibility that engine noise is hindering their ability to communicate, and may well impact their efficiency at using acoustics to forage and navigate, as well." This should be incorporated into 3.4.2.1.1.4 on masking (which talks about other species but not killer whales)- as well as the odontocete discussion on page 3.4-120.</p> <p><i>Emmons, C.K., M.B. Hanson, and MO. Lammers. 2019. Monitoring the occurrence of Southern resident killer whales, other marine mammals, and anthropogenic sound in the Pacific Northwest. Prepared for: US. Navy, US. Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, HI. Prepared by: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Northwest Fisheries Science Center under MIPR N00070-I 7-MP-4C419. 25 February 2019. 23p.</i></p> <p>There were 148 mid-frequency active sonar events detected between 2011 and 2017, with peak overlapping with occurrence of the three killer whale communities (southern residents, northern residents, and transients). Reasons for concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separation of an orca calf from its group during exposure to mid-frequency sonar playback was observed (Miller et al 2011) (page 125 marine mammal chapter). • Newer high-duty or continuous active sonars have more potential to mask vocalizations, particularly for delphinids and other mid-frequency cetaceans. (pg. 116 marine mammal chapter/pg. 3.4-102). Consequences may include avoidance of the area and interruptions to foraging or other essential behaviors. Longer-term consequences could include potential decrease in recruitment if masking interferes with reproductive activities or mother-calf communication. • Mass strandings of cetaceans have been linked to mid-frequency active sonar activity. (3.4.2.1.1.6) 	<p>The Navy considered the best available science in its analysis of each stressor, including both peer-reviewed articles suggested by the commenter. Additional language has been added to sections on Masking by Vessel Noise (3.4.2.1.1.4) in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as recommended. However, Wieland et al. (2010) does not state that discrete calls exclusively increased duration; rather, of the 16 call types that showed a change in duration, 14 calls were longer and 2 calls (S37i and S19) were shorter. In addition, the authors include possible caveats of the study which should be considered as well (e.g., changing group membership; cultural drift; motorized boats present in nearly all recordings; unable to conclude if the observed change was a result of short-term behavioral plasticity or long-term behavioral adaptation). It should also be noted that there are other articles regarding masking in killer whales (e.g., Williams et al., 2014b; Holt et al., 2008; Holt et al., 2011) discussed in the 3.4.2.1.1.4 section on Masking. The odontocetes section on Behavioral Reaction to Vessel Noise (3.4.2.1.1.5) does not include vocal response to vessel noise, as that is covered in the Masking section. Given the breadth of information covered in this document, the Navy would like to avoid repetition where possible.</p> <p>Emmons et al. (2019) was unavailable at the time of the publication of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and has since been incorporated into the analysis in this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>While it is accurate that Miller et al. (2011) observed a temporary mother-calf separation during a study of killer whales exposed to a sonar, the Navy would not conduct activities in a manner similar to the experiment that resulted in the separation. The researchers purposely approached a killer whale pod, including a known neonate, with an active sonar source near the end of a narrow fjord with limited avoidance pathways and high reverberation. The experimental exposure continued for approximately six minutes after the mother-calf separation. The Navy, on the other hand, would not intentionally approach a pod of killer whales and, in fact, employs a suite of mitigations to avoid impacts to marine mammals. The Navy has worked cooperatively with NMFS to develop an extensive suite of mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts to protected species, such as the Southern Resident killer whale, to the maximum extent practicable, including numerous new mitigation measures developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). Additionally, the use of sonars in portions of the Study Area utilized by Southern Resident killer whales is relatively limited. Based on the best</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>available science, long-term consequences for marine mammal species or stocks, including Southern Resident killer whales, would not be expected from Navy training and testing activities under the Proposed Action.</p> <p>As explained in the Navy's technical report on marine mammal strandings, <i>Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities</i> (2017) available at www.nwtteis.com, marine mammal strandings have been a historic and ongoing occurrence attributed to a variety of causes, both natural and anthropogenic. Over the last 50 years, increased awareness and reporting has led to more information about species affected and raised concerns about anthropogenic sources of stranding. While there have been limited numbers marine mammal mortalities potentially associated with U.S. Navy activities, the root causes are not clear in most cases. In addition, none of the limited number of mass strandings of cetaceans linked to mid-frequency active sonar activity have involved any killer whales. The Navy is committed to protecting marine life by implementing mitigation measures when training or testing using active sonar, working with regulatory agencies, and furthering our understanding of marine mammals through research and monitoring.</p>
WDFW-11	<p>An estimation of two to three behavioral impacts to SRKW per year from sonar and other transducers was cited, however SRKW spend most of their time travelling in larger pods close together. This estimate does not seem realistic. The estimate could be zero if the Navy activity occurs in a time of year in which SRKWs are infrequently found in the area, but much larger if SRKW s are present due to their close proximity to one another. Suggest that the Navy should more closely analyze the time of year for their activities and overlay with the most up to date seasonal and hotspot SR.KW distribution information from NOAA (instead of extrapolating across the year and geography).</p>	<p>Since the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has incorporated new estimates of Southern Resident killer whale densities and distributions in the NWT Offshore Area into the quantitative analysis of impacts. The revised density estimates are shown in the technical report <i>U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area (amended September 20, 2019)</i>, available at www.nwtteis.com. As a result, the Navy has revised the number of behavioral takes of Southern Resident killer whales in Appendix E (Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
WDFW-12	<p>In multiple locations in the EIS, there is discussion about SRKWs shifting their range to forage less in the Salish Sea because of a shift in availability of Chinook salmon.</p> <p>"As a result, foraging during the spring in Salish Sea by Southern Resident killer whales has declined in recent years as they shift their range and forage for Chinook salmon or other prey species elsewhere in response to reduced prey availability in that historically used inland waters foraging area (Shields et al., 2018b). "</p> <p>"The use of the Inland Waters portion of the NWT Study Area by Southern Resident killer whales has declined in recent years as they shift their range and forage for Chinook salmon or other prey species elsewhere and outside</p>	<p>The inclusion of references from Shields et al., 2018 was not included to imply that impacts in the Inland waters would be reduced and/or otherwise avoided because of the species changing presence of SRKW within their summer-core habitat areas, but rather to present best available science on the species current status, including prey availability. This is a critical component of the environmental baseline the Navy then uses to estimate potential impacts resulting from the Navy's activities. We recognize that the Salish Sea remains a critical foraging area for the SRKW, and the Navy is committed to not only carrying protective measures forward from Phase 2, but is also proposing additional mitigations, as described in the Strait of Juan de Fuca and Puget</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	the currently designated critical habitat in response to prey availability (Shields et al., 2018b)." While the SRKW's may have been forced to forage further and differently more recently to meet their nutritional needs, decreasing noise and disturbance to increase access to the prey that is available in the Salish may result in their return to that area. In addition, WDFW and our partners are working to increase prey availability for SRKW's in the Salish sea. Therefore, the recent information on foraging distribution should not be seen as a reason to discontinue the avoidance of impacts to SRKW's in the Salish sea.	Sound Mitigation Area (Appendix K), aimed at further reducing the potential for impact to SRKW within the Inland waters.
WDFW-13	Short-tailed Albatross (STAL) could be directly impacted by ingestion of post-explosive target fragments and debris, chaff, neutralizer and mine fragments, and other expended materials visible at the surface. Any surface or underwater explosions could directly impact foraging STAL by death or injury.	The Navy's analysis of potential impacts to marine birds in general and to the short-tailed albatross in particular are included in Section 3.6.2.6 (Ingestion Stressors) and Section 3.6.2.2 (Explosive Stressors) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. This same analysis was also included in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Regarding the ingestion risk, as the location and level of training and testing proposed is similar to that previously analyzed in the 2015 NWT Final EIS/OEIS, those determinations remain valid; that "based on the dispersed nature of chaff and flare use and the small number of birds that are likely to occur in this area at any given time, it is extremely unlikely that individual albatross would be exposed to ingestion risk." The risk of injury from explosives is analyzed in Section 3.6.2.2.1 (Impacts from Explosives). Also, the Navy consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding its activities on listed species, including the short-tailed albatross. The Navy previously completed consultation with the 2016 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2016, 2018).
WDFW-14	Marbled Murrelets (MAMU) in offshore areas <35 nautical miles from shore (Adams et al. 2014) and in all of Puget Sound operations areas are very likely susceptible to impacts from disturbances caused by high underwater sound pressure levels (barotrauma) from in-water and above-water explosions (especially in the Explosive Ordinance Disposal areas) depending on the locality and distance of the detonation. Underwater explosions will likely result in mortality of some MAMU prey resources and possible disruption of foraging by breeding adults, which could create additional indirect impacts by increased probability of mortality to nestlings by missed feedings (USFWS 2009 and ref. therein). In addition, increased vessel traffic (USFWS 2009) and disturbance by extended helicopter rotor wash over foraging areas could have direct impacts on MAMU foraging activity. Auditory injury impacts to MAMU are expected to occur at Low and Mid Frequency active sonars at decibel levels ≥ 220 dB SEL re: 1 μPa^2 -	Explosive stressors are analyzed for potential impacts to marbled murrelets in Section 3.6.2.2.1 Impacts from Explosives (In-Air and In-Water Explosions). While susceptible to impacts from explosions, marbled murrelets are "rarely encountered at sea > 5-km from shore" (Adams et al. 2014, pp. 32–33), so geographic mitigation implemented for explosives (see Chapter 5, Mitigation) greatly decreases the likelihood that military readiness activities involving explosions will overlap with marbled murrelet presence in the NWT Offshore Area. Within 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, the Navy will not conduct: (1) explosive training activities, (2) explosive testing activities (with the exception of explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing activities), and (3) non-explosive missile training activities. Mine Neutralization – Explosive Ordnance Disposal Training is the only activity involving explosives that would occur in Inland Waters. For this activity, all explosives are positive control (i.e., there is no delay between pre-

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	sec (thresholds: USFWS 2016: Table 18), and high probability of impact to MAMU at close range at active sonar frequencies MF1, MF8, ASW4 in the Puget Sound areas (USFWS 2016:Table 20).	<p>detonation surveys and detonation of explosives), which improves procedural mitigation for birds (see discussion on page 3.6-54 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS).</p> <p>According to Falaxa & Raphael (2016), prey abundance in close proximity to breeding habitat was likely a contributing factor in the decline of the marbled murrelet population (see 3.6-15). Activities in the Inland Waters are analyzed for impacts to marbled murrelet prey resources in Section 3.6.2.5 (Secondary Stressors): “The abundances of fish and invertebrate prey species near the detonation point could be diminished for a short period of time before being repopulated by animals from adjacent waters. Secondary impacts from underwater explosions would be temporary, and no lasting impact on prey availability or the pelagic food web would be expected. Indirect impacts of underwater detonations and explosive ordnance use under the proposed action would not result in a decrease in the quantity or quality of bird populations or habitats, or prey species and habitats, in the Study Area.”</p> <p>Foraging activity may be temporarily disrupted by stressors such as explosives, sonar and other transducers, vessel noise, and aircraft noise, but these disruptions are not expected to result in long-term fitness consequences. For example, instances of murrelets diving under water, coinciding at the time and location of maintenance activities, would be improbable; and birds would have to be located in very close proximity to a sonar source for any auditory injury to occur. Marbled murrelets typically forage very close to shore, and activities involving sonar, explosives, and other stressors typically occur much farther from shore with few exceptions. The Navy reinitiated Section 7 consultation with the USFWS for activities described in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for potential impacts on marbled murrelets. As part of this consultation, the Navy presented the most current information since the publication of the USFWS 2016 BO to estimate potential impacts on the marbled murrelet.</p>
WDFW-15	Rockfishes in Puget Sound generally mate in the fall. Courtship is complex and requires potential mates to first locate one another. Though detailed information about how this occurs is lacking, it is clear that rockfishes utilize sound to communicate with one another both prior to and during courtship. Any Navy activity that increases submarine sound proximate to deep, rocky habitats has the potential to disrupt reproductive activity of ESA-listed rockfishes. At a minimum, monitoring should occur to evaluate changes in sound intensity and temporal frequency in areas of documented Yelloweye and Bocaccio occurrence.	The Navy's analysis of potential impacts to fishes from the use of sonar can be found in Section 3.9.3.1.2 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As depicted in Figure 3.9-5 in that section, the Navy's mid- and high-frequency sonar sources are outside the hearing range (best sensitivity) of rockfishes. While all marine fish species can likely detect low-frequency sonars and other transducers, low frequency active sonar use is rare during proposed training and testing activities and most low-frequency active operations are conducted in deeper waters, usually beyond the continental shelf break.

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		In the 2015 Biological Opinion, NMFS determined that "the activities the Navy plans to conduct annually in the NWTT Action Area would not appreciably reduce the likelihood of ESA-listed rockfish surviving and recovering in the wild."
WDFW-16	The impact of noise and sonar on SRKW s should not be underestimated. Behavior change occurs at much lower received levels in killer whales than other marine mammals and responses to mid-frequency sonar have been observed over 25 miles from the source. Mid-frequency sonar also has the potential to have impacts on wildlife within a 2,000 sq. mi. radius. WDFW encourages the Navy to decrease potential impacts on SRKW by limiting activities to the seasons in which SRKW are the least likely to be present and by ensuring an adequate spatial buffer for SRKWs leaving the Strait of Juan De Fuca and heading south along the coastline to allow sound to attenuate before it reaches the whales.	<p>The Navy is very aware of the plight of the Southern Resident killer whales in the Pacific Northwest. In fact, the Navy plans its activities with consideration given to the possible presence of killer whales. The Navy's current and planned sonar and explosives activities occur largely in areas not frequented by Southern Resident killer whales. In addition, the Navy applies mitigation areas and mitigation measures that directly reduce the likelihood of harm to Southern Resident killer whales. As a result, the Navy anticipates no injuries to Southern Resident killer whales from proposed activities.</p> <p>For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that significantly benefit Southern Residents. The Navy's partnerships with federal, state, and local agencies; tribes; and nongovernmental organizations include restoration of aquatic lands and streams. The Navy participated with the Governor's Southern Resident Killer Whale Task Force working groups in 2019 on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy has been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and their salmon prey species.</p> <p>The Navy developed new marine mammal behavioral response functions in 2016 to help estimate instances of behavioral response. Killer whales are included within the Odontocete behavioral response group, which included observations from several killer whales exposed to mid-frequency sonar. No harm to Southern Resident Killer Whales is anticipated from proposed training and testing activities. Potential impacts to marine mammals from acoustic and explosive sources, which are part of the proposed action, are analyzed in Section 3.4.2.1 and Section 3.4.2.2, respectively. The Navy's acoustic and explosive effects analysis looks at multiple factors such as the southern resident killer whales abundance across the study area in each season, the levels of sound that may cause certain effects, and the Navy's proposed time and space use of noise producing activities.</p> <p>The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		from active sonar on Southern Resident Killer Whales and other marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict certain activities or types of sonar year-round within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area and in the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to help the Navy avoid potential impacts from active sonar on killer whales in important foraging and migration areas. Additional information about the Navy's mitigation areas is presented in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
WDFW-17	The current estimates of marine mammal densities may be underestimated, therefore leading to an underestimation of potential impacts to these species. WDFW requests that the Navy better analyze their potential impacts on marine mammals and SRKW in particular with the most recent available data on distributions and hotspots (not currently in the EIS). In addition, these estimates along with information on timing of Navy activities should be seasonally specific (at least at some level) instead extrapolating across the year.	The Navy remodeled the estimated takes using newly available density information. Please see the U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area Technical Report (Amended September 2019), found on the NWTT project website at: https://www.nwttteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents . Densities, modeling, and activities are all seasonally specific.
WDFW-18	Omitted from EIS In addition to the use of viewing platforms and other measures to detect wildlife before conducting activities, WDFW encourages the Navy to explore using the new whale report alert system for more information on marine mammal movements. This new network includes hydrophones and sightings information network.	The Navy developed new mitigation for Navy biologists to initiate communication with the appropriate marine mammal detection networks in NWTT Inland Waters prior to conducting explosive mine neutralization activities involving the use of Navy divers, Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training, Civilian Port Defense – Homeland Security Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Exercises, and Small Boat Attack Exercises. This mitigation will help the Navy plan activities in a way that minimizes the potential for exposure of Southern Resident killer whales, as described in Section K.3.3 (Mitigation Areas for Marine Species in NWTT Inland Waters). The Navy will also continue to assess the practicality of other available monitoring techniques as technologies advance.
WDFW-19	The Executive Summary the document identifies mitigation areas around live hard bottom, artificial reefs, and shipwrecks where anchoring and use of explosives will not occur. WDFW would like the addition of Marine Preserves, Marine Protected Areas, and other Conservation Areas added to this list.	In NWTT Inland Waters, the Navy's expanded suite of mitigation developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS will help avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine protected area resources located within or along the shoreline of the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area, such as the San Juan Islands Marine Preserve, San Juan Island National Historical Park, San Juan County/Cypress Island Marine Biological Preserve, Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve, Protection Island National Wildlife Refuge, Dungeness National Wildlife Refuge, Zella M. Schultz/Protection Island Seabird Sanctuary, and Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge. For example, the Navy's mitigation requires explosives to be limited to two designated

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>Explosive Ordnance Disposal ranges in NWTT Inland Waters, neither of which overlap marine protected areas.</p> <p>In the NWTT Offshore Area, mitigation within the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area and Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Mitigation Area will also help the Navy avoid or reduce potential impacts from explosives and other Navy activities on marine protected area resources. The Flattery Rocks National Wildlife Refuge, Quillayute Needles National Wildlife Refuge, and Copalis National Wildlife Refuge are located in the nearshore portion of the Study Area that abuts the Washington shoreline, well within 12 NM from shore. Additional information on marine protected areas is presented in Section 6.1.2 (Marine Protected Areas) of this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
WDFW-20	Marine Species Mitigation Areas- The table discusses max number of hours training will occur. Time of year training conducted will greatly influence impact to marine mammals and birds, especially SRKW.	The Navy added additional details on seasonality and day/night requirements of its activities to Appendix A (Navy Activities Descriptions) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy did consider seasonal movements and behaviors of marine species in its effect analysis. The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species either seasonally or year-round in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitats, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
WDFW-21	Omitted from EIS Plastics are mentioned as a potential contaminant associated with ordinance detonation and other activities. The focuses on the harmful chemicals in plastics, but these is also a detrimental effect of filling up gut space with plastic particles. Organisms feel full, but do not gain any nutrients, so their body condition degrades over time. This also results in more risky foraging and other behavioral alterations as organisms seek to satisfy their nutritional needs. A gut full of plastic also occupies space that would otherwise be filled by developing gonads, decreasing reproductive potential. Release of plastics should be avoided at all cost in all environments.	The Navy's analysis did consider the issue described in the comment. Because this Supplemental EIS/OEIS is an update to information provided in the previous 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, information from that 2015 document that is still valid was not necessarily repeated. In Section 3.6.3.3 (Ingestion Stressors) of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, is the following: "As summarized by Pierce et al. (2004) and Azzarello and Van Vleet (1987), documented consequences of plastic ingestion by birds include blockage of the intestines and ulceration of the stomach; reduction in the functional volume of the gizzard, leading to a reduction of digestive capability; and distention of the gizzard, leading to a reduction in hunger."

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Washington Department of Natural Resources		
WDNR-01	<p>From Table ES-1, page ES-10: "The use of sonar and other transducers have the potential to expose marine mammals to sound-producing activities that would present risks to individual marine mammals that could include temporary or permanent hearing threshold shift, auditory masking, physiological stress, or behavioral responses. A small number of minor to moderate behavioral reactions or temporary hearing threshold shifts to an individual animal over the course of a year are unlikely to have any significant costs or long-term consequences for that individual. Considering these factors and the mitigation measures that would be implemented as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), long-term consequences for the species or stocks would not be expected."</p> <p>DNR Response: For populations that are on the brink of collapse, such as the Southern Resident Killer Whales, a small number of minor to moderate behavioral reactions or temporary hearing threshold shifts may indeed have significant costs or long-term consequences. Particularly for species that rely on sonar to feed, the loss of even a few feeding opportunities may be significant.</p>	<p>Although the hearing range of killer whales overlaps with some frequencies used in sonar, sonar use is unlikely to interfere with the whale's ability to locate prey because 1) killer whales are able to distinguish and preferentially attend to sounds with different source locations (i.e., spatial release from masking), and 2) because of the low-duty cycles that are used by most sonars. As stated in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Section 3.4.1.1.4, Masking, subsection entitled "Masking by Sonar and Other Transducers"), masking due to high-duty cycle sonars is likely analogous to masking produced by other continuous sources (e.g., vessel noise), and will likely have similar short-term consequences. These may include changes to vocalization amplitude and frequency and behavioral impacts such as avoidance of the area and interruptions to foraging or other essential behaviors. Long-term consequences (e.g., changes to vocal behavior and vocalization structure, abandonment of habitat if masking occurs frequently enough to significantly impair communication, and a potential decrease in recruitment if masking interferes with reproductive activities or mother-calf communication) are not expected to occur for reasons described in Section 3.4.2.1.2.3 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers Under the Action Alternatives, subsection "Killer Whales").</p>
WDNR-02	<p>From page ES-26: "The use of sonar and other non-impulsive sound sources under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 has the potential to disturb or injure marine mammals and sea turtles. However, the incremental contribution of Alternatives 1 or 2 to cumulative impacts would be negligible."</p> <p>DNR Response: From the Navy's own analysis, the Navy expects to see: 212 behavioral shifts and 22 temporary threshold shifts per year for West Coast Transient Killer Whales 15,363 behavioral shifts, 14,528 temporary threshold shifts, and 153 permanent threshold shifts per year for WA Inland Waters Harbor Porpoise 43,405 behavioral shifts, 27,926 temporary threshold shifts, and 4 permanent threshold shifts per year for harbor seals in and around Puget Sound (WA Northern Inland Waters Harbor Seal, Hood Canal Harbor Seal, Southern Puget Sound Harbor Seal) While these species have seen increasing numbers in recent years, DNR contests the assumption that this level of disturbance would be negligible for these populations.</p>	<p>The excerpt from the Executive Summary referred to the Cumulative Impacts analysis in Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts). Per the reasons described in Section 4.4.4 (Marine Mammals), recognizing the difficulties with measuring trends in marine mammal populations, the focus has been on indicators for adverse impacts, including health and other population metrics (National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine, 2017). This recommended use of population indicators is the approach Navy has presented in the previous environmental analyses of Navy training and testing activities; see in particular the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.4.1 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities) and the update to that information in this Supplemental (Section 3.4.3.4, Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015). Since the 2015 analyses, neither the present nor the reasonably foreseeable actions detailed in Table 4.3-1 change the previous assessment that the Navy's contribution to any cumulative impacts on marine mammal populations would be negligible.</p>
WDNR-03	<p>From page ES-26: "In summary, based on the analysis presented in Sections 3.4 (Marine Mammals), 3.5 (Sea Turtles), 3.6 (Birds), 3.9 (Fishes), and 3.11 (American Indian and Alaska Native Traditional Resources), the current</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>aggregate impacts of past, present, and other reasonably foreseeable future actions are not significantly different than the assessment in the 2015 NWT Final EIS/OEIS. For these resource sections Alternatives 1 or 2 would contribute to and increase cumulative impacts, but the relative contribution would be negligible compared to other non-Navy actions."</p> <p>DNR Response: It is true that other non-Navy actions have contributed and continue to contribute stressors to marine mammals and that each of these sources, when considered in isolation, may appear negligible. However, when taken together, the cumulative impacts of all of these sources are indeed significant. Therefore, we must aspire to reduce the impacts on all fronts, including Navy-related actions.</p>	<p>the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
WDNR-04	<p>From page 3.4-400: "To date, the findings from the research and monitoring and the regulatory conclusions from previous analyses by NMFS in the MMPA authorization (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b) and the NMFS Biological Opinion for the 2015 NWT Final EIS/OEIS (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2014) have been that the majority of impacts from military readiness activities are not expected to have deleterious impacts on the fitness of any individuals or long-term consequences to populations of marine mammals and not likely to jeopardize listed species or destroy or adversely modify critical habitat."</p> <p>DNR Response: With Southern Resident Killer Whale populations on the brink of collapse, and some native salmon populations approaching critical levels, it may only take a small contribution of stressors to result in the irreversible decline of these species. While DNR agrees that there are other non-Navy contributions to this problem, we must seek to reduce these stressors wherever possible.</p>	<p>The Navy is fully aware of the plight of the Southern Resident killer whales. In 2019 a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Governor's Southern Resident Killer Whale Task Force working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales.</p> <p>The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.</p>
WDNR-05	<p>From page 3.4-402: "The majority of the training and testing activities the Navy is proposing for the foreseeable future in the Study Area are similar if not nearly identical to activities that have been occurring in the same locations for decades."</p> <p>DNR Response: Recent decades have also seen substantial decline in the health and fitness of species such as Southern Resident Killer Whales and native salmon. While this is likely due to a number of factors, many of them non-Navy related, DNR does not agree with the assumption that Navy actions over the last few decades have had negligible impact.</p>	<p>As stated in a previous response, there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. The Navy will continue to contribute to marine species monitoring projects to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on, and to implement habitat improvement projects that benefit the Southern Residents. In addition, the Navy will continue to update protective measures related to the important training and testing conducted in the region.</p>
WDNR-06	<p>From page 3.4-404: "It was the Navy's assessment in the 2015 NWT Final EIS/OEIS and that of NMFS as reflected in their analysis of previous Navy training and testing in the Study Area (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2014; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2015b), that it</p>	<p>The Navy agrees that absence of direct evidence does not prove that there is no relationship. The Navy's analysis does not assume that there is no impact on marine mammal populations due to the absence of direct causal links. The</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>was unlikely there would be impacts to populations of marine mammals (such as whales, dolphins, and pinnipeds) having any long-term consequences as a result of the proposed continuation of training and testing in the Study Area. This assessment of likelihood is based on four indicators from areas in the Pacific where Navy training and testing has been ongoing for decades: (1) evidence suggesting or documenting increases in the numbers of marine mammals present, (2) examples of documented presence and site fidelity of species and long-term residence by individual animals of some species, (3) use of training and testing areas for breeding and nursing activities, and (4) 13 years of comprehensive monitoring data indicating a lack of any observable effects to marine mammal populations such as direct mortalities or strandings occurring as a result of Navy training and testing activities. Consistent with the presentation in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, the evidence from Navy range complexes to date and since 2015 continues to suggest the viability of marine mammal populations where Navy trains and tests, and an absence of any direct evidence suggesting Navy training and testing has had or may have any long-term consequences to marine mammal populations."</p> <p>DNR Response: Absence of direct evidence does not prove that there is no relationship. The Navy has stated in its own words that causation is difficult to prove due to the complex nature of these aquatic environments and the species involved; therefore, it would be contradictory to assume that because a direct causal link cannot be proven, that there is no influence on marine mammal populations from Navy actions.</p>	<p>Navy states the absence of any direct evidence as only one of several points that determine its activities are not negatively affecting marine species.</p>
WDNR-07	<p>From page ES-10: "The use of explosive munitions in the water or near the water's surface present a risk to marine mammals located in close proximity to the explosion, because the resulting shock waves can cause injury or result in the death of an animal. If a marine mammal is located farther from an explosion, the impulsive, broadband sounds introduced into the marine environment may cause permanent or temporary hearing threshold shifts, auditory masking, physiological stress, or behavioral responses. Because most estimated impacts from explosions are behavioral responses or temporary hearing threshold shifts, and because the numbers of marine mammals potentially impacted by explosives are small as compared to each species' respective abundance, long-term consequences for the species or stocks would not be expected."</p> <p>DNR Response: The Navy does not expect to see any impacts to Killer Whale populations (Alaska Resident, Eastern North Pacific Offshore,</p>	<p>Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Northern Resident, West Coast Transient, Southern Resident) from explosive activities. However, even a single unexpected event impacting Southern Resident Killer Whales could have long-term consequences for the stock due to their small population size, lack of reproductive success, and other stressors impacting their survival.	
WDNR-08	<p>From page 3-26: "Detonations would typically occur in waters greater than 200 ft. in depth, and greater than 50 NM from shore, with the exception of mine countermeasure and neutralization testing proposed in the Offshore Area, and existing mine warfare areas in Inland Waters (i.e., Crescent Harbor and Hood Canal Explosive Ordnance Disposal Training Ranges). Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors) outlines the procedural mitigation measures for explosive stressors to reduce potential impacts on biological resources."</p> <p>DNR Response: While the bulk of explosive activities are planned to occur in waters that are not typically frequented by Southern Resident Killer Whales, these whales are known to range up and down the coast. Locating explosive activities in waters greater than 200 ft. in depth and greater than 50 NM from shore reduces the likelihood of contact with Southern Residents, but does not eliminate the risk completely.</p>	In consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Navy developed an expanded suite of mitigation to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on Southern Resident killer whales. For example, that Navy developed additional mitigation for explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing in the NWTT Offshore Area and for explosive Mine Neutralization Activities Involving Navy Divers in NWTT Inland Waters, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
WDNR-09	<p>From page K-10: "As a result of the Navy's biological and operational assessments, the Navy will implement mitigation within the mitigation areas detailed in Table K-1 and Table K-2 to avoid or reduce potential impacts on biological or cultural resources under the Proposed Action. Figure K-2 shows the locations of mitigation areas developed for marine species."</p> <p>DNR Response: These areas, and the seasonal restrictions associated with them, are based on historical data. However, changing ocean conditions may be driving whales into new territories, forcing them to change migration patterns, or requiring them to occupy habitats during different times of the year. The Navy's mitigation measures do not describe what, if any, measures will be taken to reduce impacts to whales if they are encountered outside of geographic mitigation areas or outside of historically typical seasons.</p>	As described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy completed an extensive assessment of the Study Area to develop the mitigation areas. The assessment involved an analysis of the best available science, including recent monitoring papers published after development of the Biologically Important Areas. In addition to implementing mitigation within mitigation areas, the Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals wherever and whenever applicable acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors are used in the Study Area, as detailed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation).
WDNR-10	<p>From 5-65: "Table 5.6-1 summarizes the procedural mitigation measures that the Navy will implement under Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 of the Proposed Action."</p> <p>DNR Response: For the majority of activities (10 out of 15), the procedural mitigation measures are limited to 1 lookout and mitigation zones ranging from 100 yards to 2500 yards wherein activities will be ceased or reduced if</p>	The Navy developed procedural mitigation for 14 activity categories. The number of Lookouts specified for each activity in Section 5.3 (Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented) represents the maximum number of Lookouts that can be designated for those activities without requiring additional personnel already assigned to that platform or reassigning duties, which would be impractical due to implications for safety, sustainability, and the

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	certain species are spotted. DNR contests that one lookout is sufficient to adequately identify a marine mammal or sea turtle for the stated mitigation zones. Sufficient lookouts should be posted to provide full visual coverage of mitigation zones. https://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/protected-species/marine-mammals/monitoring-plan-guidance.html .	Navy's ability to meet mission requirements. Regardless of the number of dedicated Lookouts required for explosive activities, if additional platforms are participating in the activity, personnel positioned in those assets (e.g., safety observers, evaluators) will support observing the mitigation zone for applicable biological resources while performing their regular duties. Explosive activities typically involve multiple platforms. For example, during typical explosive missile exercises, two aircraft circle the activity location. One aircraft clears the intended impact location while the other fires, and vice versa. A third aircraft is typically present for safety or proficiency inspections. When available, having these additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting biological resources.
WDNR-11	From page 3.4-104: "Forney et al. (2017) also point out that an apparent lack of response (e.g., no displacement or avoidance of a sound source) may not necessarily mean there is no cost to the individual or population, as some resources or habitats may be of such high value that animals may choose to stay, even when experiencing stress or hearing loss. Forney et al. (2017) recommend considering both the costs of remaining in an area of noise exposure such as TTS, PTS, or masking, which could lead to an increased risk of predation or other threats or a decreased capability to forage, and the costs of displacement, including potential increased risk of vessel strike or bycatch, increased risks of predation or competition for resources, or decreased habitat suitable for foraging, resting, or socializing. DNR Response: Each type of impact is evaluated separately in the SEIS. However, the impacts are not wholly separate but have potential to affect and compound upon each other. For example, hearing loss as a result of noise exposure may increase the risk of vessel strike. These interactions are introduced but not considered when discussing likelihood of impacts to species.	Aggregate impacts are assessed in Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 3.4.3 (Summary of Impacts [combined Impacts of All Stressors]) on Marine Mammals. Predicting cumulative impacts of multiple stressors currently relies on speculation ("hearing loss as a result of noise exposure may increase the risk of vessel strike"), but substantial efforts are underway to better understand possible compounding impacts through data collection. These efforts are not limited solely to long-term monitoring, but also include theoretical approaches and research methods generally accepted in the scientific community such as the Population Consequences of Disturbance model (see Section 3.4.2.1.1.7, Long-Term Consequences). Until there are sufficient data to inform such models, the best assessment of long-term consequences from Navy training and testing activities will be to monitor the populations over time on Navy ranges. The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area or at any Navy Range Complex. In addition, the Navy's research and monitoring programs, described in Section 3.0.1.1.1 (Marine Species Monitoring and Research Programs) in Chapter 3.0 (Introduction), are focused on filling data gaps and obtaining the most up-to-date science to inform impact assessment. Information about prior and current research being conducted on marine mammals on Navy ranges is in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals) and can be found at www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us . To date, the findings from the research and monitoring and regulatory conclusions from recent analyses by NMFS have been that the majority of impacts from military readiness activities are not expected to be deleterious with regard to fitness of any

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		individuals, and long-term consequences to any populations of marine mammals are not expected.
WDNR-12	<p>From page 3.4-381: "These factors and adaptation of additional mitigation measures since 2009 makes the period since 2009 the most appropriate for calculation of future expected strikes; while the Navy does not anticipate vessel strikes to marine mammals within the NWTI Study Area during the proposed activities, Navy vessel strikes in the Study Area for the period between 2009 and 2018 can be used to determine a statistical probability of future Navy vessel strike as a rate parameter of a Poisson distribution. To estimate the probability of 0, 1, 2, 3, ... n vessel strikes involving Navy vessels over the time period considered in this Supplemental, a simple computation can be generated: $P(X) = P(X-1)\mu/X$, where $P(X)$ is the probability of occurrence in a unit of time (or space) and μ is the number of occurrences in a unit of time (or space). For the 10-year period from 2009 through 2018, if μ is based on two strikes over 10 years ($2/10=0.20$) then $\mu = 0.20$. Plugging 0.20 into the $P(0) = e^{-\mu}$ yields a values of $P(0)=0.20$ strikes per year; and estimated probability of 1.40 Navy vessel strikes over a 7-year period in NWTI. As shown in Table 3.4-108, within any given year during the period of time considered in this Supplemental, there is approximately a 25 percent probability that no Navy vessel strikes will occur, a 35 percent chance one strike would occur, a 24 percent chance of two strikes, and an 11 percent chance of three strikes occurring per year."</p> <p>DNR Response: The Navy does not expect a vessel or in-water device strike to occur. However, the probability model indicates that there is a significant chance of a strike. In addition, the Navy states that vessel and in-water device activity will increase under Alternatives 1 and 2 and numbers of marine mammals present has increased. DNR has stated in previous comments that changes in whale behavior and timing have been observed and are expected to continue. The probability model is based on historical data and does not factor in the increased vessel activity, increased marine mammal presence, or changes in marine mammal behavior. DNR does not agree that a strike is unlikely to occur and believes the probability of a strike may be underestimated in the SEIS.</p>	<p>As stated in Section 3.4.2.4.1 (Impacts from Vessels and In-Water Devices), "projected Navy vessel use has not significantly changed over time and is not projected to significantly change under the proposed alternatives." However, based on the analysis presented above, the Navy is seeking authorization for a take to account for the possibility of an accidental strike.</p>
WDNR-13	<p>From page K-12: "Within the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area, the Navy will require units to obtain approval from the appropriate designated Command authority prior to: (1) the use of hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar during training while underway, and (2) conducting ship and submarine active sonar pierside maintenance or testing. Within the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area</p>	<p>As described in Section K.3.3. (Mitigation Areas for Marine Species in NWTI Inland Waters), the Navy developed enhanced mitigation measures in NWTI Inland Waters for Southern Resident killer whales, gray whales, and other marine species for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy's new Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area requirements will result in training and testing activities being conducted in NWTI Inland Waters only</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>for Civilian Port Defense - Homeland Security Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Exercises, Navy event planners will coordinate with Navy biologists during the event planning process. Navy biologists will work with NMFS to determine the likelihood of gray whale and Southern Resident Killer Whale presence in the planned training location. Navy biologists will notify event planners of the likelihood of species presence as they plan specific details of the event (e.g., timing, location, duration). The Navy will ensure environmental awareness of event participants. Environmental awareness will help alert participating ship and aircraft crews to the possible presence of marine mammals in the training location, such as gray whales and Southern Resident Killer Whales."</p> <p>DNR Response: The Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area was established to protect killer whales and gray whales. The Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area only requires additional approval, special event planning, and environmental training measures. Avoidance measures are not identified for situations where NMFS believes gray whale or Southern Resident Killer Whale presence is likely or one of these animals is observed in or near the area. These mitigation measures are already considered procedural mitigation measures for some activities, and the mitigation area does not include seasonal or activity-specific limitations like those provided in other mitigation areas. Mitigation within the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area is a continuation from the 2015 Final EIS and has not been updated. Since 2015, new information has shown that the Southern Resident Killer Whale population is in severe jeopardy and at risk of extinction. At this critical time, even a single unexpected event impacting Southern Resident Killer Whales could have long-term consequences for the stock due to their small population size, lack of reproductive success, and other stressors impacting their survival. The mitigation measures for the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area are not adequate to address the needs of the Southern Resident Killer Whale population at this time.</p>	<p>when necessitated by mission-essential training or testing program requirements. Furthermore, the Navy will implement additional geographic mitigation for activities that are conducted in the mitigation area as applicable, such as seasonal awareness messages, communication with sighting information networks, limitations on the type and location of active sonar and explosive activities, and prohibition of live fire activities. For example, the Navy developed new mitigation for Navy biologists to initiate communication with the appropriate marine mammal detection networks in NWTT Inland Waters prior to conducting explosive mine neutralization activities involving the use of Navy divers, Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training, Civilian Port Defense – Homeland Security Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Exercises, and Small Boat Attack Exercises. This mitigation will help the Navy plan activities in a way that minimizes the potential for exposure of Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy's mitigation as described in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS represents the maximum level of mitigation practical to implement under the Proposed Action, and any further mitigation in NWTT Inland Waters, such as mitigation for aircraft overflights, would be impractical due to implications for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements for the reasons described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).</p>
Washington Governor		
Governor-01	<p>1. Limit the amount of impulsive sound.</p> <p>The physiological effect of impulsive sound to marine life can cause injury, such as ruptured swim bladders and hemorrhaging of other gas-filled organs. I recommend that you seasonally limit training that involves underwater explosions. Doing so reduces any adverse effects during the critical timeframe when fish migration takes place.</p>	<p>The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals, sea turtles, birds, and fish in areas that are particularly important for biological life process, such as feeding, reproduction, and migration. For example, the Navy will restrict all but one type of explosive activity from occurring year-round within 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, which will help the Navy avoid potential impacts from explosives on all species that occur within</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		this expansive swath of water in the NWTT Offshore Area. In the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area within NWTT Inland Waters, the Navy does not conduct explosives except during Mine Neutralization – Explosive Ordnance Disposal Training activities in the Crescent Harbor and Hood Canal explosive ordnance disposal ranges. During these activities, the Navy will implement additional seasonal mitigation to avoid potential impacts on fish. For example, at the Crescent Harbor Explosive Ordnance Disposal Range, the Navy will conduct explosive activities at least 1,000 m from the closest point of land to avoid or reduce impacts on fish (e.g., bull trout and juvenile Chinook salmon) in nearshore habitat areas. At the Hood Canal Explosive Ordnance Disposal Range, the Navy will implement seasonal restrictions on explosive charge sizes to avoid impacts on juvenile and adult Hood Canal summer-run chum and Puget Sound Chinook.
Governor-02	Part of the current plan includes using lookouts on surface vessels and aircraft, as well as an expanded mitigation zone, but only has post-event monitoring of the detonation site when practical. This portion of the mitigation plan should be mandatory to ensure no marine mammals or Endangered Species Act-listed species were injured or killed.	In accordance with 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS consultation requirements, the Navy currently conducts (and will continue to conduct) mandatory post-activity observations after the use of explosive mines. When developing mitigation for the Proposed Action, the Navy determined that it could expand this requirement to other explosive activities for enhanced consistency and to help determine if any resources were injured during explosive events, when practical. It is not practical to require Lookout platforms to remain on station after these additional explosive events in all circumstances. For example, it may be unsafe for aircraft with fuel constraints to remain on station after an event. However, as stated throughout Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors), if additional platforms are supporting an activity (e.g., providing range clearance), those assets will assist in the visual observation of the area where detonations occurred. The Navy will follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during an event, including during the post-activity observations. In addition to the newly enhanced post-explosive observation mitigation, the Navy added a requirement that additional platforms already participating in the activity will support observing explosive mitigation zones before and during the activity while performing their regular duties. There are typically multiple platforms in the vicinity of activities that use explosive sonobuoys (e.g., safety aircraft). When available, having additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting biological resources prior to and during the activity.
Governor-03	2. Decrease sonar exposure at-sea and pier side. Marine mammals can temporarily or permanently lose their hearing when they get exposed to sonar. This exposure also increases their behavioral	As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), the Navy implements procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area.

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>reactions, physiological stress, and masks the sounds they need to hear for communication or hunting. I urge you to reduce exposure time, reduce power settings on sonar, or develop shielding to reduce sonar range during maintenance and testing.</p>	<p>Procedural mitigation involves powering down active sonar source levels or shutting down active sonar if a marine mammal is observed within a specified distance from the sound source. As described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy developed enhanced mitigation measures in NWTT Inland Waters and the NWTT Offshore Area for Southern Resident killer whales, gray whales, and other marine species for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For example, the Navy's new Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area requirements will result in training and testing activities being conducted in NWTT Inland Waters only when necessitated by mission-essential training or testing program requirements. Furthermore, the Navy will implement additional geographic mitigation for activities that are conducted in the mitigation area as applicable, such as seasonal awareness messages, communication with sighting information networks, limitations on the type and location of active sonar and explosive activities, and prohibition of live fire activities. For example, the Navy developed new mitigation for Navy biologists to initiate communication with the appropriate marine mammal detection networks in NWTT Inland Waters prior to conducting explosive mine neutralization activities involving the use of Navy divers, Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training, Civilian Port Defense – Homeland Security Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Exercises, and Small Boat Attack Exercises. This mitigation will help the Navy plan activities in a way that minimizes the potential for exposure of Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy's mitigation as described in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS represents the maximum level of mitigation practical to implement under the Proposed Action, and any further mitigation in NWTT Inland Waters, such as mitigation for aircraft overflights, would be impractical due to implications for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements for the reasons described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).</p> <p>Pierside sonar locations offer a controlled environment most suitable for conducting certain types of active sonar training and testing activities. The locations where pierside sonar activities occur are in areas where Southern Resident killer whales are not known to be present or are extremely rare. Over the past several years, the Navy's ongoing sonar reporting program has gathered classified data regarding the number of hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar hours used to meet antisubmarine warfare requirements. These data allow for a more accurate projection of the number of active sonar hours required to meet anti-submarine warfare training requirements from 2020 into the reasonably foreseeable future. It is not practical to reduce the amount of sonar hours under the Proposed Action because doing so would</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		preclude the Navy from meeting its mission requirements. As described in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar), sonar operators must train to effectively handle bottom bounce and sound passing through changing currents, eddies, and across changes in ocean temperature, pressure, salinity, depth, and in surface ducting conditions. Sonar systems must be tested in these conditions to ensure functionality and accuracy in military mission and combat conditions.
Governor-04	<p>While at-sea sonar affects marine species differently, exposure can result in the inability to communicate within the pod or group, reduce their ability to avoid predators or locate prey, and push marine animals to leave the area for less desirable locations.</p> <p>The mitigation strategy proposed in the SEIS does not sufficiently address this issue. Please consider including the following in the mitigation plan:</p> <p>1.) Establish seasonal limitations on sonar use in certain locations to reduce risk of marine mammals leaving their preferred habitat. This is most apparent with the Southern Resident Killer Whales hunting Chinook salmon off the coast in the spring.</p>	<p>As described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy completed an extensive assessment to develop mitigation areas for the NWT Study Area. The Navy considered the range of Southern Resident Killer Whale habitat in its assessment, including coastal habitat. The Navy developed several mitigation areas that will help further avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals, including Southern Resident Killer Whales, in important habitat areas. The Navy developed a new mitigation measure for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to conduct a maximum combined total of 33 hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar during testing annually within 20 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, the newly developed Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Mitigation Area. The Navy will also restrict certain active sonar activities or sources year-round within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, seasonally within the Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area and Stonewall and Heceta Bank Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, and year-round in the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to avoid potential impacts from active sonar on killer whales, humpback whales, and gray whales in important foraging and migration areas.</p>
Governor-05	<p>2.) Increase the forage fish population for marine mammals. I encourage the United States Navy and the Department of Defense to work with the State's Southern Resident Killer Whale Task Force to improve prey forage stock.</p>	<p>The Navy, as acknowledged by the Governor's Task Force in 2018, was not previously requested to participate in the Task Force. The Navy has since been invited to take part and, as a result, a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Task Force's working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that increase forage fish</p>

Table H-3: Responses to Comments from State and Local Agencies and Elected Officials (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		populations for the Southern Residents. The Navy also monitors for forage fish spawning at its installations.
Governor-06	3. Better understand the effects of testing and training unmanned systems. I am concerned about the rapid increase of unmanned underwater systems and their use in the Puget Sound and the offshore coastline. The proposed activities in the SEIS includes a broad array of activities [sic], including possible use of sonar, lasers, and payload systems. As the Navy tests emerging technology and trains on new systems, it is critical that we understand the implications of this testing and training on our undersea environment. A more thorough analysis of the proposed activities is requested.	<p>The Navy researches, develops, tests, and evaluates new platforms, systems, and their corresponding technologies. The Navy uses different testing methods, including computer simulation and analysis, throughout the development of platforms and systems. During these developmental stages, the Navy better understands how the systems operate and what their effects to the environment may be as they move from concept phase to laboratory tests, systems integrations and testing, confined moon pools, and finally the open-water environment. Navy platforms and systems must undergo at-sea testing at some point in the development process, to be evaluated within the broadest range of operating conditions available (e.g., bathymetry, topography, geography) because Navy personnel must be capable of performing missions within the wide range of operating conditions that exist worldwide. Navy personnel must be assured that platforms and systems will meet performance specifications in the real-world environment in which they will be operated.</p> <p>The Navy thoroughly analyzed potential impacts of the Proposed Action on marine species in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For marine mammals, see Section 3.4.2.4.1 (Impacts from Vessel and In-Water Devices) for the potential of unmanned underwater vehicles to impact marine mammals; Section 3.4.2.1.1 (Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers) for the potential of sonar to impact marine mammals; Section 3.4.2.3.2 (Impacts from High-Energy Lasers) for the potential of high-energy lasers to impact marine mammals. Other resource areas such as fishes or birds had similar analyses conducted. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The Navy developed numerous new mitigation areas for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to further avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine species, including marine mammals, in key areas of importance for foraging, breeding, and migration.</p>

H.1.4 Non-Governmental Organizations

This section contains comments from non-governmental organizations received during the public comment period, and the Navy's response to those comments. Form letters received from non-governmental organizations are found in Section H.1.4.1.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
<i>Citizens of Ebey's Reserve</i>		
COER-1	Concern for marbled murrelet in a letter to the USFWS related to the USFWS Biological Opinion on the Growler EIS.	Thank you for your comments. The Navy consulted with USFWS under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act to address potential impacts to marbled murrelets with implementation of the preferred alternative. During the consultation process, the Navy considered the most current information and data from USFWS, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and other best available science on the marbled murrelet population within the action area.
<i>Connection Earth</i>		
Connection-1	As an animal rights advocate and activist, representing Connection Earth, a 501 3c charitable organization, I cannot strongly enough voice my objection to use of sonar blasting by the US Navy. Whales and dolphins, as well as other oceanic animals are highly impacted by the blasts. They are dependent on their ability to use echo location to hunt, navigate and communicate. The blasts harm and can even kill these sensitive animals that are protected by international law. I have seen, firsthand the devastating effects of said blasts. I also note that these blasts can deafen these animals, and this is tantamount to a death sentence, because it so extremely impacts their ability to hunt, navigate and communicate. A deaf whale is a dead whale. I implore the Navy to stop testing and use of sonic blasting. Thank you. Gina McBride, Executive Board, Connection Earth.	The Navy has conducted active sonar and explosives training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
<i>Cultural Survival</i>		
Cultural-1	<p>Cultural Survival is an Indigenous Peoples’ rights organization based in Cambridge, MA. We support the Sinkyone Council and its member Tribes as they continue in their efforts to oppose the US Navy’s training and testing activities, and demand stronger protections for the ocean and the Tribes’ cultural ways of life.</p> <p>The Navy activities that take place in the Pacific Ocean impact the local environments as well as local Tribes’ ways of life. The Pacific Ocean holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes and is critically important for the wellbeing of all people and lifeforms on this planet. With that in mind, Cultural Survival recommends the following:</p> <p>The US Navy must seek the Free, Prior and Informed Consent of the Cahto Tribe of Laytonville Rancheria, Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians, Hopland Band of Pomo Indians, Pinoleville Pomo Nation, Potter Valley Tribe, Redwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians, Robinson Rancheria of Pomo Indians, Round Valley Indian Tribes, Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians, and Sherwood Valley Rancheria of Pomo Indians, as required by article 19 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which was endorsed by the United States in 2009. The coastal Tribes hold deep level of traditional environmental knowledge passed down from generation to generation which can be used to indicate how the Navy’s activities would impact the wellbeing of the coastal environment. In respect for the environment, human rights, and Indigenous rights, the Navy holds an obligation to integrate the Tribes’ recommendations based on that knowledge.</p> <p>The US Navy should work with the Tribes to develop and implement measures that will minimize impacts to the Tribes’ cultural ways of life, which includes the wellbeing of the environment. The Navy should also plan to monitor the potential effects of training and testing in a way that is sufficiently thorough and holistic. For instance, harmful effects may manifest in forms besides decreased population levels, and the Navy must address the potential effects of an increasingly acidic ocean.</p> <p>We ask the Navy to fulfil its responsibility to ensure the training and testing activities do not impact the wellbeing of the environment and of the Tribal Nations on the Pacific Coast.</p>	<p>The Navy will continue to consult with the Tribes. Through Government-to-Government consultations, the Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.</p> <p>As stated in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the term “traditional resources” is used to encompass protected tribal resources.</p>
<i>Environmental Protection Information Center</i>		
EPIC-01	<p>On behalf of the Environmental Protection Information Center (EPIC), we are submitting this comment letter in solidarity with the ten Tribes that comprise the Inter-Tribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council that have expressed</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>their concerns over the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS (SEIS) for the Navy Northwest Training and Testing (NWT) activities.</p> <p>The cumulative effects of this project, combined with the impacts of the Navy's historic and ongoing operations, will significantly harm the environment and endangered species. The activities currently being proposed would result in significant harm to whales, dolphins, fish and countless other marine animal species including many species, such as Humpback and Sperm Whales, that are listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act.</p>	<p>Area. The Navy thoroughly analyzed potential impacts of the Proposed Action on marine species in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The analysis considered the full range of potential impacts, including behavioral impacts, such as disruption to feeding and breeding, and other types of potential impacts, such as injury or physiological impacts. Based on the analysis in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, impacts are likely to be short-term and temporary in nature. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The Navy developed numerous new mitigation areas for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to further avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine species, including marine mammals, in key areas of importance for foraging, breeding, and migration. For information on cumulative effects, please see Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts).</p>
EPIC-02	<p>These operations will inflict significant harm the environment and sensitive species and is not in the best interest of the global commons, which is in direct violation of Executive Order 12114.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy is in full compliance with Executive Order 12114, which directs federal agencies to provide for informed environmental decision-making for major federal actions outside the United States and its territories. This Supplemental EIS is also an Overseas EIS under EO 12114, which covers analysis of impacts to the area beyond 12 NM (including U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone and any high seas area) within the Study Area.</p>
EPIC-03	<p>Activities like dumping debris on the seafloor, spreading toxic chemicals, detonating explosives, and blasting high intensity mid-frequency sonar will significantly degrade habitat areas, including many sensitive habitat areas that serve for countless species, and that are critical to the health and survival of dozens of marine mammal populations. This is regardless if the area has had previous impacts to it, as maintained in the SEIS, as repeating those impacts will only increase the pressures on the habitat and species that rely on it.</p>	<p>In the course of the Navy proposed activities (listed in Chapter 2 - Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS), which do include the use of sonar and similar sound sources as well as underwater detonations, some expended materials are left behind in the ocean. The potential impacts of these actions was thoroughly analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
EPIC-04	<p>The Navy fails to account for the decades of operations that have negatively affected our oceans, marine mammals, and other species that depend on clean safe waters to survive. The Navy also fails to account for the impact these operations have on the cultural and spiritual ways of the coastal tribes that are inextricably linked to the ocean, the marine species that inhabit it, and the coastline. As well, there lacks any incorporation or input of the Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) from the coastal tribes,</p>	<p>The Navy used the best available science and a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop a robust Cumulative Impacts analysis. See Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy will continue to consult with the Tribes. Through Government-to-Government consultations, the Navy has discussed Traditional Ecological Knowledge and will continue to consider additional tribal and traditional</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	who have stated their opposition to the project due to continued concerns over spiritual, cultural, and environmental impacts.	knowledge (including traditional ecological knowledge) provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality. As stated in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the term “traditional resources” is used to encompass protected tribal resources.
EPIC-05	In conclusion, the SEIS and mitigation measures are severely inadequate and the proposed actions would result in violations of several regulations that are in place to protect the environment and species from these types of harmful activities. All of the actions in the NWTR duplicate operations in other ranges and are therefore unnecessary for “training” purposes. The risk is too large; please rescind the proposed training and testing activities and explore other alternatives to train military personnel that do not put hundreds of thousands of species at risk in the global commons and does not impede the rights of the coastal tribes that have occupied these spaces for millennia.	As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. Please refer to the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) for an explanation of why this location is necessary for Navy training and testing. As stated in Section 2.5.1.1, "The Navy reevaluated the availability of other suitable locations that can support the training and testing requirements in the Pacific Northwest. The Navy determined that the attributes listed in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS are all still required, and that there are no other locations with those attributes."
<i>Friends of the San Juans</i>		
FSJ-1	In addition to comments submitted with other environmental organizations I am writing to address deficiencies in Table 4.3-1: Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions. This table and the Draft Northwest Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement is not inclusive of all the reasonably foreseeable new and expanding terminal and refinery projects whose vessel traffic would transit the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area. Attached please find our June 2019 Salish Sea Vessel Traffic Projections which includes a more comprehensive list of the reasonably foreseeable actions which should be included the cumulative impacts analysis of the Draft Northwest Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement.	Thank you for providing the information in your letter. The Navy has evaluated the information and included those actions that are relevant to the project. As described in Section 4.3 (Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions) in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, if no potential relationship exists such that the affected resource areas of the Proposed Action might interact with the affected resource area of a past, present, or reasonably foreseeable action, the project was not carried forward into the cumulative impacts analysis. In accordance with CEQ guidance, these actions considered but excluded from further cumulative effects analysis are not catalogued here because the intent is to focus the analysis on the meaningful actions relevant to inform decision making.
<i>Lost Coast League</i>		
Lost Coast-01	1.The US spends 6 times more on its military than its nearest competitor, China. With such an overwhelming advantage, why are we developing even more weapons? 2. Vice Admiral Forrest Faison, surgeon general of the Navy, stated recently that the US is entering an “era of great power competition”. What did he mean? Do you think aggressive US foreign policy has anything to do with accelerating the arms race? 3.Propublica examined the collisions of the USS Fitzgerald outside Tokyo	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>harbor and the USS McCain in the Malacca straits, in which a total of 17 sailors were killed. They found that in both cases, the crews were overworked (20 hours a day) and poorly trained and did not know how to run a destroyer.</p> <p>Were these sailors training in the Northwest Testing & Training program? Do you train sailors or just test weapons?</p>	
Lost Coast-02	<p>4.Are you aware that the oceans are being filled with plastic waste material. Fragments of this plastic are found percolating all the way down to the sea floor and inside the bodies of much of sea life. This plastic is lethal to sea and shore life.</p> <p>What does the Navy plan to do about this?</p> <p>5. Are you concerned about the increasing amounts of heavy metals such as tungsten, mercury and chromium as well as lithium that sonobuoys on the ocean floor are releasing into the water? Do you think they are toxic to marine life and humans?</p> <p>6. Do you think that the thousands of tons of fiberglass and other microfiber</p> <p>Used in making flares, which fall into the sea and disintegrate, have any health effect on sea life?</p> <p>7. Do you believe that climate change is a threat to life on earth as we know it?</p> <p>and</p> <p>7a.Are you aware that the US military is the largest single contributor to greenhouse gases in the world except for 34 entire nations?</p> <p>7b.What do you think the Navy should do about this?</p> <p>8. Are you concerned that phytoplankton, which provides the basis of the whole Hierarchy of ocean life, and provides the oxygen for 2 out of every 3 breaths we take, has diminished by 40% since 1950? Are you concerned that climate change, accelerated by the activities of the Navy, might be responsible for this?</p> <p>9. A CEO at Raytheon one of the largest weapons manufacturers, and who sells weapons to the Navy, observed to shareholders that</p> <p>“ expanded business opportunities will arise as a result of security concerns and the possible challenges of climate change”.</p> <p>Do you think this era of “great power competition” described by Admiral Richardson and Admiral Forrest Faison might be driven by the profit interests of powerful armaments production shareholders?</p>	<p>The relevant issues in these comments are addressed in either Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) or Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts).</p>
Lost Coast-03	<p>10.In 2015 the Navy made the following increases from its previous plan: (this is not a complete list):</p>	<p>The level of activities proposed by the Navy include some decreases in addition to some increases. Some activities are proposed to remain the same.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A 778 percent increase in number of torpedoes - A 400 percent increase in air-to-surface missile exercises (including Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary) - A 1,150 percent increase in drone aircraft - A 1,150 percent increase in drone surface vehicles - A 1,450 percent increase in expendable devices - A 72 percent increase in electronic warfare operations - A 50 percent increase in explosive ordnance disposal in Crescent Harbor and Hood Canal - A 244 percent increase in air combat maneuvers (dogfighting) - A 400 percent increase in helicopter tracking exercises - A 3- 500 percent increase in number of sonobuoys <p>from none to 284 sonar testing events in inland waters An 11 fold increase in “takes”: 9.6 million instances of loss of hearing of marine mammals and behavior disturbances and up to 100 deaths. What is the level of increase anticipated for the next 5 year period? 11. The US spends the greater proportion of its discretionary budget on its military. Meanwhile our infrastructure is falling apart. In this context, do you think this military allocation fails our country’s defense needs? 12. The US military’s greenhouse gas emissions are not included in carbon emissions calculations by the UN Committee on Climate Change. What is your understanding of the rationale for this omission, which concerns the largest single contributor to world greenhouse gas emissions? 13. Recently a Russian destroyer and a US guided missile cruiser nearly collided in either the Philippine Sea or the South China Sea, the news was unclear. Is this the result of these respective militaries playing the exciting game of cat-and-mouse with a competitor, or the overtiredness and lack of training we saw with the Fitzgerald and the McCain? In either case, do you think the Navy is taking the survival of those they purport to defend too lightly? What is your rationale for the 7th fleet to be behaving in a provocative manner with military games and exercises close to the territorial waters of a number of Asian countries who would like to see the US withdraw from its bases there and cease its interference with their affairs? The ocean has become more acid every year, making it increasingly impossible for sea life to exist. The oceans are dying. Would it not be a better defense of our country, instead of testing ever more powerful weapons and burning ever larger quantities of fossil fuels,</p>	<p>The overall level of training and testing would not be noticeably changed from existing levels. See Chapter 2 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for details on the proposed activities. The estimated marine mammal and sea turtle impacts from exposure to acoustic and explosive stressors under proposed Navy training and testing activities are included in Appendix E of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>to try to reverse climate change and clean up the oceans? Our preferred action alternative therefore is to expeditiously decrease the size of the Navy and of the Armed Services in general, to abandon the chimera of Full Spectrum Dominance, and to engage in treaties and armament reduction plans with other countries. This should be combined with a serious effort, employing the entire power of the US Navy which is uniquely situated to perform this task, to avoid planetary catastrophe by reversing climate change and creating a healthful climate for all the peoples of the world whose lives are at grave risk. We would be grateful for a response to the questions contained in our comment letter.</p>	
Meadow Farm Community Land Trust		
Meadow Farm-1	<p>People want to stop the killing of our marine mammals and all of our now so fragile ecosystem. Every individual in every corporation and government department need to act on their conscious and learn the consequences of what their actions are doing that promotes the decline of human habitat. This is the time to stop promoting the war industry and begin to pour our resources into saving ourselves, our families, our communities and the environment that supports us all. We need to wake up and see how “business as usual” is not working for us. Please deeply consider every consequence of your actions. Our farm is trying to help with our remote area’s food security, sequester Carbon, lessen our need for fossil fuels, give a place for farmers to afford living and prepare for the disasters that will come. We have so little money to do this with and yet see money pouring into industries that are pulling us all down. Let bring some balance to this scenario..together.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy’s ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy’s Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research’s Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy’s project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
National Parks Conservation Association, June 12, 2019		
NPCA-01	<p>The Navy’s DSEIS violates NEPA because it articulates an unduly narrow scope, fails to adequately consider noise impacts, fails to consider impacts on environmental justice communities, fails to properly define the purpose and need of the project and fails to adequately consider a reasonable range of alternatives, including alternatives that would limit or mitigate adverse impacts to the Park, fails to properly evaluate and disclose impacts to recreational and scenic values, fails to adequately consider impacts to wildlife in the Olympic Peninsula, and fails to properly consider the</p>	<p>The Navy has taken the necessary hard look at the potential environmental impacts of its proposed training and testing activities. Specific comments on this issue are responded to below.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	cumulative effects of the Navy's activities. These inadequacies make it impossible for Navy to have taken the necessary "hard look" at its training and testing activities' environmental consequences.	
NPCA-02	<p>Here, the Navy's DSEIS fails to properly identify the scope of its environmental impacts. The very first page of the DSEIS limits the scope of the analysis to the "study area" which it repeatedly discusses in the context of activities "conducted at sea." Only by referencing Figure 1.1-1 can someone understand that, despite these repeated "at sea" references, the Study Area in fact includes large areas of land within its Military Operations Areas (MOAs). Only much later in the DSEIS, in Figure 3.12-10, do we learn that these MOAs also include a large part, over 25%, of Olympic National Park. However, another map, in another part of the DSEIS, Figure 2.3-1, shows that the Navy's activities actually impact far more than just those parts of the Park in the MOAs. The Navy jet transit routes used to access the MOAs require the Navy jets to fly over much larger sections of the Park where they also cause direct, indirect and cumulative impacts. Unfortunately, the analysis undertaken by the Navy only assesses impacts resulting from its training and testing activities within the MOAs and Warning Areas. The Navy provides no explanation for this arbitrary limitation on the scope of its analysis and fails to acknowledge that the Navy jets operating in the MOAs do not just magically appear in that area. They fly over the Park to get to the MOAs, and they make a lot of unnatural noise, directly, and adversely impacting the Park and its visitors when they do so. This limitation is one of the many reasons why the DSEIS is inadequate, because it leads to the Navy's failure to fully consider its impacts on the entire Olympic National Park generally and recreation within the Park specifically, as well as hinders its cumulative impact analysis.</p>	<p>The Navy properly identified the scope of its environmental impacts in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As stated throughout this document, this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS supplements the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS. As stated in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Study Area (depicted in Figure 2.2-1) is the same as analyzed in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS. The 2015 document is clear that the Offshore Area includes the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA). The Supplemental EIS/OEIS description in Chapter 2 includes a reference to a figure that shows the Olympic MOA within the Study Area. The MOA is specifically mentioned on p. 2-2 to alert the reader to a designation change made to the MOA by the FAA. Throughout Chapter 2, the Olympic MOA is mentioned over a dozen times, in addition to including it as the location for two proposed activities in Table 2.5-1. The 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS (as does this Supplemental EIS/OEIS) also includes an airspace noise analysis (Appendix J) that clearly shows the relationship of the Olympic MOA to the Olympic National Park. In this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has expanded the analysis of impacts of aircraft overflights to include transits to and from the Olympic MOA. For more information about the analysis of transits, please see Section J.6.2 (Transit to/from the Olympic MOA) in Appendix J of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
NPCA-03	<p>During transits to and from the MOA, Park visitors and wildlife are directly impacted by the deafening noise of the Growler jets passing nearby. In the National Park Services' ("NPS" or "Service") Acoustic Monitoring study within the Park, in areas outside of the MOAs—Hurricane Ridge and Lake Crescent—"other aircraft sounds," meaning military jets, were heard more frequently than in areas within the MOAs; military jets were heard 8.3% and 7.2% of the time at Hurricane Ridge and Lake Crescent, respectively. Further, numerous Park visitors, including NPCA members, visit areas of the Park outside the MOAs and witness and/or hear Growler jets overhead, resulting in complaints and impacts to their park experience. The Olympic National Park is one of the most visited National Parks, with nearly 3</p>	<p>It is incorrect to assume that "other aircraft sounds" means "military jets." The National Park Service study states that "other aircraft sounds" equates to "high altitude jets." The airspace over the Olympic National Park is frequently used by commercial jet aircraft which is likely a significant source of those sounds. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. Visitation data to the park</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	million annual visitors. Importantly, a number of visitors seek to visit the Park to enjoy its serene natural soundscape; in fact, the Park's Hoh Rainforest is known for containing the "quietest one square inch in the United States." Thus, it is very likely that visitors who seek to experience the Park's tranquil natural sounds will be negatively impacted by the Navy's increased use of Growler jets. By limiting the scope of the DSEIS to the MOAs, the Navy improperly eliminated the entire Park from its analysis, as well as the impacts the Growlers may have on the Park's recreational visitors and wildlife.	does not suggest that the aircraft overflights are impacting tourism, with steady growth over 4 of the last 5 years of data (2013-2018).
NPCA-04	<p>An agency is required to perform an environmental analysis when it is reasonably possible to analyze the environmental consequences. There is no basis for the Navy to exclude the entire Park from its environmental analysis. In the NPS's 2017 Scoping Comments for this DSEIS, the Service explicitly stated it receives complaints from visitors about "low flying military aircrafts within the wilderness areas but outside of the Olympic MOA." The Navy knows its transit routes are directly over the Park and that people are being negatively impacted by the Growler traffic, yet it failed, without explanation, to analyze these impacts.</p> <p>Further, as discussed in detail above, the Navy's decision to narrow the scope of this DSEIS to only its training and testing activities within the MOAs and Warning Areas improperly segments the NEPA analysis. The Navy has been conducting activities, including both aircraft and vessel training, in the Pacific Northwest and Olympic Peninsula for decades. Despite its long and impending presence in the area, the Navy has continually failed to conduct a programmatic NEPA review to cumulatively assess the environmental impacts of all of its activities.</p> <p>The Navy's analysis of impacts within only the MOAs and Warning Areas unduly narrowed the scope of the DSEIS, which caused the Navy to fail to adequately consider the environmental impacts of the its activities. Thus, the DSEIS fails to comply with NEPA.</p>	<p>As stated above (see response to NPCA-02), the Navy did analyze aircraft transits to and from the Olympic MOA in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and this Supplemental EIS/OEIS complies with requirements of NEPA. It is important to note that Navy aircraft on these transit routes would be at a minimum altitude of 10,000 ft. Low-flying military aircraft outside the Olympic MOA would not be associated with Navy aircraft transiting to and from the Olympic MOA.</p> <p>The Navy has taken a hard look at the cumulative effects of the incremental impact of its proposed actions when added to other past, present, and future actions, against the appropriate resources and regulatory baselines. The Navy used the best available science and a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop its Cumulative Impacts analysis. As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis is commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific EIS discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental consequences). The EIS/OEIS considered its activities alongside other actions in the region, including other Navy actions, when those impacts are cumulatively significant. Past and present actions are also included in the analytical process as part of the affected environment baseline conditions presented in Chapter 3. The Navy has done so in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality 1997 guidance. Per the guidance, a qualitative approach and best professional judgment are appropriate where precise measurements are not available. Where precise measurements and/or methodologies were available they were used. Guidance from the Council on Environmental Quality states it "is not practical to analyze cumulative effects of an action on the universe; the list of environmental effects must focus on those that are truly meaningful."</p>
NPCA-05	The Draft SEIS Fails to Adequately Consider Impacts Relating to the Noise Emitted by the Navy's Aircraft Activities, particularly to the Olympic National Park.	The Navy completed a full analysis of impacts associated with its proposed activities. Where graphics and figures were helpful, they were included in the analysis. Some figures requested by this commenter are not helpful when

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	As the DSEIS states, “[n]oise is one of the most prominent environmental issues associated with military training activities.” Therefore, NPCA is greatly concerned by the Navy’s failure to both properly assess the noise impacts associated with the proposed action and to include relevant and commonplace figures illustrating noise impacts. Such illustrations would allow public comprehension of the impacts of the proposed action as required by NEPA. The DSEIS almost exclusively analyzes noise impacts to marine species. While we believe these impacts are important, the absence of further noise analysis regarding the acoustic effects of the proposed action on the terrestrial environment, especially impacts to Olympic National Park and its visitors is a serious flaw and illegal under NEPA. NPCA is further astounded by the vast discrepancies between the DSEIS and the Whidbey Island FEIS which was published less than a year ago. In order to comply with NEPA, the final SEIS must include a rigorous and factually accurate analysis of the noise impacts associated with Navy’s military training to the MOAs and the surrounding area particularly all of Olympic National Park.	conducting a noise analysis of special use airspace, which is vastly different from analyzing predictable, repeatable aircraft tracks as was the case in the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS referenced in the comment. It would be a mistake to attempt to compare the two documents. As will be described in later comment responses, the noise model used in this NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS is the best and most appropriate model to evaluate noise impacts in special use airspace, such as the Olympic MOA.
NPCA-06	The DSEIS Noise Modeling and analysis is scientifically and technically flawed. Because the DSEIS relies heavily on noise modeling to predict the impacts of its Navy jets, NPCA asked Les Blomberg, a noise pollution expert and Executive Director of the Noise Pollution Clearinghouse, to review that modeling and other relevant parts of the DSEIS. Mr. Blomberg found serious scientific and technical defects and omissions in that analysis as is outlined in his attached comment. Perhaps more importantly, Mr. Blomberg explains that he was unable to conduct a more comprehensive evaluation of the Navy’s noise modeling because the Navy failed to provide the public with the underlying data and other necessary information. Les Blomberg created a report detailing the inadequacy of the DSEIS’ acoustic analysis. His twenty page report concluded that the DSEIS is “not a serious or hard look at the impacts of military aircraft overflights on Olympic National Park” due to seven distinct reasons. First, the sound analysis within the DSEIS is incomplete due primarily to a failure to assess impacts to Olympic National Park. A particularly egregious error is the complete absence of noise maps, a commonplace tool used to assess auditory impacts, within the document. This absence serves to “obscure the noise impacts of aircraft in Olympic National Park.” Second, the document’s transit analysis is “fatally flawed” because it again fails to assess impacts to Olympic National Park and is otherwise highly disjointed.	Please see the responses to the Noise Pollution Clearinghouse comments.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Third, the DSEIS does not properly assess cumulative impacts of noise regarding these transit routes. Fourth, the DSEIS does not include vital acoustic monitoring or “actual noise measurements.” Fifth, the noise metrics employed by the DSEIS are not well-suited to assess auditory impacts, particularly those to Olympic National Park. Sixth, the DSEIS does not include “two very obvious alternatives” which would minimize auditory impacts to the national park. Seventh and finally, the document misrepresents data from a 2010 NPS sound report on Olympic National Park which is relied on heavily throughout the DSEIS.	
NPCA-07	The DSEIS fails to adequately consider the importance of Olympic National Park’s natural soundscape. As initially stated in our scoping comments, NPCA again requests that the Navy account for this public value through comprehensive analysis, including on-the-ground noise monitoring, to provide accurate scientific information as required by NEPA. Federal regulations require that the “[u]nique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas” must be considered when evaluating the intensity of an action.	The NWT Supplemental EIS/OEIS adequately considered the importance of the natural soundscape of the Olympic National Park as well as the Olympic peninsula. The Navy conducted a comprehensive noise study (See Appendix J -Airspace Noise Analysis for the Olympic Military Operations Area), for the express purpose of analyzing the impacts of proposed activities on the soundscape of the affected area. The analysis in Appendix J was used to analyze impacts in resource areas such as public health and safety, socioeconomic resources, cultural resources, and birds. On the ground noise monitoring as suggested by the comment has been conducted, but has limited value. It can provide information gathered at the selected site(s) for historical purposes, but has no value as a predictive tool. For that, the Navy used the noise model that is the standard for use in special use airspace, such as the Olympic MOA. As stated in Appendix J, "In this analysis, noise from aircraft training activities within the Olympic MOA was assessed using noise metrics recommended by the Department of Defense (DoD), the Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN), ANSI [American National Standards Institute], and the FAA [Federal Aviation Administration]."
NPCA-08	The DSEIS does not include an adequate analysis of noise impacts to residents and visitors of the Olympic Peninsula. Since the Navy’s transition from Northrup Gunman EA-6B “Prowler” jets to Boeing EA-186 “Growler” jets, residents and visitors of Olympic National Park and its surrounding area have reported increased incidents of noise disturbances. The noise pollution associated with the Navy’s military training disrupts these individuals’ daily activities and occasionally the “groaning and shrieking” sounds associated with the jets wakes individuals in the middle of the night. If the number of military training flights increases as proposed in the DSEIS, these noise disturbance events will be more frequent and felt more prevalently in day-to-day life. In addition to the impacts to wildlife as discussed below, NPCA believes the DSEIS did not properly account for noise impacts to human life.	The full sentence from the analysis of impacts to socioeconomic resources that the comment failed to capture is, "In general, airborne acoustics from aircraft overflights only generate an acoustic disturbance at the moment it is heard, and noise from an overflight disturbance would only accumulate for the duration of a specific event." This sentence was followed with several pages of analysis, including examples of various noise levels that people on the Olympic peninsula could be exposed to. There was never a limit to the analysis to "offshore tourism" as stated in the comment. The Olympic MOA is in a portion of the Study Area identified in the document as part of the "Offshore Area" due to its relationship to the nearby Warning Areas that lie completely off the coast of Washington.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	The DSEIS states that acoustic disturbances related to military activity noise will be limited to the exact “moment it is heard” and would not cause a significant impact on offshore tourism as a socioeconomic resource, while ignoring the clear adverse impacts to “onshore” tourism in the Park. This is simply untrue for two distinct reasons. First, the noise pollution associated with military jets is more than a simple auditory sensation. These auditory disturbances have negatively impacted individuals’ daily activities, volunteer and professional pursuits, and tourism opportunities in the area. Second, the actual auditory sensation associated with the Growler jets lasts far longer than a “moment.” Visitor testimonials cite these noise disturbances as exceeding multiple minutes in duration.	The Navy conducted an adequate analysis of noise impacts to residents and visitors of the Olympic peninsula. As stated previously, the Navy is proposing to increase aircraft flights in the Olympic MOA by approximately 300 flights per year, or about 1 additional flight per day. Different individuals will respond differently to the same sounds. What is loud and an annoyance to one person will not be noticed by another. As stated in Appendix J, “In general, scientific studies and social surveys have found a high correlation between the percentages of groups of people highly annoyed and the level of average noise exposure measured in DNL [Day Night Average Sound Level] (Schultz, 1974; Fidell et al., 1991; Finegold et al., 1994).” Therefore, the Navy based much of its analysis on the DNL levels that support a conclusion of negligible impact on socioeconomic resources. In addition to the DNL analysis, the Navy also provided maximum noise level (Lmax) to further consider potential impacts of the temporary effect of individual flyover events. All of this information and analysis is spelled out in Appendix J and in the various resource sections that considered the results of the Noise Study.
NPCA-09	Noise pollution associated with Growler jets impacts both residents and tourists to Olympic National Park and the surrounding area. [T]he DSEIS states that the noise will not greatly impact tourism: “The disturbance from a single aircraft transiting over land or nearshore areas to conduct a training or testing activity in the Offshore Area would...have no lasting impact on socioeconomic resources.” This is blatantly false. Multiple individuals state that the noise pollution associated with military training created such a large disturbance to their trips to the Olympic National Park and its surrounding areas that they do not plan on returning. The noise pollution associated with the Growlers makes tourists feel unsafe in the national park. This greatly inhibits their recreational experience, as discussed in Section II(e), and may further negatively impact their desire to return to the national park and its surrounding area. From these testimonials, it is clear that the Navy’s military training over Olympic National Park already has a profound impact on tourism in the area. An increased number of overhead flights, as proposed by the DSEIS, will inevitably exacerbate the negative impacts on tourists listed above and lead to fewer tourists utilizing the natural spaces in the area, including the national park.	While it is possible that the sound levels experienced beneath the Olympic MOA could have negative impacts to some individuals, as referenced anecdotally in the comment, the facts about the history and use of this airspace as described above (see NPCA-01 and NPCA-04), and the analysis included in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS point to a conclusion that the proposed increase in activities would have a negligible impact on the vast majority people living near or visiting the Olympic National Park and surrounding areas.
NPCA-10	The noise pollution associated with Growler jets lasts far longer than a “moment.” The DSEIS states that disturbances from overhead aircraft in the Offshore area would be limited to the “moment it is heard” and would “be brief	The Navy’s analysis is an accurate description that does not downplay the effects of aircraft overflights. While an aircraft may be audible for a longer period of time during an overflight, as referenced in the comment, the louder levels of sound that are more likely to result in a disturbance would be much

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>(seconds).” The recent experiences of tourists and residents to the area, clearly contradict these statements. As discussed below, the noise pollution associated with the Navy’s aircraft inhibits individuals’ ability to participate in professional and volunteer settings as the growling noise deafens the surrounding area. Recent visitors to the Olympic National Park reaffirm these sentiments:</p> <p>The Navy’s attempt to downplay the deafening noise pollution associated with military overflights as lasting mere seconds is absurd on its face and not supported by any documentation. As demonstrated above, these “momentary” interruptions occur multiple times a day and last minutes each.</p>	<p>brief, typically a few seconds. However, the entire duration of noise generated from all Navy aircraft was considered in the analysis. Higher altitude aircraft can be heard over greater distances, resulting in longer periods when they are audible; but at the same time these higher altitude aircraft would have lower peak noise levels.</p>
NPCA-11	<p>The final SEIS should include acoustic monitoring to portray the most accurate data available.</p> <p>The DSEIS fails to include updated acoustic monitoring and instead relies on a 2010 report from the National Park Service. This NPS report is significantly outdated and should not be relied upon to establish a baseline acoustic level within the MOAs. Recent more accurate research by Lauren Kuehne, a research scientist at the University of Washington, demonstrates the “feasibility and utility of on-the-ground monitoring.” Additionally, Kuehne’s research disputes many of the facts stated in the DSEIS. These factual discrepancies underscore the importance of including acoustic monitoring in the final SEIS in order to provide an accurate assessment of the effects of the proposed action as required by NEPA.</p> <p>These noise measurements are “critical to determining the existing baseline (soundscape) as well as to confirm and modify noise modeling assumptions.” Furthermore, the very fact that the Navy relied on data from the 2010 NPS Report suggests that the agency believes noise monitoring is relevant to the analysis of the proposed action. There is no justification for the Navy not undertaking such monitoring to create an updated acoustic baseline for analysis within the DSEIS.</p>	<p>DoD’s position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD’s position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>While noise modeling remains the appropriate method of analyzing aircraft noise effects from the use of special use airspace, the Navy has been directed by the FY 2020 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) to conduct sound-</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>monitoring at two west-coast naval air installations and their associated outlying landing fields on the west coast of the United States where Navy combat aircraft are based and operate, and noise contours have been developed through noise modeling. The NDAA has directed this sound monitoring in order to provide Congress with a report on the accuracy of the Navy's sound modeling. The following two installations were selected: NAS Whidbey Island, Washington (Ault Field and Outlying Landing Field Coupeville) and NAS Lemoore, California. The NDAA requires consideration of adjacent public lands, and as a result the Navy will conduct noise monitoring at one location on Olympic National Park land which lies beneath the Olympic MOA. Although noise contours were not developed for training in the Olympic MOA due to the random nature of training flights, noise modeling was performed as part of the SEIS/OEIS process (see Appendix J). As directed by the NDAA, the results of the 12-month sound monitoring project and the required report to Congress will be publicly available.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
NPCA-12	<p>Kuehne's report established that military aircraft are "dominant contributor[s] to the soundscape of the Olympic Peninsula, representing 85% of the total time aircraft are audible." Across the sampling days, military noise pollution was audible an average of 6-17% during the daylight hours. This time period routinely approached 20%, or a total of 1 hour and 36 minutes, of daylight hours. As discussed above, these impacts are deafening. Many individuals cannot adequately perform in professional capacities during noise disturbance occasions. Therefore, the time lost to noise pollution may severely hinder the productivity of those in the nearby area.</p> <p>Furthermore, individual locations can expect to receive 80-100 military noise disturbance events in a single day. With numbers such as these, it is highly unlikely that any visitors to the Olympic National Park "may not register [noise disturbance] event[s]."</p>	<p>The noise impacts are not deafening as stated in the comment, and are not near a level that could cause hearing damage. The Navy is aware that aircraft noise can disturb some park visitors; however, military aircraft flights have coexisted for decades with the Olympic National Park, and visits to the park have been increasing, not decreasing.</p>
NPCA-13	<p>NPCA is not alone in our request for updated noise monitoring. In addition to private entities, many federal agencies, including the U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service ("NPS"), requested that the Navy include this vital scientific analysis throughout the NEPA Process. In previous phases of the NEPA procedure, the Navy failed to comply with these requests due to</p>	<p>Please see response to NPCA-11.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>flawed and inaccurate rationale.</p> <p>In an October 5, 2017 letter to the Navy regarding the Notice of Intent to produce an SEIS, the National Park Service requested that the DSEIS include “baseline ambient acoustic data in the Olympic NP” and then continue to collect data via soundscape monitoring within both the MOAs and Olympic National Park for two years. NPS claimed that this data was necessary “to ensure that noise from increased military overflights does not have an appreciable effect on the natural sounds, wilderness character, visitor experience, and on federally-threatened species within Olympic NP.” The agency suggested that the two agencies, NPS and the Navy, consult and review the subsequent monitoring data “to address impacts to these important soundscapes and other resources within affected NPS units.” As discussed above, the Navy did not heed this request and instead chose not to pursue any noise monitoring within Olympic National Park and therefore failed to establish a factually accurate acoustic baseline of the area for analysis purposes.</p>	
NPCA-14	<p>Further, during the Special Use Permit application process, the Forest Service requested “that the Navy fund a noise monitoring effort related to aircraft noise in the Olympic National Forest.” Also during this application process the Forest Service requested information from the Navy regarding noise monitoring that was “currently underway” or would be completed in the future, the Navy responded that the agency did not plan on completing noise monitoring due to the previous NPS report and “significant limitations and difficulties with noise monitoring in an area like the Olympic NP.” The Navy further stated that it would be “very difficult” to differentiate military aircraft from other types of flights, including commercial and general aviation, as well as from other types of noise. As demonstrated by Lauren Kuehne’s research, this is simply false. Kuehne was able to establish that 85% of flights in the area of a total of 4,644 were classified as military operations. The audio samplings used for the report were processed using “widely available software.” The Navy’s explanation as to why it neither conducted monitoring studies nor planned to monitor the area in the future, is therefore robustly false and without merit.</p>	<p>In its analysis for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy used the noise model that is most appropriate for special use airspace as described in Appendix J and above in response to NPCA-11. It is also worth noting that Ms. Kuehne’s research claimed that they could distinguish military from non-military flights; there was nothing in the research that validated that claim. The Navy stands by the statement that it would be difficult to differentiate military aircraft from commercial or general aviation aircraft.</p>
NPCA-15	<p>Due to these clear examples of noise impacts reaching beyond the MOAs and Warning Areas, the Navy must broaden the scope of their environmental analysis. In a new DSEIS, noise monitoring must be included to ensure accurate discussion of environmental consequences of the proposed action. Additionally, this analysis must include the entirety of</p>	<p>The analysis of noise impacts in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS included impacts from all of its activities, wherever those impacts occurred, and was not limited to the MOA and Warning Area.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Olympic National Park to encapsulate all of the areas potentially affected by the Navy's increased military training.	
NPCA-16	<p>The DSEIS Fails to Consider Public Health Implications Associated with Growler Jet Noise Pollution</p> <p>The DSEIS does not include an analysis of any of these effects on local residents or visiting tourists. The DSEIS instead states that "increases in noise levels from the baseline would...not have a noticeable impact on public health and safety." As discussed above, the mental health of residents is already impacted by Growler flights overhead through increased stress levels and negative emotions. The DSEIS includes no mention of these well-documented and thoroughly studied public health implications of military noise pollution. The DSEIS therefore fails to comply with the NEPA requirement that public health implications of a proposed action are adequately assessed and disclosed.</p>	<p>The analysis of impacts of aircraft noise on public health was included in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) in both the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS and this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Based on the predicted maximum noise levels and cumulative noise levels, the conclusion that changes to impacts to public health and safety would not be noticeable are correct.</p>
NPCA-17	<p>The DSEIS Fails to Include Noise Contour Maps</p> <p>Further underscoring the legal insufficiency of both the DSEIS and the 2015 final EIS, neither document included noise contour maps of the data modeling the Navy completed. Noise contour maps "are generated by a computer model that draws from a library of actual aircraft noise measurements. Noise contours produced by the model allow a comparison of existing conditions and proposed changes or alternative actions that do not currently exist or operate at the installation." Les Blomberg, a noise pollution expert and Executive Director of the Noise Pollution Clearinghouse, describes the following: "Noise maps allow experts and the public to visualize, through color coded contour lines, the noise levels at various locations. They provide the noise footprint of the proposed action. Since people can't hear the noise at each location while reading the DEIS, noise maps are an invaluable evaluation tool, providing both the noise level and the location of resources of concern." The primary purposes of NEPA is "to insure that environmental information is available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken." There is no justification for the DSEIS not including such illustrations as a means by which to provide data regarding the impacts of the proposed action that can be easily comprehended by the public.</p> <p>Noise contour maps are commonplace for NEPA documents that assess the noise impacts of a proposed action. Many military agencies include these illustrations in their environmental impact statements. In fact, many environmental assessments (a less detailed NEPA document) include noise contour maps.</p>	<p>Noise contour maps are not applicable to the noise modeling conducted in the Olympic MOA. Any noise contour map produced based on the results of modeling would simply be a reflection of the terrain elevation and would not be useful.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The Whidbey Island FEIS was published in September of 2018. The focus of the Whidbey Island FEIS was Naval operations at Whidbey Island Complex. As part of the environmental consequences analysis, the Navy included upwards of 24 noise contour maps. The DSEIS, also produced by the Navy, was released in March of 2019 and includes none of these illustrations. Why would the Department of the Navy include noise contour maps for one area of military training operations and exclude the same, necessary illustrations for another-closely related and affiliated area? There is no reasonable explanation or legal justification for the discrepancy between these two documents. The segmentation of the Navy's operations, as discussed in Section IV, further exacerbates this problem.</p> <p>At a minimum, the Navy must include noise contour maps in a new DSEIS for the following items: current baseline levels of military training noise over the park data for which may be found after on-site acoustic monitoring, the projected noise impacts associated with each of the alternatives, and noise contour maps in relation to environmental justice communities as discussed further in Section II(c).</p>	
NPCA-18	<p>The Navy's DSEIS's noise analysis is flawed, both in terms of its limited scope, and the technical and scientific flaws in its noise modeling. The Navy's failure to conduct monitoring, in spite of multiple federal agencies' request, failure to produce noise contour maps, and failure to properly describe and analyze the impacts people in the Olympic Peninsula face are all evidence of the Navy's failure to properly analyze and disclose impacts relating to the noise emitted by its aircraft activities.</p>	Please see response to NPCA-05 above.
NPCA-19	<p>The Draft SEIS Fails to Consider the Navy's Impact on Environmental Justice Communities</p> <p>The proposed action will inevitably affect residents of Native American reservations along the Washington coast and low-income communities in the area. The boundaries of reservations overlap with the project's MOAs and Warning Areas. As discussed in Section II(b)(v), the project will have serious public health implications for residents and visitors to the Olympic Peninsula. Due to their proximity to the project's location, environmental justice communities, specifically several tribes, will face the brunt of the impacts associated with the Navy's military Growler jet training. NPCA is disappointed and shocked by the disparity between the DSEIS and the Whidbey Island FEIS,¹⁰⁷ published less than a year ago, with regard to environmental justice analysis.</p> <p>The DSEIS's failure to account for disproportionate impacts on minority and low income populations is in opposition to CEQ guidance and DOD strategy</p>	<p>As stated throughout the Supplemental EIS/OEIS and in the previous comment responses, the increased activities would have a negligible effect on the soundscape over the Olympic peninsula. The airspace where the activities would occur has been in use for decades by the same type activities. There are no changes to the activities that would result change the results of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS: "Because impacts are negligible, there are no disproportionately high impacts or adverse effects on any low-income populations or minority populations."</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>as well as Executive Order 12898. The DSIES is void of any information regarding environmental justice and instead relies on a tenuously-related and flawed socioeconomic analysis as a substitute for any real analysis regarding the impacts environmental justice communities (low income and minority populations) will face if the proposed project is approved. Instead of dedicating a separate and distinct segment to environmental justice analysis, the DSEIS uses a broad disclaimer that environmental justice is incorporated within the document's socioeconomic analysis section:</p> <p>Human resources considered in this Supplemental include cultural resources (Section 3.10), American Indian and Alaska Native traditional resources (Section 3.11), socioeconomic resources and environmental justice (Section 3.12), public health and safety (Section 3.13), and cumulative impacts (Chapter 4). This wording seems to suggest that Section 3.12 addresses both socioeconomic and environmental justice effects of the proposed action. However, Section 3.12 does not detail the environmental justice implications of the proposed action. In fact, the words "environmental justice" are never used in Section 3.12 of the DSEIS. The Navy cannot conflate socioeconomics with environmental justice; the two topics are separate fields of study entailing different concerns and areas of focus.</p> <p>In a blanket statement regarding socioeconomic impacts within the DSEIS's Executive Summary, the Navy states that the Preferred Alternative will have "no disproportionately high impacts or adverse effects on any low-income populations or minority populations." As discussed below, this is blatantly false.</p> <p>Additionally, the DSEIS does contain a section about tribal treaty rights, but this section is not sufficient from an environmental justice standpoint. Treaty rights are an important component when analyzing environmental justice concerns, but analysis does not and cannot stop there. Treaty rights relate to tribal sovereignty and tribe's status as wholly separate governments, but they do not address disproportionate health and environmental impacts on the tribal members or tribal land. Further, the consultation with the tribes appears sufficient in the DSEIS, but the impact analysis on various treaty rights, such as traditional fishing areas, seems dismissive of the tribe's concerns about impacts on their cultural resources. Due to these inaccuracies and omissions, we request that the final SEIS includes a thorough analysis and description of the environmental justice implications of the Navy's increased military training in order to comply</p>	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>with federal NEPA guidelines and regulations.</p> <p>The land of four Native American tribes are in close proximity to or fall within the boundaries of the project's MOAs: the Makah Indian Tribe, the Quileute Tribe, the Hoh Indian Tribe, and the Quinault Indian Nation. As demonstrated in the figures below, the land of three of these tribes lies directly within the boundaries of the Navy's MOAs. Although the Makah Indian Tribe Reservation is not directly within the project's MOAs residents of the area will experience the impacts of the proposed action. As discussed above, the noise pollution associated with the Navy's military training reaches far beyond the boundaries of the MOAs and Warning Areas.</p> <p>The DSEIS does not include any figures that highlight the proximity of these areas to the Navy's MOAs. Accordingly, members of the public may not be aware of these minority communities in the area and cannot utilize the procedures afforded by NEPA to communicate their concerns over the disproportionate impacts the action may have. This is in opposition to NEPA's goal to allow informed public participation in the comment process and CEQ guidance to provide the public with sufficient information to understand environmental justice issues.</p>	
NPCA-20	<p>Looking to the treaty rights analysis section of the DSEIS, the tribes have various concerns regarding impacts on their traditional fishing grounds, loss of fishing gear and changes in availability of marine resources/habitat. These concerns are seemingly glossed over, and the conclusions by the agency do not adequately address how these impacts would amplify the negative effects of the proposed action. For instance, loss of fishing gear, while not a huge loss economically, would have a great cultural impact on the tribes and on their traditional fishing practices, and this impact is not addressed in the treaty rights analysis section. This should be a component of the environmental justice analysis.</p> <p>By omitting any true environmental justice analysis, the Navy blatantly failed to uphold this responsibility.</p>	The issues described in the comment were addressed in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Section 3.11.2 (Environmental Consequences).
NPCA-21	<p>The DSEIS includes no mention of low income communities nor the effects that the proposed increase in military operations will have on these individuals. Due to the prevalence of low income communities in the project area, this is a serious omission by the Navy, and contravenes guidelines on environmental justice analysis throughout the NEPA process, which require that low-income communities be identified.</p> <p>Similarly, the DOD strategy requires that the DOD identify and address "disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental</p>	The Navy considered environmental justice issues in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice) and Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety) in both the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>effects of DoD programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations at DoD U.S. sites and facilities.” DOD also is required to collect and analyze information to “identify any opportunities to avoid or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental impacts” on minority and low income communities, as well as “identify and undertake new or existing model demonstration programs to reduce such effects.” DOD has never identified an alternative that would comply with this regulation.</p> <p>The Draft SEIS’ Environmental Justice Analysis Pales in Comparison to that of the Whidbey Island FEIS</p> <p>As discussed previously, the Department of the Navy released the Whidbey Island FEIS less than a year ago. The Growler jets at the heart of the DSEIS will originate and return to the Navy’s Whidbey Island Complex. Despite the strong connection between these actions, there is a vast, and unexplained, discrepancy between the quality of analysis within the DSEIS and the Whidbey Island FEIS. We request that the disparities between these two documents be addressed in the Navy’s final NWTT SEIS.</p>	
NPCA-22	<p>The Draft SEIS’s Unduly Narrow Statement of Purpose and Need Improperly Limited the Range of Alternatives Analysis.</p> <p>NEPA requires that an EIS shall “specify the underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives including the proposed action.” This purpose and need inquiry is crucial for a sufficient EIS because “[t]he stated goal of a project necessarily dictates the range of reasonable alternatives.” The agency cannot define its objectives in unreasonably narrow terms such that the outcome is preordained. Courts evaluate a purpose and need statement under a reasonableness standard and will overturn a statement that is arbitrary and capricious. Here, the Navy interpreted its purpose and need for preparing this supplemental EIS so narrowly that it failed to include the Navy’s obligation to consider ways to eliminate, minimize, and/or mitigate impacts, especially to unique places like the Park.</p> <p>Moreover the Purpose and Need statement and subsequent analysis of alternatives makes it clear that the Navy has no intention of considering changes to the Study area or changes in how it conducts its training, except for possible increases in the frequency of that training or the number of planes involved.</p>	<p>The Navy properly developed its Purpose and Need to ensure that proposed training and testing would allow the Navy to meet its Title 10 requirements. The Navy also considered other training and testing locations, as described in Section 2.4.1.1 (Alternative Training and Testing Locations).</p> <p>The Navy considered but did not develop mitigation for aircraft overflights, such as shifting transit routes, relocating aircrew training activities, or modifying flight altitudes, because such mitigation would not be practical to implement due to implications for safety and mission requirements. Please see response to NPCA-26 and Appendix K in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section K.3.4.6 for additional details.</p>
NPCA-23	<p>The alternatives analyzed in this DSEIS include the no action alternative, the preferred alternative, and an alternative that focuses on adding even more training and testing activities than those considered in the preferred</p>	<p>Please see response to NPCA-22.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>alternative (referred to by NPCA as the “preferred plus alternative”). Analyzing only these few alternatives is inadequate as it fails to constitute a reasonable range and fails to consider alternatives with less environmentally damaging impacts. Essentially the Navy improperly interpreted its purpose and need to mean that it would do exactly what it was already doing, in the same way and in the same place, but maybe more often and with more aircraft. This defeats and undermines NEPA’s core purpose of requiring federal agencies to fully evaluate all reasonable alternatives, including in particular alternatives that mitigate or decrease environmental impacts.</p> <p>By limiting its analysis to essentially only the preferred and preferred plus alternative, the Navy failed to fully consider other important and feasible alternatives including an alternative with reduced activities and an alternative that involves the Navy avoiding areas of Olympic National Park outside of the MOAs. The Navy did consider in appendix K “geographic mitigation,” but only regarding impacts from its at sea activities on marine species. That however is not substitute for an alternative that focuses on mitigating all types of adverse impacts, including those caused by noise from its Navy jet overflights. In fact by choosing to use a “no action” alternative that is such a drastic departure from its past and ongoing actions, the Navy, to be consistent, must consider alternatives that fall in the middle between no training, and the increased training that the Navy proposes to do. Such “middle ground” alternatives would include fewer, or even no Navy jet overflights of the Park and alternatives that focus generally on mitigating all adverse impacts from both at sea and in the air Navy actions.</p>	
NPCA-24	<p>The Navy’s use of its “no action” alternative when it compares the impacts of alternatives on specific resources is also very problematic. How the Navy discusses impacts from “airborne acoustics” on recreation generally and in the Park specifically illustrates this. First in the general impacts discussion, the SDEIS recognizes that the Navy jet overflights cause at least some adverse impacts to recreation and to recreation in the Park, although, as NPCA discusses elsewhere, this “analysis” itself has serious flaws. However when the DSEIS discusses the impacts to this same resource under the “no action” alternative all references to land-based recreation generally and to the Park specifically disappear. This discussion begins by asserting that even under the “no action alternative “other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur.” This cryptic reference is never defined or explained in this part of the SDEIS or in its</p>	<p>The Navy revised the No Action Alternative analysis in Section 3.12.3.2.3 (Impacts of Airborne Acoustics Under the No Action Alternative). The new analysis eliminates the statement “Other military activities not associated with this Proposed Action would continue to occur” and clarifies that some environmental benefits to the Olympic Peninsula could result.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>analysis of cumulative impacts. If Navy jet overflights of the Park would in fact continue under the “no action” alternative the Navy needs to clearly say that and explain under what Navy program or action such overflights would continue. But then the SDEIS discussion of impacts to airborne acoustics/recreation continues without any mention of the Park or benefits to the Park and recreation use there if there are no, or at least far fewer navy jet overflights. The Navy has a lengthy discussion on the supposed adverse effects on the local economy if training exercises cease under the “no action” alternative, but its summary of benefits is limited to saying that “environmental conditions would either remain unchanged or improve slightly.” Then the SDEIS discussion of no action impacts adds, confusingly, that “discontinuing training and testing under the No Action Alternative would lessen the potential for disturbance from airborne acoustics, but would not measurably change the frequency of severity of disturbance from airborne acoustics experienced by the public in the Study area. This assertion simply make no sense, but it is clearly designed to create the impression that, while stopping training activity would cause significant harm, it would have little or no environmental benefit.</p> <p>This is not the “rigorous” and objective” evaluation of alternatives required by NEPA. Instead it is a biased and incomplete comparison of alternatives that directly violates NEPA. The Navy is essentially using the “no action” alternative” to showcase what it believes is a “parade of horrors” if training and testing in the planning area were to stop. However, when the Navy does that, at the same time it refuses to acknowledge, and balance against any such detriments, the significant environmental benefits and public health and quality of life benefits that would occur. Without question beneficial impacts to terrestrial wildlife and recreation, especially recreation in the Park, and public health and quality of life for the people who live in the study area, including environmental justice communities, would occur if Navy jet overflights do not occur in the future. NEPA requires an EIS to acknowledge both adverse impacts and benefits when comparing alternatives.</p>	
NPCA-25	<p>In terms of a analyzing an alternative that seeks to reduce Navy activities, while the Navy lists this alternative in the DSEIS, it quickly and in conclusory fashion eliminated it from further consideration. The Navy claims, without explanation that a reduction of training and testing would prevent it from meeting its statutory requirements. NEPA requires agencies to rigorously explore alternatives and these conclusory statements offered by the Navy are insufficient to eliminate this alternative from further analysis. The Navy</p>	<p>The Navy has added further explanation in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS as to why a reduction of training or testing would prevent meeting statutory requirements.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	should re-evaluate this alternative in the final EIS and consider the environmental impacts resulting from fewer Navy activities. By analyzing a “reduced activities” alternative, the Navy’s alternatives analysis would better resemble a “range” by including a more environmentally friendly alternative.	
NPCA-26	The Navy also fails to consider an alternative that eliminates impacts to areas of Olympic National Park that lie outside of the MOAs. While a portion of the Park lies within the MOAs, the Navy’s transit flights to and from the MOAs pass directly over areas of the ONP that lie outside of the MOAs, directly impacting the Park’s visitors and wildlife. These transit flights produce significant noise and annoy Park visitors who seek out the area for its natural sounds; despite these impacts, the Navy’s DSEIS fails to ever evaluate and consider impacts to the entire ONP, see Section II(e) for further discussion. The DSEIS is unclear as to why the Navy utilizes transit routes over a National Park; when discussing these routes with Navy personnel at a public meeting, the Navy stated that the Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”) determined its flight route. It remains unclear to NPCA why the Navy failed to consider an alternative analyzing different transit routes, which would eliminate a significant portion of the impacts within the ONP. The Strait of Juan De Fuca, which lies just north of the Park and MOAs currently routes air carriers to SEATAC and it is likely that military aircrafts could be brought onto that route or a similar route. The Navy failed to consider alternatives that would avoid or minimize adverse effects when it neglected to analyze alternative transit routes.	The Navy considered but did not develop mitigation for aircraft overflights, such as shifting transit routes, relocating aircrew training activities, or modifying flight altitudes, because such mitigation would not be practical to implement due to implications for safety and mission requirements. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) controls the National Airspace System and routes that overlap the NWTT Study Area. The FAA designed the routes to efficiently manage air traffic in the region and to safely deconflict military traffic from commercial and general aviation aircraft, with consideration given to the presence of Canadian National Airspace and traffic to the north. The FAA is the responsible federal agency for determining transit routes and any changes to such routes must be approved by the FAA. The Navy is currently in discussions with the FAA exploring the possibility of shifting the FAA-established transit routes for military aircraft transiting to and from the Olympic MOA from Naval Air Station Whidbey Island to the north of the Olympic Peninsula. The purpose of these discussions is to consider the efficient and safe use of navigable airspace. While ultimately any shift in transit routes is the FAA’s decision, it is possible that, if approved, such a shift will have the added benefit of reducing military aircraft noise over the Olympic National Park.
NPCA-27	The Navy used the stated purpose and need to develop only one true “alternative,” which happened to be an increase in proposed flight and vessel activity. The Navy cannot define its objectives in such a way that its desired outcome is the only reasonable alternative. Here, the Navy’s purpose and need was interpreted in such a way that they Navy only looked at alternatives that the Navy desired. The Navy needs to train, NPCA is not disputing that, however, there is no reason that it must train in this way, with these many flights, and in this particular area. There is also no reason at all for why the Navy needs to fly over any, or at least most, of Olympic National Park in order to conduct its necessary training. The Navy’s failure to properly define the DSEIS’s purpose and need to include the Navy’s obligation to consider ways to eliminate, minimize, and/or mitigate impacts to unique places lead to the Navy failing to consider a reasonable range of alternatives. Thus, the Navy’s DSIES’s	As stated above in NPCA-22, the Navy properly developed its Purpose and Need to ensure that proposed training and testing would allow the Navy to meet its statutory requirements. And, as stated in Section 2.4.1.2 (Reduced Training and Testing) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Alternative 1 represents “the minimum training for the appropriate number of Naval forces to gain the necessary levels of readiness for the commander to be confident of meeting 10 U.S.C. 8062 requirements.”

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	statement of purpose and need and range of alternatives analysis is inadequate and illegal under NEPA.	
NPCA-28	<p>The Draft SEIS Fails to Protect Scenic, Aesthetic, and Recreational Values. An EIS must include a detailed statement regarding any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented. Effects include impacts to aesthetic and social values, such as recreation, whether direct or indirect. The draft SEIS fails to properly consider the impacts the Navy's activities will have on the Park, particularly those areas outside of the MOAs.</p> <p>The Navy's training and testing activities have an extremely negative impact on visitor's experiences at the Park, both in areas within and outside the MOAs. The draft SEIS fails to fully realize these impacts and thus fails to take a hard look at adverse environmental effects resulting from the increased Navy flights.</p>	<p>The Navy considered potential effects to activities both within and outside the area beneath the Olympic MOA. In the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy included additional analysis of aircraft transits to and from the Olympic MOA, which could have impacts beyond the borders of the Olympic MOA.</p>
NPCA-29	<p>The Draft SEIS Fails to Adequately Consider the Impacts Facing Wildlife in the Olympic Peninsula in General, and Particularly Birds.</p> <p>One of the main concerns with the Navy's analysis of impacts to species is the Navy's unduly narrow scope of review. While discussed in more detail above in Section II(a), because the Navy improperly decided to narrow its review to only the MOAs and Warning Areas, a significant amount of a species' range and habitat was eliminated from the analysis. In fact, both the marbled murrelet and northern spotted owl, have designated critical habitat in the Olympic National Park in areas that are outside of the MOAs but still directly impacted by the Navy's transit flights. To properly consider the impacts species face due to the Navy's training and testing activities, the Navy must prepare an EIS that, at a minimum, looks at impacts to species within the entire Olympic National Park, as opposed to species that only occur within the MOAs.</p> <p>The Navy's training and testing activities will have numerous negative impacts on wildlife within the Park, particularly to bird species. The draft SEIS fails to fully realize these impacts and thus fails to take a hard look at adverse environmental effects resulting from the increased Navy flights.</p>	<p>Potential impacts to wildlife in general and birds in particular were analyzed thoroughly in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and that analysis was supplemented with updated research and in consideration of changes to the proposed activities. There is no new research on the northern spotted owl, or any change in activities that would change the analysis of impacts to the spotted owl from the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS. Therefore, the focus in this Supplemental was to the marbled murrelet and short-tailed albatross. In addition, the Navy consulted with USFWS on potential impacts to ESA-listed species, including marbled murrelet and short-tailed albatross.</p>
NPCA-30	<p>The Draft SEIS Fails to Properly Consider the Cumulative Impacts of the Proposed Action.</p> <p>The draft SEIS first notes that the geographic scope of the cumulative impacts analysis is defined by the "Study Area" which encompasses the MOAs, Warning Areas, and areas within the inland waters. A Figure of the Study Area from the draft SEIS is provided below. This geographic scope is far too narrow. When analyzing project specific impacts, it is often</p>	<p>The Cumulative Impacts of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS are not limited to the areas described in the comment. The Navy clarified in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS that "The Study Area used for the cumulative impacts analysis includes areas far outside of the Study Area used for this Supplemental, because it includes all actions that may add to impacts affecting the resources that were analyzed in this Supplemental."</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	sufficient to analyze effects within the immediate area of the proposed action; however, when analyzing cumulative effects, the geographic boundaries almost always should expand. At a minimum an EIS must explain why it has limited the geographic scope of a cumulative impacts analysis. By limiting the scope of the analysis to only the MOAs, Warning Areas, and inland waters, the Navy improperly narrowed the scope of the cumulative impacts analysis. The scope of the cumulative impacts section should, at a minimum, include impacts to the entire Olympic National Park.	
NPCA-31	The draft SEIS also notes that the time frame for cumulative impacts centers on the timing of the proposed action. The timing of the proposed action consists of training and testing activities that are necessary to meet requirements beyond 2020 and into the reasonably foreseeable future. This time frame is also too narrow. The definition of cumulative impacts explicitly requires agencies to analyze impacts from past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions. By focusing the time frame from 2020 and into the future, the Navy eliminated decades of Naval activity within the Olympic Peninsula from the cumulative impacts review.	In the cumulative section, the Navy is clear that we looked at past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions.
NPCA-32	When reviewing the cumulative impacts analysis, NPCA faced additional confusion. While the Navy seemed to improperly narrow the scope of the review, in terms of both geography and timing, the draft SEIS provides a table of “Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions.” This table includes actions that are outside both the specified geographic Study Area and time frame specified for review. Thus it remains unclear to NPCA, and the general public, what the scope of the cumulative impacts review actually consisted of—the improperly narrow geographic scope and time frame designated in the “Scope of Cumulative Analysis” section, or if every action listed in Table 4.3-1 was analyzed?	See responses to NPCA-30 and NPCA-31.
NPCA-33	Overall, the DSEIS addresses cumulative impacts by including a long list of ongoing or future actions. Then, at the end of this table it “analyzes” the cumulative impacts to various resources from this list of actions and the Navy’s training and testing actions with a series of short, almost entirely conclusory paragraphs. Lists of actions are of course not an analysis, especially when those lists, are incomplete, and conclusory assertions of “no cumulative impacts” are equally ineffectual when attempting to comply with NEPA. One obvious omission from its list of ongoing or future actions is commercial logging. Even if limited to the “study area” that area includes large areas of national, state and private forests where there are always ongoing commercial logging operations. Attached below is a map showing	In the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy included the analysis of additional activities that have occurred or will occur in the vicinity of the Study Area, including logging operations. The Navy then considered the cumulative impacts of its activities in addition to all of the activities listed in Table 4.3-1. The Navy also included additional analysis in Section 4.4.12.3 (Cumulative Impacts on Socioeconomic Resources) to describe the occurrence and potential impacts of military, commercial, and general aviation in the vicinity of the Olympic National Park.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>active state timber sales in the region. In terms of noise impacts, commercial logging operations create extensive, localized noise and would create cumulative impacts with the noise from Navy Jet overflights on recreational users and on wildlife, including in particular birds.</p> <p>Another legal concern NPCA has with the draft SEIS's cumulative impacts analysis is the inadequate analysis relating to impacts from all aircraft use within and above the Olympic Peninsula. The Navy does list "commercial and general aviation" as an action that could cause cumulative impacts. However, in its subsequent "analysis paragraphs, it first appears to discuss noise impacts to the Park in the "cultural resources" section. But here it limits its actual discussion to a repeat of its flawed analysis of direct noise impacts from its navy jets, does not mention commercial aircraft as a source for cumulative impacts, and summarily concludes: "when considered with other actions (see Table 4.3-1), the contribution of the Proposed Action of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS to the Olympic National Park soundscape would be short term, intermittent, and temporary." This is a conclusion, not the actual analysis required by NEPA.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts on Park resources from Navy jet overflights and other activities like nearby commercial logging and commercial jet overflights required an actual discussion and quantification of those impacts. The DSEIS' conclusory assertions of "no impacts" violates NEPA.</p>	
NPCA-34	<p>The Navy's Failure to Provide Documents to Both the General Public and NPCA Violates NEPA.</p> <p>When an agency prepares an EIS, it shall incorporate information by reference and/or prepare an appendix. Information that is incorporated by reference includes materials that are not directly related to preparing an EIS, such as other EISs, research papers in the general literature, or technical background papers. Information incorporated by reference "must be made available, either by citing the literature, furnishing copies to central locations, or sending copies directly to commenters upon request." A significant amount of material seems to be incorporated by reference in this draft SEIS yet, although the Navy has an extensive website regarding this</p> <p>DSEIS, NPCA and other members of the public were unable to find the material on that specific website or other Navy websites. During a public meeting held for the draft SEIS, NPCA's counsel asked several Navy personnel where information referenced in the draft SEIS could be found, but no one was able to answer this question. NPCA's counsel sent an email</p>	<p>The requested references, the majority of which are publicly available via the internet, were provided to NPCA. Any references incorporated by reference were made available for inspection to a member of the public (if requested) in accordance with 40 CFR 1502.21.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>on April 30, 2019 again seeking access to this referenced material. Despite NPCA's broad request for access to all referenced material, encompassing references from a total of 25 sections in the draft SEIS, the Navy only provided access to references from one Appendix. On May 24, NPCA's counsel followed up with the NWTT Project Manager noting the requirement to provide access to all reference material, but also narrowed NPCA's request to specific SEIS sections. By the time of submitting this comment, the Navy has yet to respond to this narrowed request for information.</p> <p>In addition to incorporating material by reference, agencies may also prepare an appendix. This appendix shall consist of all materials prepared in connection with the EIS, such as research papers directly relevant to the proposal, lists of affected species, or discussions of the methodology of models used in the analysis of impacts. Importantly that appendix and related information must be circulated with the EIS, or be readily available upon request. NPCA, again, had trouble obtaining any information related to preparing the draft SEIS—this information was not circulated with the EIS nor was it available on the NWTT Project website. In an effort to receive information necessary for its comment, NPCA's counsel sent another email to the Navy requesting information and underlying data and technical information used specifically in the Navy's noise analysis and modeling. It is impossible for NPCA to fully evaluate or replicate the Navy's noise modeling, as it is entitled to do under NEPA, without this information. Again, at the time NPCA submits this comment, the Navy has not responded to this request.</p> <p>Despite requests from NPCA, the only information that was publicly available during the draft SEIS comment period was reference material from one section of the draft SEIS. A vast majority of incorporated materials and other materials/data used in preparing the draft SEIS were unavailable to NPCA and the public during the comment period. The Navy's failure to provide necessary information to the public during this time explicitly violates one of NEPA's core purposes of ensuring that environmental information be available to citizens before decisions are made.</p>	
NPCA-35	<p>Additionally, in an effort to ensure that it had necessary information during the comment period, NPCA sent two Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") requests to the Navy, one in 2016 and another in 2018 to supplement the earlier 2016 request. The Navy has yet to adequately respond to either request. In fact, NPCA was forced to file suit against the Navy as a result of</p>	<p>The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (5 U.S.C. 552) is a separate and distinct statute from the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.). During the development of its analysis under NEPA for this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy provided NPCA references upon NPCA's request. NPCA was afforded the opportunity to participate in the</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>its failure to sufficiently respond to its 2016 FOIA. In regards to its 2018 FOIA request, NPCA submitted an administrative appeal detailing NPCA's concerns with the Navy's inadequate search and improper redactions. At the time NPCA submitted this comment the FOIA lawsuit remains pending. The 2018 FOIA administrative appeal was granted on June 11, 2019, which remanded the 2018 FOIA request back for a new search. So at the time NPCA submitted this comment, it did not have the documents it requested from either the 2016 or 2018 FOIA requests. Due to the Navy's failure to adequately respond to NPCA's FOIA requests, NPCA was forced to file FOIA requests with other agencies for information regarding the NWTT Project. On May 10, 2019, NPCA sent FOIA requests to the U.S. Forest Service, the U.S. EPA, and the Federal Aviation Administration. These FOIA requests remain pending at the time NPCA submits this comment.</p> <p>Despite its best efforts—filing multiple FOIA requests and seeking documents directly from the NWTT Project Manager—NPCA did not have access to documents necessary for it to fully comment on the draft SEIS. Public scrutiny is essential to the NEPA process, and the Navy's improper withholding of environmental information related to its decision-making process directly violates NEPA.</p>	<p>NEPA process and the NPCA provided comments on the Proposed Action both before and after NPCA's receipt of all references. Separate from this release of references, the Navy, in response to NPCA's FOIA requests, provided NPCA with responsive, releasable information.</p>
NPCA-36	<p>The Navy Cannot Segment the NEPA Analyses</p> <p>The Navy's unreasonable interpretation of the proposed action—where the SEIS attempts to be a narrow environmental analysis concerning only impacts related to true "at sea" activities—is our largest concern and is the foundation for many of our other concerns. Namely, the Navy is illegally piecemealing, segmenting, and improperly limiting its analysis to individual training exercises or actions in an attempt to characterize its activities as "minimal" with respect to its impacts to the Olympic Peninsula. Segmenting related analyses is plainly illegal under NEPA and contravenes the statute's purpose. Yet, throughout its various segmented NEPA analyses addressing its training in the Pacific Northwest, the Navy has done just that.</p> <p>Despite the requirement to evaluate closely related projects within the same EIS, the Navy failed to properly consider all of its activities in the Olympic Peninsula in one comprehensive NEPA document. For example, after preparing what was purported to be a comprehensive analysis in 2010 (an EIS that does not even mention Olympic National Park), the Navy prepared a separate EA in 2014 that addressed electronic warfare activities (another NEPA document that fails to even mention Olympic National Park). Then in October 2015, the Navy issued its Northwest Training and</p>	<p>The Navy prepares Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) and Environmental Assessments (EA) in order to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). These NEPA documents are intended to ensure decision makers consider the potential environmental effects of a proposed action and its alternatives, provide an opportunity for public involvement, and promote transparency by informing the public of these potential environmental effects. Each NEPA document addresses a specific proposed action, separated from other actions by its purpose and need, independent utility, timing, and geographic location. Some NEPA documents are stand-alone documents; others tier off or expand the analyses of other NEPA documents. NEPA documents for training and testing, including this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, focus on training and testing activities occurring within a range complex or military operation area and involve different types of aircraft, ships, and range complex enhancements. NEPA documents for aircraft homebasing actions focus on aircraft operations in and around the airfield and their facility needs. NEPA documents for installations focus on infrastructure enhancements for host and tenant command missions. Importantly, every environmental document considers the cumulative impacts to the environment from other relevant past, present, and reasonably foreseeable</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Testing (“NWTT”) EIS/OEIS analyzing environmental effects related to its “need to support and conduct current, emerging, and future training and testing activities in the [NWTT] Study Area” (in this NEPA document the Navy buried a very limited discussion of impacts to Olympic National Park in an appendix that referenced it as a World Heritage site rather than a national park.). Then, in November 2016, the Navy issued another draft EIS, this time analyzing environmental impacts related to the Navy’s need to “continue and expand existing Growler operations at the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island complex . . . [and] increase electronic attack capabilities by adding 35 or 36 aircraft,” among other things. Clearly, at the time it issued its 2015 NWTT EIS, the Navy knew of its pending action to also add an additional 35–36 EA-18 Growler aircrafts to its fleet. Thus, the two EISes—issued approximately one year apart—analyzed projects that would have “cumulative and synergistic environmental impact[s] upon [the Olympic Peninsula]” and that should have been analyzed together.</p> <p>Rather than assess all of the impacts associated with training activities on and above the Olympic Peninsula in one document, the Navy has split them up into several documents over the course of several years. Between 2010 and the present, the Navy has published at least 6 NEPA documents that separately assess impacts flowing from its activities in the Olympic Peninsula, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2010 Northwest Training Range Complex Environmental Impact Statements/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement • 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 2019 Northwest Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement • 2016 EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, Washington Draft Environmental Impact Statement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 2018 EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, Washington Final EIS <p>Here, the Navy has taken effectively one action (or one series of connected or related actions)— its training activities in the Pacific Northwest—and split it up into multiple separate analyses. In doing so, “the public ... can[not] be assured that the [agency] provided the hard look that it is required to provide.” The Navy goes to some length to argue that these various actions are not “connected actions” as defined by 40 C.F.R. Section 1508.25(a)(1). NPCA disagrees, but, in any case, notes that the Navy does not address whether the actions are “related” as defined by 40 C.F.R. Section 1502.4 or “similar” as defined by Section 1508.25(a)(3), which they</p>	<p>future actions (federal, state, local, and private) in addition to the proposed action.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	certainly appear to be. And such related or similar actions also should be addressed in a single NEPA document. The Navy does acknowledge that all these supposedly “unconnected actions” must be included in its cumulative impacts analysis and it claims to have done so in the DSEIS. NPCA explains below why the DSEIS cumulative impacts analysis is inadequate. Moreover, what is really missing from the Navy’s overall approach to NEPA compliance regarding its training and testing activities in the Pacific Northwest is a broad programmatic NEPA document as contemplated by Section 1502.4, that explains the overall training and testing program and addresses its broader, regional and cumulative impacts. That programmatic analysis would then be followed by more specific NEPA documents that tier to the programmatic analysis, see Section 1502.20, and focus on evaluating the more localized and specific impacts of certain types of activities.	
NPCA-37	<p>The DSEIS confuses things even more by calling itself a “supplemental” DEIS but insisting that it is not “incorporating” the analysis from the 2015 FEIS, which it is supposedly supplementing. The DSEIS also does not claim to tier to the 2015 FEIS as a supplemental EIS normally would do in order to avoid any duplicative analysis. Nevertheless, despite this affirmative refusal to “tier” or “incorporate,” the DSEIS cites to the analysis in the 2015 FEIS extensively. This is all unnecessarily confusing and easily avoidable, if the Navy had followed proper NEPA procedures. Despite its label and unreasonable attempt to restrict its scope, the DSEIS is not a “supplemental” DEIS. Because it does not ever expressly tier to any prior Navy NEPA document and explicitly claims not to incorporate by reference the 2015 FEIS, the Navy cannot point to other prior NEPA analyses to satisfy its legal obligations under NEPA. This DSEIS must stand or fall on its own and it “falls” in many respects.</p> <p>Under NEPA, the public deserves a comprehensive review. By piecemealing the analysis out bit by bit, the Navy makes it incredibly difficult, if not impossible, for the public to effectively comment on the proposed training activities, particularly in relation to the extent of the Navy’s cumulative effects on the region. Further, the segmentation undertaken by the Navy forces the public to spend considerable time and effort to parse and understand all of these constantly intertwining analyses.</p> <p>Here, the Navy appears to be continuing its practice of segmenting different (yet interrelated) NEPA analyses. We ask that, instead, the Navy perform one comprehensive EIS that analyzes all of its impacts from all of</p>	<p>In accordance with 23 CFR § 771.130 and 40 CFR section 1502.9(c)(1), the Navy prepared a Supplemental EIS/OEIS to the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS as the Navy determined: (1) changes to the proposed action would result in significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and (2) new information or circumstances relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts would result in significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS. This is stated in Chapter One (Purpose and Need) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not purport to tier off or incorporate by reference the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS because it supplements the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS. The 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS is not a programmatic or other broader-scope environmental impact statement. See 40 CFR sections 1502.20 and 1502.28 and 43 CFR section 46.140 for CEQ guidance on tiering and using tiered documents.</p> <p>The Navy is not segmenting its different NEPA analyses. The Navy prepares separate NEPA documents covering different proposed activities because each NEPA document is focused on a specific proposed action, is separated from other actions by its respective and distinct purpose and need, has independent utility, has different timing, and involves differing geographic locations. Specifically, this Supplemental, which is designed to address the Navy’s statutory responsibility to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready forces, analyzes the potential impacts of training and testing activities from the year 2020 forward (as stated in Chapter One). This mission is achieved in part by conducting training and testing within the Study Area in accordance with established Navy military readiness requirements. The EIS for EA-18G</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	its testing and training activities in the Pacific Northwest. Until it does so, the Navy will not comply with the requirements of NEPA.	"Growler" Airfield Operations at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island Complex, on the other hand, states that the purpose of the Proposed Action is to augment the Navy's existing Electronic Attack community at NAS Whidbey Island by operating additional Growler aircraft that have been appropriated by Congress in order to maintain and expand Growler operational readiness to support national defense requirements. Therefore, training and testing in the NWT Study Area would continue if regulatory and permitting actions were approved, regardless of the decisions made regarding Growler Airfield Operations or other activities conducted in the Pacific NW and analyzed under separate NEPA documents.
NPCA-38	The Navy must also offer NPCA the opportunity to submit a supplemental comment after NPCA receives all the specific information it has requested regarding the DSEIS references and underlying noise modeling information and after it receives complete responses from the Navy to NPCA's 2016 and 2018 FOIA requests. After the Navy reviews this comment, other comments from the public and NPCA's supplemental comment, NPCA is confident the Navy will conclude that it must prepare a significantly revised and improved second Draft SEIS and that revised document out for additional public comment.	Please see response to NPCA-35.
NPCA-39	NPCA also requests that the Navy as many other federal agencies do, post all comments it receives regarding the DSEIS online so the public can see what issues are raised by other members of the public and other governmental agencies. Indeed, NEPA requires and comments by other Federal agencies on any draft EIS must be made public. Almost all other federal agencies do not treat comments from members of the public on a NEPA document as confidential or entitled to any privacy protections. NEPA commenting is clearly intended to be a public process and an important part of that public process is allowing all members of the public to review comments by other members of the public and other governmental agencies.	The Navy has posted all comments received on the NWT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS on the project website at: https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/Public-Comments .
NPCA-40	I am writing on behalf of the National Parks Conservation Association ("NPCA") to request that the Department of the Navy exercise its discretionary authority under 40 C.F.R. § 1506.10(d) and extend the public comment period for the Northwest Training and Testing Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (the "Draft SEIS"). As I explain in more detail below, the Navy has repeatedly failed to fully respond to NPCA's valid and timely requests under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") for records that NPCA, and the public generally, needs and is entitled to have in order to prepare comments on that Draft	Jackie responded to this request, so awaiting her response.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	SEIS. NPCA requests that the Navy extend the public comment period by 45 days, until July 26, 2019, or 30 days after the Navy fully responds to NPCA's FOIA requests, whichever extension period is shorter.	
National Parks Conservation Association, Supplemental Comments, November 15, 2019		
NPCA-41	<p>I am responding to your November 10, 2019 email, which I received at 7:54 pm on a Sunday evening during a three-day holiday weekend. Exhibit 1. My response has been delayed somewhat by the timing of your email. You should consider this to be a supplemental comment by my client the National Parks Conservation Association ("NPCA"). But rather than a supplemental comment regarding the substance of and analysis in the Navy's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS/OEIS") (the "2019 DSEIS"), this is a supplemental comment documenting the Navy's continuing deeply flawed and illegal National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") public participation process regarding that 2019 DSEIS and the forthcoming 2020 Final SEIS. Your November 10th email incorrectly suggests that the Navy has fulfilled its responsibility to provide NPCA with the records it has requested under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") and under NEPA's public participation provisions, and this comment will explain just how incorrect that assertion is. Moreover your letter references a two week "deadline" for NPCA to submit a supplemental comment, and this supplemental comment will explain why that is an unreasonable deadline and a deadline that NPCA thought was still open to discussion between the parties' counsel. NPCA expressly reserves the right to submit an additional supplemental comment regarding the substantive analysis and assertions in the Navy's 2019 DSEIS, once it has in fact received all of the records underling the Navy's 2019 DSEIS NEPA analysis that NPCA has properly and repeatedly requested but has still not received.</p> <p>Over the past several decades the Navy has engaged in a fractured NEPA process regarding its Navy jet electronic warfare training exercises. Those military jet aircraft operate out of its base on Whidbey Island in Puget Sound and fly over the Olympic Peninsula, including Olympic National Park while conducting those exercises. Unfortunately the Navy has never produced a programmatic NEPA analysis regarding these training exercise and has instead issued a series of much narrower NEPA analyses that examine only specific aspects of those exercises or recent changes to those exercises.</p> <p>NPCA's June 2016 FOIA Request</p>	Please see response to NPCA-35.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>As you know NPCA submitted a FOIA request to the Navy in June of 2016 (the “June 2016 FOIA”). That June 2016 FOIA sought records regarding and underlying several of the Navy’s most recent jet training NEPA documents including a 2014 Environmental Assessment (“2014 EA”) and a 2015 EIS. NPCA needed those records in the short term to address a then pending Navy permit application to the U.S. Forest Service that relied upon the 2014 EA and 2015 EIS. However from a longer term perspective, NPCA also needed these records to prepare to participate in the Navy’s next NEPA analysis, which was expected to begin in 2017. See NPCA’s October 4, 2017 Scoping comments at 6-7. As NPCA explained in its 2017 scoping comments on the forthcoming 2019 DSEIS it would be a direct violation of NEPA, 40 C.F.R. § 1506.6(f), and FOIA for the Navy to force NPCA to participate in a public commenting process regarding the 2019 DSEIS before the Navy had fully responded to NPCA’s 2016 FOIA. Id. The Navy’s initial response to NPCA’s 2016 FOIA was to produce a ridiculous 158 pages of responsive records. The Navy then required NPCA to go through two administrative appeal processes, both of which were “successful” in that they resulted in remands for new searches but neither remand resulted in the Navy producing a single additional page of responsive records.</p> <p>NPCA’s December 2018 FOIA Request</p> <p>In December of 2018, because NPCA believed the Navy’s release of its 2019 DSEIS was likely during the spring of 2019 and because NPCA had still received no additional records in response to its 2016 FOIA, NPCA submitted a second FOIA request to the Navy (the “2018 FOIA”). The 2018 FOIA clearly indicated it supplemented the 2016 FOIA and sought all records created or obtained by the Navy regarding its ongoing NEPA process since it received the 2016 FOIA. In February of 2019 the Navy produced only about 400 pages of records in response to the 2018 FOIA, which was clearly not all of the responsive records. NPCA therefore administratively appealed the Navy’s initial inadequate response to the 2018 FOIA. In addition to challenging the scope of the Navy’s search, that April 2019 appeal objected to the Navy’s improper redactions under FOIA exemption 6 and its withholding of comments by other agencies regarding its drafts of the 2019 DSEIS, in clear violation of 40 C.F.R. § 1505.6(f). In June of 2019 the Navy granted NPCA’s FOIA administrative appeal and remanded the 2018 FOIA so the Navy could conduct a supplemental search (the “2018 FOIA Supplemental Search”). Significantly, by this time the 2019 DSEIS was already released for public comment and only one day remained in the comment period. As such, NPCA was forced to submit its initial</p>	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>comments of the 2019 DSEIS without the benefit of most of the responsive records sought by its 2018 FOIA.</p> <p>NPCA's 2019 FOIA Lawsuit</p> <p>Of course NPCA also was forced to submit its 2019 DSEIS comments without a complete response to its 2016 FOIA. When the Navy announced that its 2019 DSEIS was out for public comment in March of 2019, NPCA reluctantly decided that the only way it would possibly get a complete response to the 2016 FOIA would be to file a FOIA lawsuit against the Navy, which it did in early May of 2019. NPCA v. US Navy, 2:19-cv-645-TSZ (W.D. WA.) (the "FOIA lawsuit"). In July of 2019 the FOIA lawsuit was stayed so that the Navy could conduct the supplemental search regarding NPCA's 2016 FOIA that the Navy had initially promised to do in 2017.</p> <p>NPCA's Multiple Requests for the DSEIS Scientific and Technical References</p> <p>In addition to FOIA, the Navy has obligations under NEPA to provide information regarding its NEPA analysis. In April, while the Navy's 2019 DSEIS was out for public comment, NPCA requested that, as required by 40 C.F.R. § 1502.21, the Navy provide it and the public with all the references cited and incorporated into its 2019 DSEIS. NPCA first requested these references through its counsel at an April 29th open house in Astoria, Oregon. NPCA followed up on that in-person request with an April 30th email (the first email request, Exhibit 2), which indicated that the Navy was required to produce these references pursuant to both Section 1502.21 and NPCA's pending 2018 FOIA. After the Navy posted a few references online on or about May 15, 2019, NPCA sent the Navy an email on May 24, 2019 (the second email request, Exhibit 3) explaining that NPCA's request for references included all references cited in the 2019 DSEIS. NPCA then raised the missing references issue during a June 26, 2019 conference call with the Navy's counsel. In early July NPCA received a CD from the Navy containing more, but still not all, of the 2019 DSEIS references. NPCA then sent the Navy an email on July 9, 2019 (the third email request, Exhibit 4) explaining what references were still missing. NPCA received another CD from the Navy in mid-August with additional references, but the Navy's response was still incomplete and also referred NPCA to references that were behind pay walls. On August 14th NPCA sent another email to the Navy (the fourth email request, Exhibit 5) seeking a complete response regarding the requested DSEIS references and objecting to the Navy's attempt to require NPCA to pay for access to multiple references. When the Navy did not respond, NPCA sent the Navy another email request on</p>	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>August 26, 2019 (the fifth email request, Exhibit 6) reiterating its requests in its fourth email request. The Navy's counsel responded in a September 23, 2019 email that attached a few additional references and promised that another CD with references would be forthcoming. Exhibit 7. NPCA received that CD on October 17, 2019, but once again the Navy had still not provided all of the DSEIS references NPCA had requested. NPCA sent the Navy an email on November 1, 2019 (the sixth email request, Exhibit 8) explaining what references were still missing. As of the date of this supplemental comment the Navy has not responded to NPCA's sixth email request. Thus, after six written requests and at least two verbal requests, NPCA still has not received all of its requested 2019 DSEIS references that the Navy is obligated to produce under both NEPA (Section 1502.21) and NPCA's 2018 FOIA.</p> <p>The Navy's failure, after sixth months of requests, to produce all of the 2019 DSEIS references is especially difficult to understand. NPCA is requesting technical and scientific references that the Navy itself listed in its 2019 DSEIS as technical and scientific sources that it used and relied upon when it drafted its DSEIS. Ordinarily, if the Navy in fact reviewed and relied upon those listed references, one would expect them to all have been in the Navy's possession, gathered together and saved in one or more folders, or at least readily accessible to the Navy, and therefore relatively easy to produce. The fact that the Navy is still struggling to produce these references raises obvious questions about the accuracy of the Navy's listed references in its DSEIS.</p> <p>The Noise Analysis Data</p> <p>In its 2019 DSEIS the Navy repeatedly referenced the results of noise modeling that it had conducted. NEPA requires that the data and other information that substantiates such modeling in an EIS be provided to the public, usually in an Appendix to the EIS. See 40 C.F.R. § 1502.18. However the appendices to the 2019 DSEIS did not contain this information and on May 31, 2019 NPCA requested that the Navy produce it. Exhibit 9. That request noted that in addition its production being required by Section 1502.18, this noise analysis data was also responsive to NPCA's 2018 FOIA. After several months of waiting, on September 23, 2019, Exhibit 7, the Navy's counsel informed NPCA that its May 31st email had been converted by the Navy into a new, separate FOIA request, DON-Navy-2019-011111. As of the date of this supplemental comment NPCA has not received any response to this 2019 Noise Analysis FOIA.</p> <p>The Navy's Supplemental FOIA Searches and Responses</p>	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>As explained above, as of July 2019, the Navy had committed in writing to do supplemental searches regarding both NPCA’s 2016 FOIA and 2018 FOIA requests. During the next several months NPCA received a series of partial, supplemental responses to those two FOIA requests. On October 4, 2019 NPCA received what the Navy called its final supplemental response to the 2018 FOIA. Exhibit 10. On October 22, 2019 NPCA received the Navy’s final supplemental response to its 2016 FOIA. Exhibit 11. From NPCA’s perspective, both of these supplemental responses are still incomplete, as NPCA communicated to the Navy’s counsel during a conference call on November 5, 2019. Both supplemental responses continue to improperly invoke FOIA exemption 6. Redacting from the records the names of public officials and almost all Navy personnel, including the Navy personnel who prepared the actual public NEPA analysis, makes it very difficult to understand and evaluate these redacted records. The 2016 supplemental response did not inform NPCA of the volume of records the Navy was withholding under other exemptions and the Navy’s supplemental search appears to have missed numerous responsive records including many public comments on the Navy’s 2015 EIS. The Navy’s 2018 supplemental response continues to improperly withhold comments from other agencies regarding drafts of the DSEIS and there also appear to be issues regarding the scope of the Navy’s supplemental search regarding the 2018 FOIA as well.¹ Because NPCA informed the Navy’s counsel that it was still not satisfied with the Navy’s responses to its 2016 FOIA, the Navy answered NPCA’s complaint in the 2016 FOIA litigation on November 8th and NPCA is preparing an administrative appeal of the Navy’s supplemental response to NPCA’s 2018 FOIA.</p> <p>The Navy’s November 10, 2019 Email</p> <p>All of the above NEPA and FOIA process history between the Navy and NPCA underlies the Navy’s November 10th email, which erroneously asserts that NPCA must, within 5 days, submit a supplemental comment on the 2019 DSEIS because the Navy has fulfilled its obligations to conduct a single “supplemental search.” This assertion fails for multiple reasons. First, the November 10th email references the Navy’s October 4th supplemental response, which was a supplemental response to NPCA’s 2018 FOIA request. As noted above NPCA does not consider that October 4th Supplemental response to be complete. Second, the Navy’s November 10th email says it is following up on a June 20th email, but does not include the text from that June 20th email. Exhibit 12. That June 20th Navy email specifically references the supplemental</p>	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>search the Navy agreed to do regarding NPCA's 2016 FOIA and the FOIA litigation. Again, as noted above, NPCA has notified the Navy's counsel that it does not consider the Navy's supplemental response to its 2016 FOIA request to be complete and the parties are therefore preparing to litigate those FOIA issues in federal court.</p> <p>Third, the Navy's June 20th email, based on its subject line, is actually a direct response to NPCA's May 31st request for the data underlying the 2019 DSEIS noise analysis and in fact expressly says that it will accept a supplemental comment on the issue of noise impacts. In September the Navy converted NPCA's May 31st request into a separate FOIA request (the 2019 Noise analysis FOIA). The Navy has never responded to this separate 2019 Noise Analysis FOIA and none of the Navy's supplemental responses to NPCA's 2016 and 2018 FOIAs contain the requested noise analysis data.</p> <p>Fourth, the Navy's assertion in its November 10th email totally ignores its failure to produce all of the DSEIS references that NPCA has requested eight different times (two verbal requests and six email requests).</p> <p>The Navy, in its June 20th email, clearly indicated it would accept a supplemental comment from NPCA regarding the substance of its 2019 DSEIS analysis once the Navy had given NPCA the additional records and information it was seeking under FOIA and NEPA. However the Navy's assertion in its November 10th email that it has somehow fulfilled its obligations under NEPA and FOIA to provide NPCA with additional records and information to use when preparing such a supplemental comment has no basis in fact.</p> <p>The Timing of a NPCA's Supplemental Comment</p> <p>In its June 20th email, the Navy indicated it would require NPCA to submit its supplemental response within fourteen days of receiving the outstanding FOIA and NEPA records. Thereafter timing of any supplemental comment from NPCA was the subject of discussions between counsel for the Navy and NPCA, with counsel for NPCA explaining that fourteen days would not be enough time for NPCA to both review the Navy supplemental productions and prepare a supplemental comment. NPCA also requested that the time period would not start to run until both sides agreed that NPCA had what it was legally entitled to have under FOIA and NEPA.</p> <p>See June 28, 2019 email from NPCA's counsel to the Navy's counsel.² NPCA believed the parties' discussions regarding the timing of a supplemental comment from NPCA were still ongoing and was surprised when it received the Navy's November 10th email suddenly reviving the fourteen-day time</p>	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>limit from the Navy's June 20th email and in fact demanding a supplemental comment be submitted within 5 days.</p> <p>NPCA objects to any arbitrary fourteen-day time limit that the Navy seeks to impose on NPCA's right to submit a supplemental comment on the substance of the Navy's analysis in its 2019 DSEIS after NPCA ultimately receives all of the information it is entitled to under both FOIA and NEPA. The Navy has given itself multiple years, in the case of the 2016 FOIA, and almost a year, in the case of the 2018 FOIA, to conduct supplemental searches, which are still incomplete. Even if those supplemental searches had been complete, requiring NPCA to both review the thousands of additional records produced by the Navy and draft a supplemental comment within fourteen days is completely unreasonable and inconsistent with the Navy's obligations to allow and facilitate informed public participation under NEPA. See 40 C.F.R. §§1500.1(b), 1500.2(d), 1506.6. A thirty day deadline would be much more reasonable.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>NPCA therefore objects to the demand in the Navy's November 10, 2019 email that NPCA submit a substantive supplemental comment regarding the Navy's 2019 DSEIS. That demand is based on a mistaken (in multiple respects) factual premise that the Navy has supposedly met its obligations to provide NPCA with supplemental responses to NPCA's 2016 and 2018 FOIA. The Navy's demand also ignores the Navy's other obligations under NEPA to provide NPCA with additional information regarding its 2019 DSEIS. Rather than submitting a substantive supplemental comment based on clearly incomplete information, NPCA submits this supplemental comment setting forth the Navy's continuing violations of its legal obligations to NPCA under both FOIA and NEPA. NPCA reserves the right to submit a substantive supplemental comment regarding the Navy's 2019 DSEIS within 30 days of the Navy fulfilling all of its obligations under FOIA and NEPA to provide NPCA relevant information underlying the analysis in that 2019 DSEIS.</p> <p>1 NPCA attempted to get some of these agency comments by sending a FOIA directly to one of those agencies, the US Environmental Protection Agency. The EPA however referred that request to the Navy (the 2019 EPA Comment FOIA) and the Navy once again improperly refused to release these agency comments in violation of 40 C.F.R. § 1506.6(f). NPCA currently has an October 25, 2019 administrative appeal pending regarding the Navy's improper withholding of records regarding NPCA's 2019 EPA Comment FOIA.</p>	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
<i>Natural Resources Defense Council</i>		
NRDC-01	<p>Fundamental to satisfying NEPA’s requirement of fair and objective review, agencies must ensure the “professional integrity, including scientific integrity,” of the discussions and analyses that appear in environmental impact statements. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.24. To this end, they must make every attempt to obtain and disclose data necessary to their analysis. The simple assertion that “no information exists” will not suffice; unless the costs of obtaining the information are exorbitant, NEPA requires that it be obtained. See 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22(a). Agencies are further required to identify their methodologies, indicate when necessary information is incomplete or unavailable, acknowledge scientific disagreement and data gaps, and evaluate indeterminate adverse impacts based upon approaches or methods “generally accepted in the scientific community.” 40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.22(2), (4), 1502.24.2 Such requirements become acutely important in cases where, as here, so much about an activity’s impacts depend on newly emerging science. Finally, NEPA does not “permit agencies to falsify data or to ignore available information that undermines their environmental impact conclusions.” <i>Hoosier Environmental Council v. U.S. Department of Transportation</i>, 2007 WL 4302642 *13 (S.D. Ind. Dec. 10, 2007). Thus, the Navy and NMFS’s review must be thorough; they may not “sweep[] negative evidence under the rug.” <i>National Audubon Society v. Department of the Navy</i>, 422 F.3d 174, 194 (4th Cir. 2005). Various stressors associated with the Navy’s activities will directly, indirectly, and cumulatively impact marine mammals and other marine species. These stressors include but are not limited to acoustic impacts; impacts from explosives and other non-acoustic energetic sources; vessel strikes and other physical disturbance; entanglement in cables, wires, and parachutes; ingestion of materials such non-explosive munitions and expended materials; and secondary effects such as transmission of diseases and parasites.</p> <p>The underwater noise produced by vessels and the vessels’ physical presence mask the acoustic cues that the whales depend on and disrupt these vital behaviors. Notably, researchers have reported that, on exposure to vessel noise, the whales increase their swimming speeds, engage in evasive swimming patterns, increase their time spent traveling, alter their dive lengths, and significantly reduce their foraging time. Reduction in foraging efficiency translates to lower intake of food energy, which in turn compromises fitness and survival, lowers birthrates, and increases mortality. An independent population viability analysis found that if it were</p>	<p>The Navy uses the best available science to analyze potential impacts of the Proposed Action (including from acoustic, explosive, energy, physical disturbance and strike, entanglement, ingestion, and secondary stressors) on marine mammals according to methods generally accepted in the scientific community and coordinated with NMFS as a cooperating agency on the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The potential responses of marine mammals from vessel noise are assessed in Section 3.4.2.1.3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Vessel noise associated with proposed Navy activities is unlike persistent vessel noise from commercial vessels or whale watching activities. Noise from Navy vessels is unlikely to have significant effects on marine mammals, including the reduction in foraging time. The standard operating procedures and mitigation the Navy uses to help avoid vessel strike would further help avoid any significant behavioral reactions from marine mammals due to exposure to vessel noise.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	possible to eliminate acoustic disturbance while maintaining current levels of Chinook abundance, annual population growth would increase to 1.7 percent.	
NRDC-02	<p>The DSEIS contemplates activities within the range of the Southern Resident population, including the Salish Sea. These include bombing and missile exercises in the Navy's offshore operations area, including in Area W-237; sonar exercises in offshore area generally; and various activities in the Salish Sea, although Navy units would be required to obtain approval from a "designated" Command authority before using mid-frequency active sonar during training or pierside maintenance or testing. DSEIS at 2-28 to 2-38, K-12. Notably, according to the Navy's analysis, the Washington Inland Waters population of harbor porpoises and of the Hood Canal population of harbor seals will be subjected to some of the highest estimated take (DSEIS to E-2 to E-37), suggesting that some activities with the potential to harm the orcas are concentrated in the Salish Sea and the interior waters of Puget Sound. Given this overlap, and given the potential for grievous harm from Navy activities, the Washington State Southern Resident Orca Task Force specifically included the Navy in its recommendations, advising that the governor meet with the region's commanding officer "to address the acoustic and physical impacts to Southern Resident orcas from Naval exercises in waters and air of Washington state" and request the Navy's participation in the second year of the Task Force, to "identify actions to reduce the Navy's impacts to Southern Resident orcas."</p>	<p>Potential impacts to marine mammals from acoustic and explosive sources, which are part of the Proposed Action, are analyzed in Section 3.4.2.1 and Section 3.4.2.2, respectively. The Navy's acoustic and explosive effects analysis looks at multiple factors such as the southern resident killer whale's abundance across the Study Area in each season, the levels of sound that may cause certain effects, and the Navy's proposed time and space use of noise producing activities. A greater number of effects are estimated for harbor porpoises and harbor seals than other species, such as Southern Resident killer whales, due to their much higher abundances in the Study Area.</p> <p>The Navy worked cooperatively with NMFS during the ESA and MMPA consultation processes to enhance mitigation measures for Southern Resident Killer Whales to the maximum extent practical. Based on its operational analysis of potential mitigation measures for active sonar, explosives, and physical disturbance and strike stressors in NWT Inland Waters, the Navy determined it would be practical to implement additional measures in the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to further avoid or reduce potential impacts on Southern Resident Killers whales. These new measures are detailed in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) of the Navy's Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy, as acknowledged by the Governor's Task Force in 2018, was not previously requested to participate in the Task Force. The Navy has since been invited to take part and, as a result, a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Task Force's working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.</p>
NRDC-03	It is not clear how the Navy conducted its impact analysis on the Southern Resident population. The suggestion that its training activities would impact individual orcas only twice each year under its preferred alternative	Information about the quantitative analysis is described in detail in the 2018 technical report titled Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>(DSEIS at E-3) makes little sense, given that the Southern Residents travel together in pods, making it far more likely that every member of the pod would be affected; nor does it make sense that take estimates for Washington Inland Waters harbor porpoises and Hood Canal harbor seals would number in the hundreds of thousands, while Southern Residents account for a handful; nor does it make sense that the 2019 modeling would result in the same numbers of whales taken as in 2015, when the Navy's impact thresholds were substantially higher and the types and numbers of some activities were different. The Navy intends to conduct missile training and other explosives activities with an impact zone that is extremely difficult to monitor, yet, as discussed below, it assumes that its mitigation will preclude mortalities. And in the past, the number of mid-frequency active sonar events that have occurred within the whales' range is not trivial. These apparent defects in the Navy's modeling run counter to the "hard look" required by NEPA and are extremely concerning given the plight of this endangered and declining population. See 40 C.F.R. §§ 1500.1(b); Baltimore Gas & Electric, 462 U.S. at 97.</p>	<p>Testing, available at www.nwtteis.com. The Navy's acoustic and explosive effects analysis looks at multiple factors such as the southern resident killer whale abundance across the Study Area in each season, the levels of sound that may cause certain effects, and the Navy's proposed time and space use of noise producing activities. The Navy Acoustic Effects Model uses Monte Carlo methods to estimate the expected value of behavioral responses. This is accomplished by running multiple simulations in which factors are randomly selected for the selected modeling area, including, but not limited to, the travel path of the platform with a sound source and animal distribution based on a probability density function for the species. Many simulations are run for any given testing and training event to ensure that the mean impacts predicted by NAEMO represent the likely impacts given the potential for a species to be present within the ranges to effect. In instances where the potential for a species to be present at any point in time is very low, as in the case of Southern Resident killer whales, the mean value will be weighted by the large majority of instances in which no impacts would occur. A greater number of effects are estimated for harbor porpoises and harbor seals due to their much higher abundances in the study area.</p> <p>Given the low numbers of Southern Resident killer whales and the similarity of the Phase II and Phase II proposed actions, it is not surprising that the predicted behavioral harassments in the Inland Waters portion of the study area were the same despite revisions to the quantitative analysis. Since the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, however, the Navy has incorporated new estimates of Southern Resident killer whale densities and distributions in the NWTT Offshore Area into the quantitative analysis of impacts. The revised density estimates are shown in the technical report <i>U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area</i> (amended September 20, 2019), available at www.nwtteis.com. As a result, the Navy has revised the number of behavioral takes of Southern Resident killer whales in this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>As described in the technical report, in practice, the Navy conservatively factors mitigation effectiveness (i.e., underestimated mitigation effectiveness) into its quantitative analysis process. To calculate a mitigation effectiveness score for each scenario, the Navy multiplied the Species Sightability Factor [g(0)] by a Visibility Factor [0.25, 0.5, 0.75, or 1], then by an Observation Area Factor [0, 0.5, or 1], and lastly by a Positive Control Factor [0, 0.5, or 1]. One example of why the Navy's method for calculating mitigation effectiveness is conservative is that the Navy assigns worst-case</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>scores (instead of typical-case scores) to each effectiveness factor. The Navy would assign an Observation Area Factor of 0, if for example, during an explosive missile exercise the intended detonation location could not be continuously visually observed. Multiplying 0 by the other mitigation factors would result in an overall mitigation effectiveness score of 0; therefore, the Navy would not take any credit for mitigation in its take estimate (i.e., would not reduce the number of model-estimated mortality takes based on mitigation).</p> <p>For NWTT, the Navy Acoustic Effects Model predicted zero mortalities of any marine mammal species due to explosives. Mitigation measures would reduce the risk of injury due to explosives, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation); however, no adjustments to the take estimates were made for mortality takes based on mitigation effectiveness because the model predicted zero mortalities.</p>
NRDC-04	<p>Here, disruption in gray whale behavior can act adversely with the inanition caused by lack of food, increasing the risk of stranding and lowering the risk of survival in compromised animals. Further, starving gray whales may travel into unexpected areas in search of food—a likely contributing cause of some of the ship-strikes observed in recently stranded animals. The Navy estimates that its activities will cause as many as 80 takes of gray whales each year, including two cases of temporary hearing loss caused by underwater explosives. <i>See passim</i> DSEIS at E-2 to E-37. In addition to improving the transparency of its analysis (see “Selection of Modeled Locations,” below), the Navy must carefully consider the biological context of behavioral disruption in that species and evaluate the potential for severe consequences in exposed whales.</p>	<p>Information about the quantitative analysis is described in detail in the 2018 technical report titled <i>Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing</i>. The Navy’s acoustic and explosive effects analysis looks at multiple factors such as gray whale abundance across the Study Area in each season, the levels of sound that may cause certain effects, and the Navy’s proposed time and space use of noise producing activities. As discussed in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Sections 3.4.2.1 and 3.4.2.2, a few instances of behavioral reaction or even minor to moderate TTS is not expected to have long-term consequences for individual gray whales.</p>
NRDC-05	<p>The Navy, following the criteria set forth in its 2017 technical report, has elected to base its estimates of mortality and non-auditory injury (such as lung damage) from explosives on a 50% averaging of risk rather than on the onset of risk. See DSEIS at 3.4-294 (Table 3.4-72). Both the 50% average and onset criteria account for variability in water depth and body mass; the difference between them appears to stem from natural variability in the data produced by the 45- year-old study on which the Navy’s criteria is founded, a study that exposed a range of terrestrial species to underwater explosives. Remarkably, the Navy uses the 50% average for its impact analysis while using onset for purposes of assessing the effectiveness of the Navy’s mitigation zones. DSEIS at 3.4-293 to 3.4-294.</p> <p>This approach is not consistent with the probability standards set forth in</p>	<p>The Navy used the range to 1 percent risk of mortality and injury (referred to as “onset” in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and since clarified as 1 percent risk of onset) to inform the development of mitigation zones for explosives, and similar to other thresholds, used the mean of onset for impact assessment. In all cases, the mitigation zones for explosives extend beyond the range to 1 percent risk of non-auditory injury, even for a small animal (representative mass = 5 kg).</p> <p>It is unclear what the commenter intends by asserting that the differences in thresholds are due to “natural variability,” whereas available injury data suggest that injury susceptibility is correlated to dose, among other factors. The Navy points the commenter to the technical report titled <i>Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)</i></p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	the Marine Mammal Protection Act (“MMPA”). The MMPA incorporates a standard of “significant potential” into its definition of “injury” for military readiness activities; this standard plainly differs from the higher “likelihood” standard that applies to behavioral disruption. Compare 16 U.S.C. §§ 1362(18)(B)(i) and (B)(ii). And while the probability standard for mortality is not specifically defined in the Act, Congress expressly amended the MMPA in 1994 to incorporate a “potential” standard in the wake of the Ninth Circuit decision in <i>U.S. v. Hiyashi</i> , 22 F.3d 859 (9th Cir. 1993). If the DSEIS is intended to serve NMFS’ purposes in rulemaking under the Marine Mammal Protection Act, as well as to represent a more conservative estimate of harm, the Navy cannot base its mortality and injury estimates on the mean.	(U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017h), available at www.nwtteis.com , for derivation of the Navy’s injury and mortality thresholds for underwater explosives. Over-predicting impacts would occur with the use of 1 percent non-auditory injury risk criteria in the quantitative analysis. The Navy, in coordination with NMFS, has determined that the mean onset incidence of occurrence is an appropriate threshold to analyze the “significant potential” for this effect under 16 U.S.C. §§ 1362(18)(B)(i), similar to other criteria that are based on mean data (e.g., auditory impacts).
NRDC-06	The Navy, while appearing finally to accept the strong evidentiary basis for decompression sickness in some sonar-exposed whales (DSEIS at 3.4-87), nonetheless discounts the leading explanation about the mechanism of sonar-related pathologies—maladaptive alteration of dive patterns—as uncertain. DSEIS at 3.4-88 to 3.4-89 (concluding, “It is uncertain as to whether there is some more easily-triggered mechanism for [bubble and fat emboli] specific to beaked whales or whether the phenomenon occurs only following rapidly occurring stranding events”). But this explanation has now been supported by numerous studies, including post- stranding pathology, laboratory study of organ tissue, and theoretical work on dive physiology, as well as by expert reviews, and is clearly best available science. As the Navy notes, experiments on common bottlenose dolphin to test for nitrogen bubble formation after sudden repetitive dives have found no evidence of gas bubble formation. But beaked whales, which are adapted to perform long and deep dives, show saturation of nitrogen levels near the ocean surface, making them particularly vulnerable. Even if some uncertainty exists around the physiological mechanism for bubble formation, with several viable models set forth by researchers (at described at DSEIS at 3.4-88), the science still indicates that the effect is likely to be behaviorally mediated and occurs in beaked whales apart from strandings. The DSEIS concludes its discussion of gas-bubble formation by arguing, in a single dismissive sentence, that “the rarity of observations of bubble pathology” makes it “discountable” for purposes of the Navy’s impact analysis here. In fact, the rarity of those observations is easily attributable to many factors that limit the availability of beaked whales to analysis, including the offshore, deep-water occurrence of these species and the	The Navy considered the best available science on bubble pathology, summarized in Section 3.7.3.1.1.1 (Injury – Nitrogen Decompression), to develop the conclusions presented in this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As thoroughly documented in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Section 3.4.2.1.1.1 (Injury), it is correct to state that there is uncertainty regarding the mechanism behind the bubble pathology exhibited in a small number of stranded beaked whales. Additionally, it appropriate to conclude that this effect would not be expected as a result of this proposed action. Only a small number of strandings have been associated with the use of U.S. Navy sonar; none of these have occurred in the Study Area. Information on the beaked whale strandings associated with Navy training and testing activities is provided in the Navy’s technical report titled <i>Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities</i> (2017), available at www.nwtteis.com . The Navy’s analysis, based on the best available science, indicates that beaked whales would not suffer this injury due this proposed action. Additionally, the Navy’s behavioral response criteria takes into account the greater sensitivity of these species to acoustic disturbance.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	short window that exists for assaying tissue for the purpose, as the literature has made clear. The Navy's one-sentence dismissal of these impacts is arbitrary. For purposes of analysis, the Navy must assume that some number of beaked whales are subject to injury from gas-bubble formation, and will suffer gas-bubble formation, under certain conditions of sonar exposure.	
NRDC-07	The criteria that the Navy's SPAWAR command has produced to estimate temporary and permanent threshold shift in marine mammals, and that the Navy applies here, are erroneous and non-conservative. Wright (2015) has identified several statistical and numerical faults in the Navy's approach, such as pseudo-replication, use of means rather than onset, and inconsistent treatment of data, that tend to bias the proposed criteria towards an underestimation of effects. Similar and additional issues were raised by a dozen scientists during the public comment period on the draft criteria held by NMFS. At the root of the problem is the Navy's broad extrapolation from a small number of individual animals, mostly bottlenose dolphins, without taking account of what Racca et al. (2015b) have succinctly characterized as a "non- linear accumulation of uncertainty." The auditory impact criteria should be revised.	The permanent threshold shift/temporary threshold shift criteria and thresholds, as set by NMFS, include numerous conservative assumptions, such as (1) Navy assumes no recovery of hearing during time intervals between intermittent exposures. However, multiple studies from humans, terrestrial mammals, and marine mammals have demonstrated less temporary threshold shift from intermittent exposures compared to continuous exposures with the same total energy because hearing is known to experience some recovery in between noise exposures. Therefore, the Navy's approach is known to over-estimate the effects of intermittent noise sources such as tactical sonars. (2) Marine mammal temporary threshold shift data have shown that, for two exposures with equal energy, the longer duration exposure tends to produce a larger amount of temporary threshold shift. Since most marine mammal temporary threshold shift data have been obtained using exposure durations of tens of seconds up to an hour, much longer than the durations of many tactical sources, the use of the existing marine mammal temporary threshold shift data tends to over-estimate the effects of sonars with shorter duration signals. Since marine mammal hearing and noise-induced hearing loss data are limited, both in the number of species and in the number of individual's available, attempts to minimize pseudoreplication would further reduce these already limited data sets. Specifically, with marine mammal behavioral temporary threshold shift studies, behaviorally-derived data are only available for two mid-frequency cetacean species (bottlenose dolphin, beluga) and two phocids in water pinniped species (harbor seal and northern elephant seal), with OW pinnipeds and high-frequency cetaceans only having behaviorally-derived data from one species. Arguments from Wright (2015) regarding pseudo replication within the temporary threshold shift data are therefore largely irrelevant in a practical sense because of limited data. Multiple data points were not included for the same individual at a single frequency - if multiple data existed at one frequency, the lowest temporary threshold shift onset was always used. There is only a single frequency where temporary threshold shift onset data exist for two individuals of the same species: 3 kHz for dolphins. Their temporary threshold shift (unweighted) onset values were 193 and 194 dB re

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2\text{s}$. Thus, Navy believes that the current approach makes the best use of the given data. Appropriate means of reducing pseudoreplication may be considered in the future, if more data become available. Many other comments from Wright (2015) and the comments from Racca et al. (2015b) appear to be erroneously based on the idea that the shapes of the auditory weighting functions and temporary threshold shift/permanent threshold shift exposure thresholds are directly related to the audiograms; i.e., that changes to the composite audiograms would directly influence the threshold shift/permanent threshold shift exposure functions [e.g., Wright (2015) describes weighting functions as “effectively the mirror image of an audiogram” (p. 2) and states “The underlying goal was to estimate how much a sound level needs to be above hearing threshold to induce temporary threshold shift.” (p. 3) — both statements are incorrect and suggest a fundamental misunderstanding of the criteria/threshold derivation.] This would require a constant (frequency-independent) relationship between hearing threshold and temporary threshold shift onset that is not reflected in the actual marine mammal temporary threshold shift data. Attempts to create a “cautionary” outcome by artificially lowering the composite audiogram thresholds would not necessarily result in lower temporary threshold shift/permanent threshold shift exposure levels, since the exposure functions are to a large extent based on fitting mathematical functions to the existing temporary threshold shift data.</p>
NRDC-08	<p>Further, in estimating the number of instances of injury and mortality, the DSEIS makes two post hoc adjustments, significantly reducing the totals based on presumed animal avoidance and mitigation effectiveness. These two reductions are arbitrary and non-conservative.</p> <p>By itself, the Navy’s avoidance adjustment effectively reduces the number of estimated auditory injuries by 95%, on the assumption that marine mammals initially exposed to three or four sonar transmissions at levels below those expected to cause permanent injury would avoid injurious exposures. While it is certainly true that some marine mammals will flee the sound, there are no data to inform how many would do so, let alone that 95% would move as expeditiously as the Navy presumes. Marine mammals may remain in important habitat, and the most vulnerable individuals may linger in an area, notwithstanding the risk of harm; marine mammals cannot necessarily predict where an exercise will travel; and Navy vessels engaged in certain activities may move more rapidly than a marine mammal that is attempting to evacuate.</p>	<p>The commenter provides no scientific basis for asserting that incorporating NMFS-approved animal avoidance into the quantitative analysis (referred to as “two post hoc adjustments”) is “arbitrary and non-conservative.” Consideration of these factors, along with propagation and exposure modeling in the Navy Acoustic Effects Model, provides the best estimate of potential impacts under this proposed action.</p> <p>Sound levels diminish quickly below levels that could cause PTS. Studies have shown that the vast majority of animals are likely to avoid sound levels that could cause injury to their ear and would initiate avoidance at even lower received levels [see Section 3.4.2.1.1.5 (Behavioral Reactions)]. Behavioral response literature, including the recent 3S and SOCAL BRS studies, indicate that multiple species from different cetacean suborders do in fact avoid approaching sound sources by a few hundred meters or more, which would reduce received sound levels for individual marine mammals to levels below those that could cause permanent threshold shift (PTS). Specifically, for the most powerful hull-mounted sonar source, the ranges to PTS for most marine</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Avoidance adjustments were first used in 2012, for an environmental impact report prepared under the California Environmental Quality Act; in that case, the authors, to compensate for their non-conservative assumptions about avoidance, presumed that every instance of permanent threshold shift would result in biological removal of the individual. As the Marine Mammal Commission has repeatedly advised, the Navy should not adjust for avoidance here.	<p>mammal groups are within a few tens of meters, and the ranges for the most sensitive group, the high-frequency cetaceans, average about 200 meters. PTS ranges for other sources are even shorter. Thus, an animal may avoid sound levels that could cause PTS while remaining in its current habitat.</p> <p>Assuming a typical marine mammalian swim speed, animals present beyond the range to onset PTS for the first three to four pings of an MF1 source could avoid onset PTS. In reality, animals may avoid at greater speeds, and ranges to onset PTS for many sources would be even shorter, than assumed for analyzing avoidance in this impact assessment. This means the potential for PTS may be lower than predicted by this quantitative analysis. A detailed analysis, including information on swim speeds, is provided in the 2018 technical report titled <i>Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing</i>. Nevertheless, some animals could be caught off-guard at the beginning of, or after a pause in a training or testing event. Therefore, the Navy acknowledges that some animals could receive PTS and has estimated these impacts in the analysis. Avoidance adjustments to the raw output from the NAEMO are necessary because, as described in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonars and Other Transducers) and Section 3.4.2.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives), animals (i.e. computer representations of individual marine mammals) in the model are not programmed to avoid sound sources or move horizontally in any way.</p>
NRDC-09	<p>The Navy's adjustment of mortality numbers for "mitigation effectiveness," which incorporates the methodology set forth in a 2018 technical report (DSEIS at 3.4-297 to 3.4-298), is also arbitrary.</p> <p>The Navy's analysis starts with the species-specific $g(0)$ factors applied in professional marine mammal abundance surveys, then multiplies them by a simple factor to reflect the relative effectiveness of its lookouts in routine operating conditions. Yet the Navy's sighting effectiveness is likely to be much poorer than that of experienced biologists dedicated exclusively to marine mammal detection, operating under conditions that maximize sightings.</p> <p>In the first place, the sighting conditions that may obtain during Navy activities are substantially inferior to those used to generate $g(0)$ factors in abundance surveys. As one NOAA paper observed, abundance survey rates decline significantly as sea states rise above Beaufort 1. Yet most Navy activities would be allowed to occur in all sea conditions and hours of day</p>	<p>The commenter provides no scientific basis for asserting that incorporating NMFS-approved mitigation effectiveness is arbitrary. Information about the quantitative analysis process, including the consideration of mitigation effectiveness, is described in detail in the 2018 technical report titled <i>Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing</i>. The Navy quantitatively assessed the effectiveness of its mitigation measures on a per-scenario basis for four factors: (1) species sightability, (2) a Lookout's ability to observe the range to PTS (for sonar and other transducers) and range to mortality (for explosives), (3) the portion of time when mitigation could potentially be conducted during periods of reduced daytime visibility (to include inclement weather and high sea state) and the portion of time when mitigation could potentially be conducted at night, and (4) the ability for sound sources to be positively controlled (e.g., powered down). Line-transect surveys and Navy training and testing activities are conducted for</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	(see DSEIS at Ch. 5 (“Mitigation”), and Beaufort sea states in areas proximate to Navy activities within the Northwest Study Area averaged Beaufort 5 across the previous three years—a point at which detection power is a small fraction of $g(0)$ for most species. (See Table 1 below for averages at representative NOAA buoy stations.)	<p>fundamentally different purposes. Differences exist between the areas observed, number of observers, observation tools and techniques, and types of observer experience. The Navy assessed these differences and determined that using $g(0)$ values derived from line-transect surveys is the best available scientific basis (i.e., statistically-derived values) for its species sightability factors. The $g(0)$ values used by the Navy for their mitigation effectiveness adjustments take into account the differences in sightability with sea state, and utilize averaged $g(0)$ values for sea states of 1–4 and weighted as suggested by Barlow (2015). This helps to account for reduced sightability in varying conditions. Using $g(0)$ values is an appropriate and conservative approach that underestimates the protection afforded by the Navy’s mitigation measures for the reasons detailed in the technical report. For example, during line-transect surveys, there are typically two primary observers. During Navy training and testing, there are routinely between one to four Navy Lookouts designated to observe the mitigation zones. During explosive activities, if additional platforms are participating, personnel positioned in those assets (e.g., safety observers, evaluators) will support observing the mitigation zone. During activities involving vessel movement, the Navy positions watch personnel to monitor for any indication of danger to the ship and the personnel on board. As a standard collision avoidance procedure, watch personnel also monitor for marine mammals that have the potential to be in the direct path of the ship. This can result in additional personnel observing a mitigation zone (e.g., during hull-mounted active sonar activities). To conservatively assess mitigation effectiveness, the Navy only accounts for the minimum number of Lookouts required for each activity. Therefore, the mitigation effectiveness factors may underestimate the likelihood that some marine mammals and sea turtles may be detected during activities that are supported by additional personnel who may also be observing a mitigation zone.</p> <p>Line-transect surveys are typically used to estimate cetacean and turtle abundance, and as such, are designed to cover a survey area uniformly in a straight line or grid pattern. Each primary line-transect observer looks for marine species in the forward 90-degree quadrant on their side of the survey platform and scans the water from the vessel out to the limit of the available optics (i.e., the horizon). For mitigation, Navy Lookouts focus their observations directly on the mitigation zone, which is several degrees of magnitude smaller than that used to calculate species sightability. For example, during hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar activities, the mitigation zone extends 1,000 yd. from the ship hull. During explosive</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		bombing activities, the mitigation zone is 2,500 yd. around the intended target, which is located directly beneath the firing platform. Some Navy training and testing activities are stationary or occur within a localized area. During these activities, Lookouts generally scan the same area of water during the activity, which offers a continuous opportunity to sight animals at that location, including animals that may have initially been underwater and not available to be seen. As previously described, the Navy's approach to estimating marine mammal impacts integrates a host of conservative assumptions to ensure that potential impacts are overestimated instead of underestimated.
NRDC-10	Second, the impact radius of many of the Navy's explosives extends far beyond the limited sighting distances used in vessel abundance surveys. The g(0) factor is predicated on sightings occurring directly on the trackline of the vessel, with detection rates dropping significantly as distance from the trackline increases. Yet the distances expected to cause permanent hearing loss in "high-frequency cetaceans" (i.e., porpoises) can run thousands of kilometers in all directions from both explosive sonobuoys and explosive torpedoes, and in both cases the mobile source can be kilometers away from Navy watchstanders when it detonates.	The commenter suggests that the Navy considered mitigation in its PTS estimates for explosive sources; however, this is incorrect. The Navy does not reduce PTS takes for explosives based on mitigation. The Navy conservatively assessed the likelihood that Lookouts would be able to visually observe the range to PTS for non-impulsive sources, and mortality for impulsive sources (e.g., explosives) for each training or testing scenario. As previously described, this is influenced by the size of the predicted impact ranges, location of the mitigation zone in proximity to the observation platform, type of observation platform (e.g., pier, small boat, large vessel, helicopter, fixed-wing aircraft), and number of Lookouts. The Navy also considered the objectives of each training and testing scenario to determine the opportunities for and capabilities of Lookouts to continuously visually observe the impact range, for example the range to mortality for explosives. If the range to mortality could not be observed during an activity, the Navy would not take any credit for mitigation in its take estimate (i.e., would not reduce the number of model-estimated mortality takes based on mitigation).
NRDC-11	Finally, Navy watchstanders have been shown to be significantly less effective than biologists, of the sort used in professional abundance surveys, in detecting marine mammals. We know from the Navy's own studies that watchstanders charged with implementing exclusion zones appear to fare much poorer in detecting marine mammals than do trained protected species observers, who are generally not allowed aboard ship. Given this—and given that)—Navy visual surveys can seldom approximate the sighting effectiveness of a large-vessel abundance survey. In any case, the public has no meaningful way to evaluate the Navy's adjustment further since the DEIS does not provide the scores used to generate the effectiveness factor, nor does it provide pre-adjustment take numbers.	The commenter incorrectly characterized the findings of the Watwood et al. 2016 report. As described in the report, the marine mammal observation study was conducted to further the Navy's understanding of several monitoring questions, including obtaining data to characterize the possible exposure of marine species to mid-frequency active sonar. As such, marine mammal observers were tasked with recording sightings within a 180-degree field in front of the ship out to the horizon, a significantly larger swath of water compared to the 1,000 yd. mitigation zone the Navy Lookouts were responsible for observing and reporting sightings around the vessel hull. The marine mammal observation team only observed two marine mammals when active sonar was on, and both animals were several thousand yards away

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		from the sonar source, and therefore outside of the mitigation zone and area in which Navy Lookouts were required report marine mammal sightings.
NRDC-12	<p>The Navy's post hoc adjustment for operational mitigation effectiveness is not a trivial or an abstract issue. It has the apparent effect of eliminating risk of mortality from explosives known to be of a power to kill marine mammals. Some experts have raised concerns that one Southern Resident orca mortality (L112) was caused by naval explosives or ordnance. We urge the Navy to provide more transparency about its modeling adjustment so that the public has the opportunity to comment on the Navy's analysis (40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.9(a), 1503.1(a), 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(D)), and to provide unadjusted mortality estimates.</p> <p>Table 1. Mean, standard deviation (S.D.), minimum (min.), and maximum (max.) wave height (m), and mean and range on Beaufort Sea State (B.S.S.) values for data collected at four buoys positioned within the Northwest Study Area from 2016 through 2018. Data source: NOAA National Buoy Data Center (NBDC) (2019).</p>	<p>As described previously and in the 2018 technical report titled Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing, credit taken for mitigation effectiveness is extremely conservative, and NMFS has concurred with the analytical approach used. In some instances, no mitigation credit for certain species or scenarios was taken (i.e., the Navy did not adjust mortality take estimates based on mitigation). For example, the model estimated zero (0) mortality takes of Southern Resident killer whales. Therefore, no adjustments were made for mitigation because there were no takes estimated by the model.</p> <p>As stated in the Navy's 2019 Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.2.1 (Acoustic Stressors) and Section 3.4.2.2 (Explosive Stressors), the conservative consideration of mitigation effectiveness is integral to the Navy's overall analysis of impacts from sonar and explosive sources. As discussed in the technical report, the Navy's acoustic effects model does not consider procedural mitigations (i.e., power-down or shut-down of sonars, or pausing explosive activities when animals are detected in mitigation zones around a detonation location), which necessitates consideration of these factors in the Navy's overall acoustic analysis. The National Marine Fisheries Service investigated the stranding of Southern Resident killer whale L-112 (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-133). No U.S. Navy training activities involving sonar or explosives were conducted between February 1 and 11, 2012, in the Northwest Training Range Complex (which includes Washington, Oregon, and northern California). Other anthropogenic activity, including other U.S. military, Royal Canadian Navy, fishing, or construction activities, were also ruled out as potential causes of the observed injuries.</p>
NRDC-13	<p>For example, two of the proposed behavioral response functions rely substantially on captive animal studies, even though it is generally accepted that captive animals, especially (but not limited to) those that have previously been trained, are likely to be less responsive to intrusive sound. More specifically, every data point that informs the pinniped function, and nearly two-thirds of the data points informing the odontocete function (30/49), are derived from a captive study. In the case of the odontocete function, the reliance on captive studies exacerbates that function's heavy dependence on the bottlenose dolphin, a species that is generally considered relatively insensitive, to represent a diverse set of</p>	<p>The commenter suggests that the Navy results are arbitrary; however, this is incorrect. The Navy uses the best available science in the analysis which has been reviewed by external scientists and approved by NMFS. The Navy has used all available data for the development of updated criteria and threshold, and limiting the data to the small number of field studies would not provide enough data with which to develop the new risk functions. In addition, the Navy accounts for the fact that captive animals may be less sensitive, and the scale at which a moderate to severe response was considered to have occurred is different for captive animals than for wild animals, as the Navy understands those responses will be different. Please see the 2018 technical</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	taxa with divergent sensitivity and reactivity to mid- frequency anthropogenic noise. If, for example, the number of wild killer whale data points (n=8) and captive bottlenose dolphin data points (n=30)—a discrepancy that owes itself to the greater accessibility of captive animals—were exchanged, such that killer whales represented the larger and bottlenose dolphins the lesser amount of data, the resulting response function would differ substantially. That result is entirely arbitrary.	report titled Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017) for details on how the Navy accounted for the differences in captive and wild animals in the development of the BRFs.
NRDC-14	Additionally, the risk functions do not incorporate (nor does the Navy apparently consider) a number of relevant studies on wild marine mammals, such as a passive acoustic study on blue whale vocalizations and a tagging study on behavioral responses to dipping sonar, even though received levels from these studies are either available or can be estimated. Some were included in the only published quantitative synthesis of behavioral response data, Gomez et al. (2016); others, like the dipping sonar study, appeared after that synthesis was published, and after the Navy produced its behavioral take functions two years ago. Exclusion of those studies fails to meet regulatory requirements that base evaluation of impacts on research methods generally accepted in the scientific community. See 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22(b)(4).	The new risk functions were developed in 2016, before several recent papers were published or the data were available. As new science is published, the Navy continues to evaluate the information. It is unreasonable to revise and update the criteria and risk functions every time a new paper is published. These new and future papers provide additional valuable information, and the Navy has already begun to consult them for updates to the criteria in the future. Although not incorporated into the behavioral response functions, relevant new studies are not excluded from the analysis in this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Thus far, no new information has been published or otherwise conveyed that would fundamentally change the assessment of impacts or conclusions of this Final EIS/OEIS. To be included in the behavioral response function, data sets needed to relate known or estimable received levels to observations of individual or group behavior. Melcon et al. (2012) does not relate observations of individual/group behavior to known or estimable received levels [at that individual/group]. In Melcon et al. (2012), received levels at the HARP buoy averaged over many hours are related to probabilities of D-calls, but the received level at the blue whale individuals/group are unknown.
NRDC-15	It is not clear from the DSEIS or from the Navy's associated technical report on acoustic "criteria and thresholds" exactly how each of the studies the Navy employed were applied in the analysis, or how the functions were fitted to the data, but the available evidence on behavioral response raises concerns that—withstanding the DSEIS' claims to the contrary—the functions are not conservative for some species. For this reason and others, we ask the Navy to make additional technical information available, including expert elicitation and peer review (if any), so that the public can fully comment pursuant to NEPA.	As stated in Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers), the derivation of the BRFs is provided in the 2017 technical report titled Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III). The appendices to this report detail the specific data points used to generate the BRFs. Data points come from published data that is readily available and cited within the technical report.
NRDC-16	As noted above, dipping sonar, like hull-mounted sonar, appears on the basis of preliminary data to be a significant predictor of deep-dive rates in beaked whales on the Navy's SOAR range, with the dive rate falling	The Navy relied upon the best science that was available to develop the BRFs in consultation with NMFS. The Navy's current beaked whale BRF acknowledges and incorporates the increased sensitivity observed in beaked

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>significantly (e.g., to 35% of that individual's control rate) during sonar exposure, and likewise appears associated with habitat abandonment. Importantly, these effects were observed at substantially greater distances (e.g., 30 or more km) from dipping sonar than would otherwise be expected given the systems' source levels and the beaked whale response thresholds developed from research on hull-mounted sonar. Researchers have hypothesized that the inherently unpredictable nature of dipping sonar—the inability of whales to track its progress in the water—make it a disproportionately powerful stressor. Yet all the data sources used to produce the Navy's behavioral response functions concern hull-mounted sonar, an R/V-deployed sonar playback, or an in-pool source. The Navy's generic behavioral response function for beaked whales thus does not incorporate their heightened response to these sources, although such a response would be presumed to shift the function "leftward." Nor do the response functions for other species account for this difference, although unpredictability is known to exacerbate stress response in a diversity of mammalian species and should conservatively be presumed, in this case, to lead to a heightened response in marine mammal species other than beaked whales.</p>	<p>whales during both behavioral response studies and during actual Navy training events. This article (Associating patterns in movement and diving behavior with sonar use during military training exercises: A case study using satellite tag data from Cuvier's beaked whales at the Southern California Anti-submarine Warfare Range, supra.) was not available at the time the behavioral response functions were developed. The new information and data presented in the new article was recently thoroughly reviewed the Navy and will be quantitatively incorporated into the Navy's future BRFs as appropriate. However, the Navy's current beaked whale BRF covers the responses observed in the new article since the beaked whale risk function is more sensitive than the other risk functions at lower received levels. Thus far, no new information has been published or otherwise conveyed that would significantly change the assessment change the assessment of impacts or conclusions of this Final EIS/OEIS.</p>
NRDC-17	<p>As with injury and mortality, the Navy applies cut-offs in estimating the number of behavioral impacts on marine mammals. It is evident that these cut-offs significantly affect the Navy's estimates. The DSEIS postulates that the cutoffs would zero-out take estimates at a point where, using the Navy's response functions, 25% of all odontocetes other than beaked whales and harbor porpoises, 13% of all mysticetes, and 18% of all pinnipeds and mustelids (i.e., sea otters) would be considered to have a potentially significant behavioral response. DSEIS at 3.4-150 (Table 3.4-13).</p> <p>Applying this post hoc adjustment makes no sense theoretically, as the Marine Mammal Commission pointedly observes in its comments, since distance is already incorporated in the Navy's new behavioral response functions as a contextual factor. In other words, distance is already accounted for in the data and analyses from the which the behavioral response functions were derived. More than this, the Navy's chosen cut-offs, which for each hearing class were grounded in little to no information, are plainly inconsistent with the available data, including but not limited to blue whale feeding response, blue whale vocalization response, controlled exposures of beaked whales, and opportunistic data from at least one mass stranding, of melon-headed whales, associated with sonar use. Indeed, a</p>	<p>Cut-off distances are only applied as a component of the behavioral response criteria, not injury or mortality criteria. The consideration of proximity (cut-off distances) was part of the criteria developed in consultation with NMFS and was applied within the Navy's acoustic effects model. Cut-off distances were used to better reflect the take potential for military readiness activities as defined in the MMPA. As stated in Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.7.3.1.2.1, the derivation of the behavioral response functions and associated cut-off distances is provided in the 2017 technical report titled Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III). Briefly, much of the data used to derive the behavioral response functions was from nearby, scaled sources, thereby potentially confounding results since it is difficult to tell whether the focal marine mammal is reacting to the sound level or the proximity of the source and/or vessel amongst other potentially confounding contextual factors that are unlike actual Navy events for which the behavioral response functions (BRFs) were derived. To account for these non-applicable contextual factors, all available data on marine mammal reactions to actual Navy activities and sound sources (or other large-scale activities such as seismic surveys when information on proximity to sonar sources is not available for a given species group, i.e. harbor porpoises) were reviewed to find the farthest distance to which significant behavioral</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>recent controlled exposure study of Northern bottlenose whales designed to investigate this very issue concluded that received level, and not distance, drove responses to sonar in this beaked whale species even at distances somewhat beyond the cutoffs used by the Navy here. The Navy appears to respond to this criticism by doubling its cutoffs where higher-intensity sonar or multi-platform sonar activities are concerned, but these adjustments do not cure the inconsistencies with the data we have cited above.</p> <p>As the Marine Mammal Commission notes, "Use of cut-off distances could be perceived as an attempt to reduce the numbers of takes." We urge the Navy to abandon this arbitrary, consequential, and highly concerning element in its new analysis.</p>	<p>reactions were observed. These distances were rounded up to the nearest 5 or 10 km interval, and for moderate to large scale activities using multiple or louder sonar sources, these distances were greatly increased --- doubled in most cases. The Navy's BRFs applied within these distances is currently the best known method for providing the public and regulators with a more realistic (but still conservative where some uncertainties exist) estimate of impact and potential take under military readiness for the proposed actions within this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The commenter claims the cut-offs are inconsistent with available data. This claim is inaccurate, and the data cited to support this claim were considered in the development of the analysis in this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. To be included in the behavioral response function, data sets needed to relate known or estimable received levels to observations of individual or group behavior. Thus, the data from Goldbogen et al. (2013) was directly used in the development of the behavioral criteria. Although Wensveen et al. (2019) was not published when the behavioral criteria were developed, the cutoff distances encompass the most distant detected responses in that study. In Melcon et al. (2012), received levels at the HARP buoy averaged over many hours are related to probabilities of D-calls, but the received level at the blue whale individuals/group and corresponding distances to the source are unknown. The link between sonar use and the melon-headed whale stranding at Hanalei Bay is speculative and not strongly supported by available evidence; see the technical report titled Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (available at www.nwtteis.com).</p>
NRDC-18	<p>For purposes of take estimation, the DSEIS assumes that marine mammals do not respond behaviorally to single explosive detonations, beyond a brief alerting response that would not constitute a significant alteration in behavior. This assumption appears to derive from final rules issued under the Marine Mammal Protection Act for ship-shock trials in the late 1990s and 2000s, and is entirely without empirical support.</p> <p>The Navy's preferred alternative provides for detonations with net explosive weights up to 650 lbs. There is no reason for the Navy to assume, as the Marine Mammal Commission observes, that a marine mammal "would exhibit a significant behavioral response to two 5-lb. charges detonated within a few minutes of each other but would not exhibit a similar response for a single detonation of 50 lbs., let alone detonations of more than 500 lbs." In response to comments made on other Draft Environmental Impact Statements, concerned with other ranges, the</p>	<p>Marine mammals may be exposed to isolated impulses in their natural environment (e.g., lightning). There is no evidence to support that animals have significant behavioral responses (rising to the level of 'harassment' under the MMPA definition for military readiness activities) to temporally and spatially isolated explosions. Still, the analysis conservatively assumes that any modeled instance of temporally or spatially separated detonations occurring in a single 24-hour period would result in harassment under the MMPA for military readiness activities. Further, the criteria do not preclude the consideration of animals being behaviorally disturbed during single explosions if they are exposed above the TTS threshold, which is only 5 dB higher than the behavioral harassment threshold. The range to effect for TTS would be correlated to the size of the explosive.</p> <p>The Navy has been monitoring detonations since the 1990s and has not observed significant behavioral reactions. To clarify, this monitoring has</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>agency justified its position by claiming it had not observed significant behavioral responses to single detonations in the course of its observations since the 1990s. Yet the Navy's monitoring effort around underwater explosives is often limited and is focused, where it occurs, on preventing injuries and mortalities within the blast radius, not on detecting marine mammal behavioral responses.</p> <p>The literature on responses to explosions does not distinguish between single and multiple detonations. It is arbitrary for the Navy, in estimating takes and assessing impacts, to assume that only multiple rounds of in-water detonations can cause behavioral takes.</p>	<p>occurred under the monitoring plans developed specifically for shock trials, the detonations with the largest net explosive weight conducted by the Navy (no shock trials are proposed in this Study Area).</p>
NRDC-19	<p>The delineation of Biologically Important Areas by NOAA, the updates made by the Navy to its predictive habitat models, and evidence of additional important habitat areas within the Northwest Study Area, provide the opportunity for the agencies to improve upon their current approach to the development of alternatives by improving resolution of their analysis of operations.</p> <p>Recognizing that important habitat areas imply the non-random distribution and density of marine mammals in space and time, both the spatial location and the timing of training and testing events in relation to those areas is a significant determining factor in the assessment of acoustic impacts. Levels of acoustic impact are likely to be under- or over-estimated depending on whether the location of the modeled event is further from the important habitat area, or closer to it, than the actual event. Thus, there is a need for the Navy to compile and provide more information regarding the number, nature, and timing of testing and training events that take place within, or in close proximity to, important habitat areas, and to refine its scale of analysis of operations to match the scale of the habitat areas that are considered to be important.</p> <p>While the DSEIS, in assessing environmental impacts on marine mammals, breaks down estimated impacts by population, little detail is provided about assumptions concerning modeled locations and times of year, making it impossible for the public to assess the reasonableness of the Navy's impact analysis in capturing the distribution of the activities proposed in the document. See, e.g., DSEIS at 2-28 TO 2-38 (e.g., defining numerous activities as simply occurring "[o]ffshore"). Furthermore, without knowing more about the modeled sites, it is impossible to assess the reasonableness of the Navy's "take" numbers in representing the amount of take that the Navy will propose for authorization under the Marine Mammal Protection Act.</p>	<p>The EIS/OEIS is structured to provide flexibility in training and testing locations, timing, and number. Many factors influence actual training and testing locations that cannot be predicted in advance (e.g., weather), so the analysis must allow for flexibility. The analysis must consider multiple Navy training and testing activities over large areas of the ocean for a 7-year period; therefore, analyzing activities in multiple locations over multiple seasons produces the best estimate of impacts/take to inform the EIS/OEIS and regulators. The scale at which spatially explicit density models are structured is determined by the data collection method and the environmental variables that are used to build the model. A number of variables that are meaningful to marine mammal species, such as sea surface temperature, do not vary or affect species on a fine scale. Expecting fine scale resolution from the Navy's density database may force artificial granularity on species for which it is not biologically meaningful at the population level. Therefore, given the variables that determine when and where the Navy trains and tests and the resolution of the density data, the analysis of potential impacts cannot be scaled to specific habitat areas, and is used to provide the EIS/OEIS and the regulator with the information necessary to determine potential impacts/take for a population of animals. Specific modeled locations are not disclosed in public documents because of national security concerns, and information regarding the exact location of sonar usage is classified. Furthermore, the Navy requires large areas of sea space because it trains in a manner to avoid observation by potential adversaries. Modern sensing technologies make training on a large scale without observation more difficult. A foreign military's continual observation of U.S. Navy training in predictable (e.g., compiled and publicly disclosed) geographic areas and timeframes would enable foreign nations to gather intelligence and</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>This is important in ensuring that the Navy’s activities do not exceed annual levels of authorized take—and that sufficient measures are taken to protect particularly vulnerable marine mammal populations, such as the critically endangered Southern Resident orca and the struggling California gray whale.</p> <p>We recommend that the Navy provide further information on modeled locations, and determine the worst-case take estimate if activities take place in the highest-density areas that are authorized and not excluded from use through geographic mitigation.</p>	<p>subsequently develop techniques, tactics, and procedures to potentially and effectively counter U.S. naval operations.</p> <p>Still, the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS provides a significant level of information about the locations of specific activities in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) and Appendix A (Activity Descriptions). Chapter 2 also describes Standard Operating Procedures that may influence activity location. Lastly, Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) describe Mitigation Areas that would be implemented under the proposed action.</p> <p>In addition to the above considerations, conservative assumptions in the quantitative assessment process, as described in the technical report titled <i>Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing</i> (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018c); conservative application of marine mammal behavioral response data in the development of behavioral response criteria, as described in the technical report titled <i>Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)</i> (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017h); and implementation of the adaptive management process under Letter of Authorization under the Marine Mammal Protection Act for the proposed action ensure that the level of authorized take would not be exceeded. Both technical reports are available at www.nwtteis.com.</p>
NRDC-20	<p>As a threshold matter, it is unclear where in the DSEIS this analysis of the environmental effects of Growler training in the offshore area appears. For example, while the Navy points to its cumulative effects discussion for this analysis, that chapter is limited to the observation that “[t]hese proposed operations, when considered with the Proposed Action, could add to the cumulative impacts on air quality, birds, noise, socioeconomic resources, cultural resources, and American Indian and Alaska Native Traditional resources.” DSEIS at 4-4 (Table 4.3-1). Nor does Appendix J, which summarizes the modeled noise impacts to human health, recreational, and aesthetic values, discuss the impacts of Growler operations within the training range.</p>	<p>The analysis of the Growler training in the Offshore area appears in the various resource sections. For example, impacts to fishes or marine mammals from aircraft overflights can be found in those sections (3.9.3.1.4, Impacts from Aircraft Noise [Fishes], or 3.4.2.1.4, Impacts from Aircraft Noise [Marine Mammals]). Because aircraft pose a potential strike hazard to birds, the analysis of that potential is found in Section 3.6.2.4.1 (Impacts from Aircraft and Aerial Target Strikes).</p>
NRDC-21	<p>Second, as the Navy admits, its analysis of the impacts from Growler overflights has been parceled out into multiple actions and multiple EISs. DSEIS at 1-10. The Navy attempts to justify these segmented analyses based on its belief that each of the Growler expansion and training activities—as well as the training purportedly considered in the DSEIS</p>	<p>The Navy prepares Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) and Environmental Assessments (EA) in order to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). These NEPA documents are intended to ensure decision makers consider the potential environmental effects of a proposed action and its alternatives, provide an opportunity for public involvement, and promote</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>itself—are disconnected from one another but “cumulatively” addressed in each of these documents. DSEIS at 1-10, 4-1, 4-4. Federal agencies, however, cannot segment or manipulate the scope of their actions in order to evade the full environmental impact analysis that NEPA demands. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(7) (“Significance cannot be avoided by ... breaking [an action] down into small component parts.”). Rather, when determining the scope of its environmental review under NEPA, an agency must consider “connected, cumulative, and similar actions” together to prevent an agency from “dividing a project into multiple ‘actions,’ each of which individually has an insignificant environmental impact, but which collectively have a substantial impact.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.25; see, e.g., <i>Earth Island Inst. v. U.S. Forest Serv.</i>, 351 F.3d 1291, 1305 (9th Cir. 2003). The Navy’s attempt to subdivide its analysis of these impacts violates these requirements and impermissibly risks masking significant effects to terrestrial and marine wildlife because the sum of these parts does not make a whole. Neither the Growler EIS, nor the electronic warfare EA, nor the NWTT EIS adequately and completely analyzes the impacts of Growler overflights and training on marine and terrestrial wildlife.</p>	<p>transparency by informing the public of these potential environmental effects. Each NEPA document addresses a specific proposed action, separated from other actions by its purpose and need, independent utility, timing, and geographic location. Some NEPA documents are stand-alone documents; others tier off or expand the analyses of other NEPA documents. NEPA documents that analyze the potential impacts of training and testing activities, including this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, support the purpose and need of the Navy to both successfully train naval forces and test naval capabilities for eventual employment in military operations. NEPA documents for aircraft homebasing actions focus on aircraft operations in and around the airfield and their facility needs. NEPA documents for installations focus on infrastructure enhancements for host and tenant command missions. Importantly, every environmental document considers the cumulative impacts to the environment from other relevant past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (federal, state, local, and private) in addition to the proposed action.</p>
NRDC-22	<p>Third, the Navy’s limited discussion in the DSEIS, and in the other NEPA documents, of the impacts of Growler training and overflights in the NWTT area fails to satisfy NEPA’s “hard look” requirements. It is clear that the presence of Growlers and other aircraft throughout this region can disrupt wildlife, including marine mammals. Multiple studies and literature reviews have documented effects of aircraft on the behavior of cetaceans. These effects range from diving in response to the presence of aircraft to defensive behaviors and directional change.</p> <p>It is also clear from the literature that noise from aircraft transfers to the water column at biologically meaningful volumes. Indeed, as the Navy notes in the DSEIS, but does not bring forward for analysis, modeling specific to Growlers demonstrates that sound levels from overflights can range from 152 dB re 1 µPa at 2 meters below the water surface for a subsonic flight at 1,000 ft., to 128 dB re 1 µPa at 2 meters below the water surface for subsonic flight at 10,000 ft. DSEIS at 3-19 (Table 3.0-4). These levels plainly exceed, for example, the 120 dB re 1 µPa threshold that coincided in one study with the onset of behavioral responses, in orcas, to vessel noise. And sonic booms from Growlers can also produce noise at levels far above those causing behavioral changes.</p> <p>Growlers will be using the Olympic MOAs and Warning Areas 237A and B,</p>	<p>The studies cited in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS support the Navy’s conclusions regarding aircraft noise impacts to species present in the Study Area. The Navy used the best available data, science, and information accepted by the relevant and appropriate regulatory and scientific communities in its analysis in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Administrative Procedure Act (5 United States Code sections 551–596), and Executive Order 12114. Specifically, best available science used to inform the assessment of impacts to marine mammals from aircraft noise is provided in Section 3.4.2.1.1.5 (Behavioral Reactions – Behavioral Reactions to Aircraft Noise) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). Section 3.0.3.1.3 (Aircraft Noise) characterizes aircraft noise stressors in the Study Area, while Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis for the Olympic Military Operations Area) characterizes aircraft noise in the Olympic MOA and W-237. Appendix D (acoustic and Explosive Concepts) explains the conditions under which airborne sound may enter the water.</p> <p>The modeled values cited in Table 3.0-4 are for an F/A-18, not a EA-18G. Information regarding flight activity specific to the Olympic MOA and W-237 that would impact the sound level transmitted underwater (i.e., flight altitude) is provided in Appendix J of this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>and transiting to and from these areas to Whidbey Island NAS tens to hundreds of thousands of times during the period evaluated in the DSEIS. This offshore area and those in the Salish Sea represent a significant part of Southern Resident orca habitat—much of it designated as critical habitat—but the Navy does not discuss effects to this habitat or to cetaceans or other marine mammals anywhere in the DSEIS, or any of the other NEPA analyses prepared for this overflight activity.</p> <p>For the above reasons, the Navy must provide further information on the noise impacts from aircraft. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22. Further, we recommend that the Navy consult with NMFS to determine the effects of this significant aggregate of overflights on marine mammals, including, but not limited to, critically endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales.</p>	<p>majority of fixed-wing aircraft flights in the Study Area would occur at altitudes greater than 6,000 ft. MSL. All aircraft fixed-wing aircraft flights would occur at altitudes greater than 6,000 ft. MSL in the Olympic MOA, including the portion of the MOA over the Offshore Area within 3 NM of shore. The sound from aircraft overflight noise is short duration and widely dispersed; therefore, there is a low probability for potential overlap with an animal near the surface. Sound from aircraft overflight noise lacks the amplitude and duration to cause hearing loss. Behavioral responses would be short-duration and are unlikely to cause a significant impact. The annual number of EA-18G sorties to and from the Olympic MOA and W-237 under Alternative 1 is given in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS as 2,524 sorties and would not equate to hundreds of thousands of sorties over a 7-year period as suggested in the comment. In addition, going supersonic 30 NM or closer to shore and over land is not allowed in the Pacific Northwest during military readiness activities, and it is unlikely that supersonic flight training will occur. If a training need should occur for supersonic flight it will comply with Navy regulations CNAF M-3710.7.</p> <p>Brief, transient broadband noise at low received levels in the water due to aircraft flights under this proposed action would not disrupt natural behavioral patterns including, but not limited to, migration, surfacing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering to a point where such behavioral patterns are abandoned or significantly altered. Aircraft noise in Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat is discussed in Section 3.4.2.1.4 (Impacts from Aircraft Noise). The Navy has consulted with NMFS in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. In addition, the Navy has conducted conferencing with NMFS on proposed Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.</p>
NRDC-23	<p>In order to satisfy NEPA, an EIS must include a “full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.1. It is not enough, for purposes of this discussion, to consider the proposed action in isolation, divorced from other public and private activities that impinge on the same resource; rather, it is incumbent on the Navy to assess cumulative impacts as well, including the “impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future significant actions.” Id. § 1508.7. A meaningful cumulative impact analysis must identify (1) the area in which the effects of the proposed project will be felt; (2) the impacts that are expected in that area from the proposed project; (3) other actions—past,</p>	<p>Please see response below regarding aggregate impacts to marine mammals.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	present, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable—that have had or are expected to have impacts in the same area; (4) the impacts or expected impacts from these other actions; and (5) the overall impact that can be expected if the individual impacts are allowed to accumulate. Grand Canyon Trust v. FAA, 290 F.3d 339, 345 (D.C. Cir. 2002) (quotation and citation omitted).	
NRDC-24	<p>As with past analyses, the present DSEIS tabulates exposures and takes of marine mammal species but has not adequately assessed the aggregate impacts. On the contrary, it assumes, without explanation, that the accumulated annual mortalities, injuries, energetic costs, temporary losses of hearing, chronic stress, and other impacts would not affect vital rates in individuals or populations, even though the Navy’s activities would affect the same populations over time.</p> <p>This assumption seems predicated, for many species, on the unsupported notion that transient activity will not accumulate into population-level harm. The DSEIS makes this assertion even for species such as harbor porpoises (see DSEIS at 3.4-232 to 3.4-237), for which it estimates auditory injury, temporary hearing loss, and behavioral disruption at extraordinarily high numbers relative to the size of individual populations. See <i>Motor Veh. Mfrs. Ass’n v. State Farm Ins.</i>, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983) (holding an agency arbitrary and capricious where, inter alia, it “offered an explanation for its decision that runs counter to the evidence before [it]”).</p> <p>Ultimately, the DSEIS states, “The best assessment of long-term consequences from Navy training and testing activities will be to monitor the populations over time within the Study Area” (DSEIS at 3.4-133). But while we strongly concur with the Navy that long-term monitoring is critical, that monitoring cannot substitute for an adequate assessment of the aggregate effects of those activities. Nor can the Navy’s summary dismissal of impacts substitute for the more robust population consequences analyses performed by other parties for an increasing number of other actions, such as for harbor porpoises exposed to pile-driving in the North Sea. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22(b)(4) (requiring use of “theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community”).</p>	<p>No mortalities or non-auditory injuries are predicted under the Proposed Action for any marine mammal species including harbor porpoises. The vast majority of estimated impacts to marine mammals are instances of behavioral response, followed by instances of temporary threshold shift, both considered Level B under the MMPA. A small proportion of a few species such as harbor porpoises are estimated to receive instances of PTS. It is unclear if or how a PTS would affect the fitness of an individual, although this uncertainty is considered when analyzing long-term consequences for individuals and populations and applying this to the overall aggregate impacts.</p> <p>Aggregate impacts are assessed in Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3 (Summary of Impacts [Combined Impacts of All Stressors] on Marine Mammals). In the NWT Study Area, unit-level military readiness activities occur over a small spatial scale with few participants, typically over a short duration (a few hours or less), while larger-scale training and testing events occur in locations outside of the Study Area. Predicting synergistic impacts of multiple stressors currently relies on speculation, but substantial efforts are underway to better understand possible aggregate effects through data collection. These efforts are not limited solely to long-term monitoring, but also include theoretical approaches and research methods generally accepted in the scientific community such as the Population Consequences of Disturbance model (see Section 3.4.2.1.1.7, Long-Term Consequences). Until there are sufficient data to inform such models, the best assessment of long-term consequences from Navy training and testing activities will be to monitor the populations over time on Navy ranges. The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area or at any Navy Range Complex. In addition, the Navy’s research and monitoring programs, described in Section 3.0.1.1.1 (Marine Species Monitoring and Research Programs) in Chapter 3.0 (Introduction), are focused on filling data gaps and obtaining the most up-to-date science to inform impact assessment.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Information about prior and current research being conducted on marine mammals on Navy ranges is in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals) and can be found at www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us . To date, the findings from the research and monitoring and regulatory conclusions from recent analyses by NMFS have been that the majority of impacts from military readiness activities are not expected to be deleterious with regard to fitness of any individuals, or cause long-term consequences to populations of marine mammals.
NRDC-25	<p>Nor does the Navy's treatment of cumulative impacts, adding the impacts of other reasonably foreseeable activities to its own projected training and testing, result in an adequate analysis. The DSEIS begins by listing numerous other military, commercial, and industrial activities in the region (DSEIS at 4-3 to 4-40), including Navy activities, such as Growler operations, that were purportedly covered in other NEPA documents; pier extensions and replacements; commercial fishing; and substantial maritime traffic. Unfortunately, in assessing the additive and synergistic impacts of these activities, the Navy provides only abstract rationalization.</p> <p>In the case of marine mammals, for example, the Navy relies on its findings from the 2015 EIS, to conclude that "the incremental contribution of the Proposed Action would be negligible" and to rule out any further analysis of marine mammals. DSEIS at 4-43. Yet this misstates the actual conclusion of the Navy's previous analysis. The 2015 EIS recognized that "the current aggregate impacts of past and present actions and reasonably foreseeable future actions are expected to result in recoverable impacts to most marine mammal species, and significant impacts on some in the Study Area"; that, "[t]herefore, cumulative impacts on marine mammals would be significant" even without consideration of the additional impacts caused by the proposed training and testing activities; but that, compared to other actions, the Navy's "relative contribution would be low." The fact that an activity's "relative contribution would be low" does not mean that it is "negligible," as the Navy concludes here, and not in need of further analysis. See <i>Klamath-Siskiyou Wildlands Ctr. v. BLM</i>, 387 F.3d 989, 994 (9th Cir. 2004) (stating that "[a] proper consideration of the cumulative impacts of a project requires some quantified or detailed information"). On the contrary, NEPA requires review of the cumulative impacts resulting from "individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time" (40 C.F.R. 1508.7). That requirement is all the more important where, as the Navy previously acknowledged, cumulative</p>	<p>The Navy, in cooperation with NMFS, has taken a hard look at the cumulative effects of the incremental impact of its proposed actions when added to other past present and future actions, against the appropriate resources and regulatory baselines. The Navy used the best available science and a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop its Cumulative Impacts analysis. As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis is commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific EIS, discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental consequences). The EIS/OEIS considered its activities alongside other actions in the region when those impacts are cumulatively significant. Past and present actions are also included in the analytical process as part of the affected environment baseline conditions presented in Chapter 3. The Navy has done so in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality 1997 guidance. Per the guidance, a qualitative approach and best professional judgment are appropriate where precise measurements are not available. Where precise measurements and/or methodologies were available they were used. Guidance from the Council on Environmental Quality states it "is not practical to analyze cumulative effects of an action on the universe; the list of environmental effects must focus on those that are truly meaningful." All of the potential effects on marine mammals from Navy training and testing were analyzed in Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals). Based on the best available science, it was determined that population-level impacts would not occur. The commenter otherwise has provided no evidence that demonstrates stock or population-level consequences resulting from Navy training and testing activities have occurred, activities that have occurred in these areas at similar levels of intensity, for decades.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>impacts from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions are already “significant” for some species. Furthermore, as noted above, the Navy’s conclusion that its “relative contribution would be low” does not follow from the facts presented for some of the region’s marine mammal populations, such as harbor porpoises.</p> <p>At present, the Navy’s analysis of cumulative impacts is arbitrary and does not meet NEPA’s requirement to assess the overall impact of the accumulation of individual impacts.</p>	
NRDC-26	<p>There is no question that the Navy’s alternatives analysis is improved by the addition of a true “no-action” alternative. The Hawai’i District Court, in reviewing the Navy’s most recent EIS for Hawai’i and Southern California training and testing (“HSTT”) activities, concluded that that document failed to include such an alternative, which the NEPA regulations mandate to “provide a baseline against which the action alternatives are evaluated.” Conservation Council, 97 F. Supp. 3d at 1236 (citing Friends of Southeast’s Future v. Morrison, 153 F.3d 1059, 1065 (9th Cir. 1998)). The present DSEIS, in including the alternative—though immediately rejecting it as unreasonable (see DSEIS at 2-24)—purports to cure this clear deficiency. Describing the “no action” option cannot by itself, however, provide the choice among the full range of reasonable alternatives required by law. In an effort to provide that range, the Navy has developed a preferred alternative (“Alternative 1”) based on a “representative year of training” and “an annual level of testing that reflects the fluctuations in testing programs.” DSEIS at 2-25. The maximum level of training and testing is captured in the Navy’s only other action alternative (“Alternative 2”). Id. According to the DSEIS, the effect is to “reduce[] the amount of hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar estimated to be necessary to meet training requirements” (id.), which would be a welcome change. It does not appear, however, that the Navy’s preferred alternative will actually reduce the amount of sonar activity that takes place in the NWTT Study Area, as opposed to reflecting a pre-defined status quo. Indeed, the description provided in the DSEIS suggests that Alternative 1 better captures the “fluctuations” in activity that the Navy expects to occur. Id. at 2-25. Thus, for example, Alternative 1 anticipates that a particular anti-submarine warfare exercise will be run 75 times in the first year and 100 times in the second, and so forth, rather than the less realistic 100 times per year contemplated by Alternative 2. Id. at 2-29. The Navy’s preferred alternative provides a more accurate estimate of sonar and explosives activity, which is a significant improvement for analysis; yet its Alternative</p>	<p>The Navy’s alternatives were developed in order to satisfy the Navy’s purpose and need related to fulfilling its Title 10 requirements. The Navy has explored and evaluated all reasonable alternatives. Details regarding the development of reasonable alternatives are provided in Section 2.4 (Action Alternatives Development) and Section 2.4.2 (Alternatives Carried Forward). Consistent with 40 C.F.R. 1502.14, the Navy has included a robust suite of mitigation measures, which will be implemented in both action alternatives (i.e., whichever alternative is selected). These mitigation measures, as well as standard operating procedures that the Navy routinely employs, are discussed in detail and specifically inform the decision maker and the public how the Navy can avoid or minimize adverse impacts. NEPA identifies the application of mitigation measures, such as those suggested by the comment, to the alternatives “when not already included in the proposed action or alternative” (40 C.F.R. 1502.14).</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	2 is not a true alternative, in that it does not “avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.1 (stating purpose of an environmental impact statement). We urge the Navy to develop a fuller range of reasonable alternatives.	
NRDC-27	<p>The latest science, including the Navy’s own analysis, indicates an urgent need to extend mitigation to dipping sonar, which is deployed via cable from manned and unmanned aircraft.</p> <p>Dipping sonar, like hull-mounted sonar, appears on the basis of available data to be a significant predictor of deep-dive rates in beaked whales. Evidence indicates that beaked whales dive deeper and stay at depth during exposure to mid-frequency active sonar (possibly to escape from the sound, as the lowest sound pressure levels occur at depth), behavior that also extends the inter-deep-dive-interval (“IDDI,” a proxy for foraging disruption).80 IDDI’s were found to significantly lengthen upon exposure to MFAS, with the longest, lasting 541 and 641 minutes, recorded during helicopter-deployed mid-frequency active sonar at distances of ~17 and ~11 kilometers, respectively. These effects have been documented at substantially greater distances (~30 km) than would otherwise be expected given the systems’ source levels and the response thresholds developed from research on hull-mounted sonar. Deep-dive duration increases as distance to the helicopter decreases.</p> <p>Helicopters deploy mid-frequency active sonar from a hover in bouts generally lasting under 20 minutes, moving rapidly between sequential deployments in an unpredictable pattern, and thus whales may react more strongly to these sudden, close-range exposures even though their duration of use and source level (217 dB) are generally well below those of hull-mounted mid- frequency active sonar (235 dB). Dipping sonar is also deployed at depth, which may be another reason why it is relatively more impactful. This finding is consistent with the wider stress literature, for which predictability is a significant factor in determining stress-response from acoustic and other stimuli (Wright et al. 2007). It should thus be presumed conservatively to apply to marine mammal species other than beaked whales.</p> <p>The DSEIS projects a substantial increase in activities involving dipping sonar, from 14 annual events during the current cycle (2015-20) to 53 to 75 annual events under the Navy’s preferred alternative and 80 annual events under Alternative 2. DSEIS at 3-13 (bin MF4). The Navy must consider restricting or limiting use of dipping sonar during the present NEPA process.</p>	<p>The Navy did include mitigation for active sonar, including dipping sonar, in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, the Navy will not conduct Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Exercise – Helicopter, Maritime Patrol Aircraft, Ship, or Submarine training activities. These activities involve the use of MF4 and MF5.</p> <p>The Navy relied upon the best science that was available to develop the behavioral response functions in consultation with NMFS. The Navy’s current beaked whale BRF acknowledges and incorporates the increased sensitivity observed in beaked whales during both behavioral response studies and during actual Navy training events. The article cited in the comment (Falcone, 2017) was not available at the time the behavioral response functions were developed. The Navy will incorporate these findings into the Navy’s future behavioral response functions as appropriate. However, the Navy’s current beaked whale BRF covers the responses observed in the new article since the beaked whale risk function is more sensitive than the other risk functions at lower received levels. Although not incorporated into the behavioral response functions, relevant new studies are not excluded from the analysis in this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Thus far, no new information has been published or otherwise conveyed that would fundamentally change the assessment of impacts or conclusions of this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
NRDC-28	The Navy does not incorporate stand-off distances of any size within its management requirements for its proposed Mitigation Areas, providing only that activities not take place “within” the defined areas. See DSEIS at K-11 to K-13. Thus, activities that are otherwise restricted or limited within an Area could occur directly along the boundary and ensnare the Area at levels that can cause injury and increase the risk or severity of behavioral disruption. Stand-off distances are a reasonable mitigation measure that is routinely required by NMFS in authorizing take under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. 40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.14(f), 1503.3(d). The Navy must consider establishing stand-off distances around its Mitigation Areas to the greatest extent practicable, allowing for variability in size given the location of the Area, the type of operation at issue, and the species of concern.	The mitigation areas identified in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) represents the maximum mitigation within mitigation areas and the maximum size of mitigation areas that are practical to implement under the Proposed Action. Implementing additional mitigation (e.g., stand-off distances that would extend the size of the mitigation areas) beyond what is described in the appendix would be impractical due to implications for safety, sustainability, and the Navy’s ability to continue meeting its mission requirements. For example, as described in Section K.3.2.2.2 (Operational Assessment), creating stand-off distances from the 12 NM, 20 NM, and 50 NM limits within the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area would result in activities being conducted farther offshore. Moving activities farther offshore would be impractical due to decreased event realism, increased resource allocations and operational costs (due to extending distance offshore and proximity to Navy support facilities, which would increase fuel consumption, maintenance, and time on station), increased safety risks (associated with conducting training and testing at extended distances offshore and farther away from critical medical and search and rescue resources), and accelerated fatigue-life of aircraft and ships (leading to increased safety risk and higher maintenance costs). Increased resource allocations and operational costs would serve as a limiting factor for Navy surface units whose available underway times are constrained by available manpower and fuel expenses. This would also reduce training or testing opportunities during a platform’s limited available timeframes because increased time spent transiting to more distant training areas or test sites results in decreased time available for training or testing.
NRDC-29	As with the consent order entered by the court in Conservation Council for Hawai’i v. NMFS, 97 F.Supp.3d 1210 (D. Haw. 2015), the present DSEIS would allow the Navy to derogate from the measures associated with its mitigation areas, where necessary for national security, if certain conditions are met. Specifically, authorization must be granted, the Navy must provide NMFS with advance notice of the derogation and data on the activities conducted after the completion of events, and the Navy must provide information on those activities in its annual reports. See DSEIS at K-11 to K-12 (Table K-2). Unlike the consent order, however, the DSEIS does not clearly restrict derogation authority to highest-level officers. Under the consent order, authority could be invoked only by certain named officers representing the highest command authority, namely the Commander or Acting Commander of the Pacific Fleet, for training activities, and the Commander or Acting Commander of the various	As discussed in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) of the Navy’s 2018 Final HSTT EIS/OEIS, the Navy amended the level of permission authority for the HSTT Proposed Action so that the four-star Commander of the U.S. Pacific Fleet could delegate authority to another high-level Command authority for approval. Mitigation language in the NWTT Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS for obtaining permission from the “appropriate designated Command authority,” providing NMFS with advance notification, and including relevant information about the event in annual activity reports to NMFS prior to commencement of applicable activities is consistent with mitigation language included in the 2018 Final HSTT EIS/OEIS. The Navy expanded its suite of mitigation areas in NWTT Inland Waters and will implement additional mitigation beyond requiring Command approval and NMFS notification and annual reporting for certain activities, as detailed in

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	research branches for testing activities, and then only when the Navy “deems it necessary for national defense.” Stipulated Settlement Agreement and Order, Conservation Council, supra (Sept. 14, 2015). Similarly, at least some of the geographic areas adopted by the Navy in prior NEPA processes, such as the Humpback Whale Cautionary Area established in previous Hawaii- Southern California Training and Testing EISs, allowed for derogation only upon approval of the Pacific Fleet Commander. This requirement made it more likely that derogation decisions would be taken with the greatest seriousness and consideration. By contrast, the DSEIS is unclear in its designation, generally allowing units to obtain permission from “the appropriate delegated Command authority.” DSEIS at K-11 to K-12 (emphasis added). The Navy should clarify that authorization may be given only by the highest-level Command authorities, consistent with the consent order in Conservation Council.	Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) of this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
NRDC-30	That protection, however, though improved on the current NMFS authorization, would not be comprehensive, particularly for the Southern Resident orca population. Best available scientific information indicates that this population of orcas uses waters of the Pacific Ocean between Cape Flattery, Washington, and Point Reyes, California, extending approximately 47 miles offshore, between December and June. Id. In light of the observed impacts of noise disturbance, including active sonar, on Southern Resident orcas (see Section II.A.1), we recommend the Navy consider prohibiting or at least significantly limiting the use of mid-frequency active sonar from all sources, including dipping sonar, within the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, at least between December and June; and, similarly, to further limit other activities that have the potential to result in species take. If prohibiting or limiting mid-frequency active sonar (and/or other activities) is not possible across the entire Mitigation Area, we recommend that the Navy at least carefully consider a prohibition in the waters within the Mitigation Area extending between Cape Flattery, Washington, and Tillamook Head, Oregon, including the waters offshore of the Columbia River mouth, to protect an area of highest relative habitat use for Southern Residents, as indicated by presently available satellite telemetry data.	The Navy does not generally schedule training and testing near Cape Flattery due to the high volume of commercial vessel traffic in that portion of the Study Area. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict certain activities or types of sonar year-round within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, seasonally within the Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area and Stonewall and Heceta Bank Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, and year-round in the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to help the Navy avoid potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed a new mitigation area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, which encompasses waters near Cape Flattery as the commenter recommended. The Navy will conduct a maximum combined total of 33 hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar during testing annually within 20 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Mitigation Area. Additional geographic mitigation for active sonar beyond what is detailed in Section K.3 (Mitigation Areas to be Implemented), such as prohibiting all active sonar within 50 NM from shore, would be impractical to

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		implement for the reasons described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) and Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar).
NRDC-31	<p>In addition to the proposed restrictions, the Navy must consider prohibiting or restricting air- deployed mid-frequency active sonar (i.e., dipping sonar) within the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Mitigation Area, as well as other activities involving sources of mid-frequency active sonar, including unit-level training and maintenance and system checks while vessels are in transit.</p> <p>In particular, the deployment of all forms of mid-frequency active sonar should be restricted within the vicinity of the Quinault Canyon. Both visual and passive acoustic surveys have demonstrated the importance of the canyon for a diversity of marine mammal species.</p> <p>Remarkably, the extremely rare and endangered North Pacific right whale has been acoustically detected within the canyon, as have humpback whales, sperm whales, offshore, transient, and resident killer whales, Pacific white-sided dolphins, and Risso's dolphins, and a variety of beaked whale species. Dall's porpoise, Cuvier's beaked whale, northern right whale dolphin, and northern fur and elephant seals have also been sighting in the vicinity of the Quinault Canyon (Oleson et al. supra; Oleson & Hildebrand, NPS-OC-12-001CR, pp. 56, 2012), and Southern Resident orcas have been satellite tracked in this area (NOAA Fisheries, 2015).</p> <p>We recognize that the Quinault Canyon lies within the Quinault Range Site and that the practicability of implementing comprehensive mitigation may be limited; however, we recommend the Navy fully explore opportunities for applying additional mitigation measures to protect the Quinault Canyon to the full extent practicable. First and foremost, such measures should include further restrictions on activities. For those activities that the Navy concludes, after probing analysis, cannot be reduced or shifted, the Navy (1) should undertake year-round monitoring of the Canyon to ascertain the seasonality of species presence and habitat use and adaptively plan to reduce operations during periods of greater biological importance; and (2), as a last resort, should employ enhanced monitoring techniques, including the use of passive acoustics, to avoid protected species.</p>	<p>The Navy did include mitigation for active sonar, including dipping sonar, in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, the Navy will not conduct Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Exercise – Helicopter, Maritime Patrol Aircraft, Ship, or Submarine training activities. These activities involve the use of MF4 and MF5. For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed new mitigation to conduct a maximum combined total of 33 hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar during testing annually within 20 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Mitigation Area. Previously in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy was proposing to conduct a maximum of 33 hours of MF1 annually within only the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (excluding the portion of the mitigation area that overlapped the Quinault Range Site). The expanded mitigation will offer additional protections for marine mammals that inhabit the Sanctuary or sea space around Quinault Canyon. Additional geographic mitigation for active sonar beyond what is detailed in Section K.3 (Mitigation Areas to be Implemented), such as prohibiting additional types of active sonar or further limiting active sonar hours in the NWTT Offshore Area (such as prohibiting use of active sonar near Quinault Canyon), would be impractical to implement for the reasons described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) and Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar).</p>
NRDC-32	<p>The Navy should expand the proposed mitigation measures to more comprehensively protect humpback whales at Stonewall and Heceta Banks between May and November. The Navy should prohibit air-deployed mid-frequency active sonar (i.e., dipping sonar) within the Stonewall and Heceta Bank Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, as well as other activities</p>	<p>For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed new mitigation to conduct a maximum combined total of 33 hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar during testing annually within 20 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, and the Olympic Coast National Marine</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	involving sources of mid-frequency active sonar, including unit-level training and maintenance and system checks while vessels are in transit. The expanded mitigation measures would benefit a variety of species, including noise-sensitive harbor porpoise, that are likely to be found in relatively higher densities within the Mitigation Area. The Navy should also include mitigation measures that limit vessel speeds to reduce the likelihood of vessel strike.	Sanctuary Mitigation Area. The expanded mitigation will offer additional protections for humpback whales in the portion of the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area that overlaps Stonewall and Heceta Banks. Additional geographic mitigation for active sonar beyond what is detailed in Section K.3 (Mitigation Areas to be Implemented), such further expanding mitigation requirements at Stonewall and Heceta Banks, would be impractical to implement for the reasons described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) and Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar).
NRDC-33	As with the Stonewall and Heceta Bank Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, the Navy should expand the proposed mitigation measures to more comprehensively protect humpback whales at Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, here between July and November. The Navy should prohibit air-deployed mid-frequency active sonar (i.e., dipping sonar), as well as other activities involving sources of mid-frequency active sonar, including unit-level training and maintenance and system checks while vessels are in transit. The Navy should also include mitigation measures that limit vessel speeds to reduce the likelihood of vessel strike.	For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed new mitigation to conduct a maximum combined total of 33 hours of surface ship hull-mounted MF1 mid-frequency active sonar during testing annually within 20 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Mitigation Area. The expanded mitigation will offer additional protections for humpback whales in the portion of the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area that overlaps the Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area. Additional geographic mitigation for active sonar beyond what is detailed in Section K.3 (Mitigation Areas to be Implemented), such further expanding mitigation requirements in the Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, would be impractical to implement for the reasons described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) and Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar).
NRDC-34	As noted elsewhere in these comments, the Salish Sea, including the inland waters of Puget Sound, constitutes critical habitat for the Southern Resident orca and is a focus of extensive conservation effort, on both sides of the border, to sustain and recover the population. The high numbers of takes estimated, in the DSEIS, for both the Washington Inland Waters harbor porpoise and the Hood Canal harbor seal indicates that considerable activity would take place in the whales' critical habitat. This appears true notwithstanding the requirement that units obtain approval from the "designated Command authority" before undertaking certain activities in the area, which differs notably from the derogation procedures proposed for other Navy Mitigation Areas in not incorporating a "national security" standard. See id. at K-12. Navy impacts are intolerable to the public We urge the Navy to engage in a more rigorous analysis of alternatives and mitigation options in this area, with the aim of eliminating potential impacts on Southern Residents. The Navy should consider (1) completely	As described in Section K.3.3. (Mitigation Areas for Marine Species in NWT Inland Waters), the Navy developed enhanced mitigation measures in NWT Inland Waters for Southern Resident killer whales, gray whales, and other marine species for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy's new Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area requirements will result in training and testing activities being conducted in NWT Inland Waters only when necessitated by mission-essential training or testing program requirements. Furthermore, the Navy will implement additional geographic mitigation for activities that are conducted in the mitigation area as applicable, such as seasonal awareness messages, communication with sighting information networks, limitations on the type and location of active sonar and explosive activities, and prohibition of live fire activities. For example, the Navy developed new mitigation for Navy biologists to initiate communication with the appropriate marine mammal detection networks in NWT Inland Waters prior to conducting explosive mine neutralization activities involving the use of Navy divers, Unmanned Underwater Vehicle

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	prohibiting activity during periods of higher residency or occurrence of the population, viz, roughly May through October for the Salish Sea and roughly October through mid-February for the inland waters of Puget Sound; (2) using existing methods, and working with Navy engineers, to isolate noise from its activities, particularly for activities such as pierside testing and maintenance that are concentrated in particular location; and (3) setting a transparent, rigorous protocol for ensuring that Southern Residents will not be exposed to noise that can cause behavioral disruption, before an activity proceeds, including by using the region's existing real-time hydrophone networks and by establishing additional hydrophone sites in key areas as needed. Finally, the Navy (4) must consider measures to mitigate the impacts of its Growler overflights on Southern Residents and other marine species—an issue that the DSEIS does not squarely address (see above at sec. II.E).	Training, Civilian Port Defense – Homeland Security Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Exercises, and Small Boat Attack Exercises. This mitigation will help the Navy plan activities in a way that minimizes the potential for exposure of Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy's mitigation as described in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS represents the maximum level of mitigation practical to implement under the Proposed Action, and any further mitigation in NWTT Inland Waters, such as mitigation for aircraft overflights, would be impractical due to implications for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements for the reasons described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
NRDC-35	As noted above, gray whales are undergoing a major die-off of uncertain duration, with large percentages showing signs of “skinniness” and some stranded whales exhibiting emaciation; in animals suffering from such stress, the addition of another stressor could have severe consequences. The Navy should expand its proposed mitigation measures to more comprehensively protect gray whales at Northern Puget Sound Gray Whale Mitigation Area between March and May. It should not conduct any testing and training activities within the Mitigation Area from March through May. In addition, the Navy should include mitigation measures that limit vessel speeds to reduce the likelihood of vessel strike.	As described previously and in Section K.3.3. (Mitigation Areas for Marine Species in NWTT Inland Waters), the Navy developed enhanced mitigation measures in NWTT Inland Waters for Southern Resident killer whales, gray whales, and other marine species for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy's new Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area requirements will result in training and testing activities being conducted in NWTT Inland Waters only when necessitated by mission-essential training or testing program requirements. Furthermore, the Navy will implement additional geographic mitigation for activities that are conducted in the mitigation area as applicable, such as seasonal awareness messages for gray whales, limitations on the type and location of active sonar and explosive activities, and prohibition of live fire activities. The Navy's mitigation as described in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS represents the maximum level of mitigation practical to implement under the Proposed Action, and any further mitigation in NWTT Inland Waters would be impractical due to implications for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements for the reasons described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
NRDC-36	Located approximately 60 km west of Grays Harbor, Washington, Grays Canyon represents seasonal feeding habitat for high densities of humpback whales. In addition, sightings of Dall's porpoise, fin whale, and the first sighting of a blue whale in the region in several decades have been made in the vicinity of the Grays Canyon. Guide and Willapa Canyon, located to the west of Willapa Bay, Washington, have been shown to represent	The Navy assessed the practicality of implementing the commenter's additional mitigation recommendations. As described in Section K.3.2.2.2 (Operational Assessment), training with active sonar in varying ocean floor topographies, such as near canyons, is essential to national security; therefore, additional restrictions on the use of active sonar near Quinalt, Grays Canyon, Guide, Willapa, Astoria, or Eel Canyons, would be impractical

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>biologically important foraging habitat for female northern fur seals. Astoria Canyon, Oregon, is located directly west of the Columbia River mouth, coincident with the Columbia River plume. Astoria Canyon has a rich prey field that supports an important groundfish fishery and falls within the recently recorded expansion in the range of jumbo squid in the California Current, a primary prey species for endangered sperm whales. This highly productive environment provides biologically important feeding habitat for marine mammals, including humpback whales, and has led to the site being designated as an Important Bird Area. In addition, there is evidence from satellite telemetry that Southern Resident killer whales use the topography of the Astoria Canyon during navigation along the Oregon/Washington coastline. Humpback whale, Risso's dolphin, and harbor porpoise have been sighted within the Eel River Canyon, northern California.</p> <p>The five canyon systems fall within the 50 nm and, in some cases, the 20 nm boundaries of the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area and are thus afforded protection from most explosive and several non-explosive training and testing activities, as discussed above. We recommend that, additionally, the Navy conduct no training or testing activities with mid-frequency sonar within the vicinity of the canyons at any time of year to provide protection for deep-diving and/or noise-sensitive species, including endangered sperm whales and harbor porpoise.</p>	<p>to implement because such mitigation would preclude ready access to areas with the necessary environmental and oceanographic conditions that replicate military mission and combat conditions. Preventing access to critical training waterspace would have a significant impact on the ability for units to meet their individual training and certification requirements (impacting the ability to deploy with the required level of readiness necessary to accomplish their missions), to certify forces to deploy to meet national security tasking (limiting the flexibility of Combatant Commanders and warfighters to project power, engage in multi-national operations, and conduct the full range of naval warfighting capability in support of national security interests).</p>
NRDC-37	<p>(1) Avoidance of underwater detonations at night and in other low-visibility conditions</p> <p>At night and during periods of low visibility, the Navy's ability to detect marine mammals within its safety zone declines significantly. Additionally, some endangered species engage in rest or shallow diving during the night, increasing their vulnerability to ship collision and to injury from explosives and ordnance. Many individual Navy exercises, tests, and maintenance activities last eight hours or fewer, making avoidance of nighttime activity practicable, at least in some cases. Yet, with the exception of mine neutralization exercises involving Navy divers (DSEIS at 5-45, 67), the Navy does not require, nor does it consider, avoidance of underwater detonations at night and/or during other low-visibility conditions. See DSEIS at Ch. 5 ("Mitigation").</p>	<p>Activities using explosives typically occur during daytime. For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed new mitigation to prohibit conducting explosive Mine Countermeasure Neutralization Testing at night or in Beaufort Sea state number 3 conditions or better. As described in Section 5.6.2 (Explosives) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the locations and timing of explosive training and testing activities vary based on range scheduling, mission requirements, testing program requirements, and standard operating procedures for safety and mission success. Further mitigation to prohibit activities at night or in low-visibility conditions would be impractical to implement for the reasons described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).</p>
NRDC-38	<p>Based on these studies, mitigating active sonar impacts could be achieved by employing down- sweeps with harmonics or by reducing the level of side bands (or harmonics).108 In addition, results indicate that low-frequency (1-2 kHz) active naval sonar systems without harmonics can</p>	<p>The Navy explicitly designs its active sonar signals to provide optimum performance at detecting underwater objects (e.g., submarines) in a variety of acoustic environments. The Navy assessed the potential for implementing active sonar signal modification as mitigation. At this time, the science on the</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>therefore operate at higher source levels than mid-frequency (6-7 kHz) active sonar systems without harmonics with similar startle effects on porpoises. To our knowledge, the Navy is not presently investigating signal modification as a potential mitigation measure. Given the tangible management implications of this research, however, and the potentially broad benefits to multiple species through modification at the signal source, we recommend that more research of this nature should be carried out in order to understand the extent to which these results can be generalized across species. In parallel, the feasibility of implementing signal modifications (such as those recommended above) into Navy operations should be explored.</p> <p>Other signal characteristics may also be of interest. For example, short rise times (i.e., rise times less than or equal to 15 ms) are correlated across mammalian species with startle response, raising concerns about sensitization. In a 2011 study, researchers demonstrated that sounds with short rise times elicited an acoustic startle response in captive grey seals, followed by “rapid and pronounced” sensitization, taking hold after about 3 playbacks, whereas sounds with longer rise times failed to induce a startle response and did not sensitize the animals. The startled seals then displayed sustained spatial avoidance, rapid flight responses, and “clear signs of fear conditioning,” and, once sensitized, even avoided food that was proximate to the sound source. According to the authors, sounds with short rise times thus have “the potential to cause severe effects on long-term behavior, individual fitness and longevity of individuals in wild animal populations.” In a follow-on study, high-frequency echosounders with short rise times were found to produce a strong behavioral response in the same species, leading the researchers to conclude that it could produce startle responses, and therefore potentially sensitization, as well.</p> <p>Here, too, we recommend further research and exploration of the feasibility of signal modification.</p> <p>The DSEIS appears both to defer conducting research on how modifying sonar signals (particularly upsweeps and downsweeps) might affect sonar performance until future studies confirm that it could be an effective mitigation measure; and conducting those studies itself. DSEIS at 5-58. This is not acceptable under NEPA. Obtaining information on the viability of this measure is especially important in this region, where, given the</p>	<p>differences in potential impacts of up or down sweeps of the sonar signal (e.g., different behavioral reactions) is extremely limited and requires further development. For example, Kastelein et al. (2012) researched the behavioral responses of a single captive harbor porpoise to varying sonar signals. Although this very limited data set suggests up or down sweeps of the sonar signal may result in different reactions by harbor porpoises in certain circumstances, this science requires further development (e.g., to determine potential reactions by other individual harbor porpoises and other marine mammal species). If future studies indicate that modifying active sonar signals (i.e., up or down sweeps) could be an effective mitigation approach, then the Navy will investigate if and how the mitigation would affect the sonar's performance. As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), mitigation must meet the appropriate balance between being effective and practical to implement.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	extraordinarily large number of takes estimated for harbor porpoises—the very subject of the Kastelein et al. signal modification study—the information is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives. See 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22(a). While the Navy notes that “active sonar signals are designed explicitly to provide optimum performance at detecting underwater objects,” it never explains why making the modifications implicated by the marine mammal behavioral studies discussed above would be impracticable. Indeed, some of those modifications, such as converting up-sweeps to down- sweeps, would not alter the system’s spectral output in any way. The Navy must obtain information on the viability and effectiveness of this measure. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22.	
NRDC-39	The Navy should employ thermal detection in optimal conditions, or, at minimum, require the establishment of a pilot program for thermal detection, with annual review under the adaptive management system established in MMPA rulemaking. The Navy states once again, as it has in several previous NEPA reviews, that it “plans to continue researching thermal detection systems to determine their effectiveness and compatibility with Navy applications.” DSEIS at 5-63. A pilot program would be consistent with that interest, while allowing for trial use as a monitoring measure.	Analysis of the potential for thermal detection systems as a mitigation tool was presented in Section 5.5.4 (Thermal Detection Systems and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Office of Naval Research Marine Mammals and Biology program funded a project (2013-2018) to test the thermal limits of infrared-based automatic whale detection technology. The Navy has also been investigating the use of thermal detection systems with automated marine mammal detection algorithms for future mitigation during training and testing, including on autonomous platforms. For example, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency funded six initial studies to test and evaluate infrared-based thermal detection technologies and algorithms to automatically detect marine mammals on an unmanned surface vehicle. Based on the outcome of these initial studies, the Navy is planning additional follow-on efforts and testing. The Navy plans to continue researching thermal detection systems to determine their effectiveness and compatibility with Navy applications. If the technology matures to the state where thermal detection is determined to be an effective mitigation tool during training and testing, the Navy will assess the practicality of using the technology during training and testing events and retrofitting its observation platforms with thermal detection devices. The Navy will provide information to NMFS about the status and findings of Navy-funded thermal detection studies and any associated practicality assessments at the annual adaptive management meetings. Information about the Navy’s adaptive management program is included in Section 5.1.2.2.1.1 (Adaptive Management).
NRDC-40	The speed at which Navy vessels operate during testing and training exercises, and during general transit between exercises, has direct implications for the probability of mortality from a ship strike as well as for the size of the ship’s acoustic footprint. Based on studies of right whales,	As described in Section 5.5.7 (Reporting Requirements) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed its reporting requirements in conjunction with NMFS to be consistent with mission requirements and balance the usefulness of the information to be collected with the practicality of collecting it. The

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>which NMFS has generally accepted as a proxy for other baleen whale populations, a vessel speed of 15 knots is estimated to result in an 80% probability of mortality if a ship strike were to occur; this probability approaches 100% at a speed of 20 knots or higher. Slowing ships below 10 knots can reduce collision rates by 90% and decrease the probability of serious injuries or death. The acoustic footprint of vessels also widens dramatically with speed, such that speed is one of the leading covariate influences on noise output from vessels.</p> <p>Ship strikes are a leading cause of large whale mortality off the U.S. west coast. While elsewhere the Navy has indicated a need to operate at higher speeds under certain circumstances, such as when an aircraft carrier must maintain a minimum wind speed relative to ground in order to launch and receive aircraft, there are other conditions when maintaining a 10-knot vessel speed is surely practicable. The Navy should include restrictions to limit vessel speed within some of the mitigation areas cited above, particularly those intended to protect endangered large whales, as it has in certain portions of the Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing (AFTT) Study Area.</p> <p>Additionally, given that the speed of Navy ships during all aspects of their operations potentially impacts marine mammals, we recommend that the Navy collect and report data on ship speed as part of the EIS process. This will allow for objective evaluation of ship-strike risk, of harassment resulting from vessel activity, and of the potential benefit of additional speed-focused mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Navy's training and testing activity reports and incident reports are designed to verify implementation of mitigation; comply with current permits, authorizations, and consultation requirements; and improve future environmental analyses. Additional reporting would be ineffective as mitigation because it would not result in modifications to training or testing activities or further avoidance or reductions of potential impacts. For example, additional reporting of vessel speed data would not result in modifications to vessel speeds (e.g., speed restrictions) or reduce the already low potential for vessel strikes of marine mammals. As described in Section 5.3.4.1 (Vessel Movement), Navy vessels are required to operate in accordance with applicable navigation rules. Applicable rules include the Inland Navigation Rules (33 Code of Federal Regulations 83) and International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea (72 COLREGS), which were formalized in the Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972. These rules require that vessels proceed at a safe speed so proper and effective action can be taken to avoid collision and so vessels can be stopped within a distance appropriate to the prevailing circumstances and conditions. In addition to complying with navigation requirements, Navy ships transit at speeds that are optimal for fuel conservation, to maintain ship schedules, and to meet mission requirements. Vessel captains use the totality of the circumstances to ensure the vessel is traveling at appropriate speeds in accordance with navigation rules. Depending on the circumstances, this may involve adjusting speeds during periods of reduced visibility or in certain locations. Navy vessel operators need to train to proficiently operate vessels as they would during military missions and combat operations, including being able to react to changing tactical situations and evaluate system capabilities. For example, during training activities involving flight operations from an aircraft carrier, the vessel must maintain a certain wind speed over the deck to launch or recover aircraft. Depending on wind conditions, the aircraft carrier itself must travel at a certain speed to generate the wind required to launch or recover aircraft. Implementing vessel speed restrictions would increase safety risks for Navy personnel and equipment and the public during the training event and would reduce skill proficiency in a way that would increase safety risks during military missions and combat operations. Furthermore, vessel speed restrictions would not allow the Navy to continue meeting its training requirements due to diminished realism of training exercises. The Navy needs to test the full range of its vessel and system capabilities to ensure safety and functionality in conditions analogous to military missions</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>and combat operations. For example, during non-explosive torpedo testing activities, the Navy must operate its vessels using speeds typical of military missions and combat operations to accurately test the functionality of its acoustic countermeasures and torpedo systems during firing. Vessel speed restrictions would not allow the Navy to continue meeting its testing program requirements due to diminished realism of testing events. Researchers, program managers, and weapons system acquisition programs would be unable to conduct accurate acoustic research to meet research objectives and effectively test vessels and vessel-deployed systems and platforms before full-scale production or delivery to the fleet. Such testing is required to ensure functionality and accuracy in military mission and combat conditions per required acquisition milestones or on an as-needed basis to meet operational requirements.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Navy does not currently maintain a record management system to collect, archive, analyze, and report marine species observation or vessel speed data for every training and testing activity and all vessel movements. For example, the speed of Navy vessels can fluctuate an unlimited number of times during training and testing events. Developing and implementing a record management system of this magnitude would be unduly cost prohibitive and place a significant administrative burden on vessel operators and activity participants. Burdening operational Commanders, vessel operators, and event participations with requirements to complete additional administrative reporting would distract them from preparing a ready force and focusing on mission-essential tasks. Additional reporting requirements would draw event participants' attention away from the complex tactical tasks they are primarily obligated to perform, such as driving a warship or engaging in a gunnery event, which would adversely impact Navy personnel safety, public safety, and the effectiveness of training or testing.</p>
NRDC-41	In addition to a rigorous assessment of the biological impacts discussed above, NEPA (and multiple treaties, laws, and polices) require an assessment of the cultural impacts of the Navy's activities. See, e.g., § 40 C.F.R 1508.8. The vast coastal area affected by the Navy's proposed action holds great cultural and spiritual significance for U.S. Tribes and Canadian First Nations. In addition to emphasizing the Navy's obligation to conduct government-to-government consultation with each of the tribes in this region, we support and incorporate by reference the comments from the	<p>The Navy has conducted an assessment of cultural impacts of the Navy's activities, as captured in Section 3.10 (Cultural Resources) and Section 3.11 (American Indian and Alaska Native Traditional Resources).</p> <p>As stated in Section 3.11.1.1 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has invited 56 recognized tribes potentially impacted by the proposed activities to government-to-government consultation. The Navy is currently involved in government-to-government consultation with several tribes.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	InterTribal Sinkiyone Wilderness Council and others seeking a full analysis of these cultural effects across the affected area in any final EIS.	
Noise Pollution Clearinghouse		
NPCH-01	My review of the DSEIS, however, is limited because the Navy has not provided the underlying data and information supporting the noise related claims in the DSEIS. In particular, in order to completely evaluate the claims in the DSEIS, I and others would need the modeling used by the Navy and the information and data used to support the modeling assumptions. I prepared a list of the required data and information needed to assess the completeness and accuracy of the DSEIS noise assessment, and NPCA's representatives requested that information from the Navy on May 31, 2019. To date, I have not received this data and information. Consequently, it is impossible for anyone with only the currently publicly available data and information to fully evaluate the DSEIS noise assessment. Nevertheless, I have identified a number of deficiencies which I describe in these comments.	Please see response to NPCA-35.
NPCH-02	<p>1. Incomplete Analysis</p> <p>The noise analysis is incomplete, particularly with respect to noise impacts on Olympic National Park and Daniel J. Evans Wilderness Area.</p> <p>1.1 Lack of Analysis of Noise Impact on Olympic National Park and Wilderness Areas</p> <p>Olympic National Park is not mentioned in Volume 1 of the DSEIS by name. In fact, there are only three references to the national park in two paragraphs of the 970 page document. There were only two references to the nearby wilderness areas.</p> <p>Olympic National Park is mentioned in conjunction with something approaching a noise analysis on only seven of the 814 pages of Volume 2 (3.12.29, 3.12.30, 3.12.32, 3.12.33, 3.12.34, 4.50, and 4.51). Many of the references were repetitive and redundant. None were comprehensive nor cumulative. Most strikingly, Appendix J, Airspace Noise Analysis for the Olympic Military Operations Areas, does not specifically mention Olympic National Park in conjunction with an actual noise analysis, other than one study conducted by the National Park Service in 2010, and not related to the proposed alternatives.</p> <p>Similarly, the Daniel J. Evans Wilderness Area is below the MOA and transit routes, the Buckhorn Wilderness is under the transit routes, and the Colonel Bob Wilderness is under the MOA. Also there are three additional nearby wilderness areas, the Brothers Wilderness, the Mount Skokomish Wilderness, and the Wonder Mountain Wilderness. Yet, the Daniel J. Evans</p>	The Navy revised the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include additional analysis of potential noise impacts outside the Olympic MOA, including the Olympic National Park. This additional information in Appendix J includes additional analysis of aircraft transits to and from the Olympic MOA. The analysis includes the areas beneath the Olympic MOA as well as all areas on the Olympic Peninsula.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Wilderness Area is mentioned only once in Volumes 1 and 2. There is no noise analysis of the impacts of Navy aircraft on the wilderness areas. The DSEIS cannot claim to have taken a hard look at the noise impacts on Olympic National Park and Daniel J. Evans Wilderness Area when it rarely discusses the Park, does not discuss the Daniel J. Evans Wilderness Area or other wilderness areas, or discusses noise impact in limited and general ways. This is critical because the MOAs are over 27 percent of the Olympic National Park. (DSEIS, Volume 2, 3.12- 30). Moreover, Navy aircraft noise does not travel only straight down from the aircraft, but covers a wide area for which the Navy has not analyzed.	
NPCH-03	<p>1.2. Lack of Map of Noise Impacts</p> <p>The noise modeling used in the assessment of the noise impacts is called "MOA and Route NoiseMap Model (MRNMap)." (DSEIS, Appendix J, J-5-6, emphasis added) Ironically, there is no map of the noise impact of aircraft on Olympic National Park or wilderness areas from the MRNMap modeling. In fact there are no noise maps at all in the DSEIS or its appendices. NoiseMap is more than just the name of the model the Navy used to assess the noise impacts, noise maps are one of the primary tools acousticians use to evaluate noise impacts. Noise maps allow experts and the public to visualize, through color coded contour lines, the noise levels at various locations. They provide the noise footprint of the proposed action. Since people can't hear the noise at each location while reading the DSEIS, noise maps are an invaluable evaluation tool, providing both the noise level and the location of resources of concern. They are even part of the DOD guidance in the Range Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (RAICUZ) Program that the DSEIS claims to be following, which is found in the Appendix J.</p> <p>The lack of noise maps serves to obscure the noise impacts of aircraft on Olympic National Park. The limited tabular data in the DSEIS provides neither a comprehensive (few locations within the Park are considered) nor a cumulative (see Point 3 below for a description of how the cumulative impact of multiple aircraft and cumulative impact of transit and MOA operations were not considered) analysis of the impacts.</p>	Noise contour maps are not applicable to the noise modeling conducted in the Olympic MOA. Any noise contour map produced based on the results of modeling would simply be a reflection of the terrain elevation and would not be useful. The noise analysis using MR_NMap was modified to account for the varying terrain elevation levels underneath the Olympic MOA. Thus, the estimated noise levels are directly related to the terrain levels as reported in Tables J-11 and J-16. The reader can look at the terrain map and match with the associated estimated noise exposure levels.
NPCH-04	<p>This DEIS does not provide noise maps, probably for one of two likely reasons, neither of which excuse the Navy from taking a hard look at the noise impacts.</p> <p>1) MRNMap is poorly suited to evaluate noise impacts in complex mountainous terrain such as found in Olympic National Park. The Navy seeks to excuse this with the demonstrably false claim that "[t]he current</p>	MR_NMap is the approved model for airspace noise analysis by both DoD and FAA. Note that AEDT (INM has been retired) does not handle military airspace operations. The model approach and assumptions within MR_NMap are not demonstrations of "absurdity." The critique provided by the commenter indicates a limited understanding of airspace operations: Navy MOA training operations vary from sortie to sortie; there are no predictable flight paths

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>version of MRNMap, which uses the best available science to calculate noise within SUA, does not have the capability to model complex terrain." (DSEIS Appendix J, J-18) What is false about this statement is the claim that NRNMap uses the best available science. The best available science can assess noise levels in complex terrain. The FAA's INM noise model does this and has done it for years. Our 21st Century acoustical science is much more capable than the Navy claims. The Navy's model, however, does not include the best available science.</p> <p>2) The Navy chose not to present a noise map because it chose not to use actual flight paths in developing its model of noise levels and impacts. Instead, the Navy chose to smear hypothetical noise sources evenly over the MOAs (except for very near the boundaries). Had the Navy presented a noise map generated from MOA and Range Noise Map software, it would strain credibility, since the noise would be essentially the same everywhere, the noise contours would be essentially the shape of the airspace modeled. The map would merely show the absurdity of the assumptions used to model the noise. The map would not actually show anything useful in analyzing the impacts on various areas within Olympic National Park, but would show that DSEIS did not do a very good job of assessing actual noise impacts.</p> <p>The two most important factors in noise modeling are the noise of the source and the distance of the source from noise receivers. The distance depends critically on the location of the source. The Navy's assessment ignored this fundamental aspect of noise evaluation. Instead of taking a hard look at where the noise sources are located, the Navy smeared them everywhere. This has the effect of averaging the noise and hiding the areas of greatest impact, the exact areas a legitimate DSEIS would identify and analyze.</p>	<p>within the MOA. MR_NMap does, in fact, include the source noise as well as its lateral and vertical distributions while operating in the airspace. These parameters are directly stated in Appendix J.</p>
NPCH-05	<p>1.3. No assessment of Audibility or the Noise Footprint of Military Jets One map the DSEIS should have presented and did not is that of the noise footprint of the military jets on the National Park. Figure 1 below provides an example of such a map. The footprint is determined using actual empirical evidence from observers using the Growler Tracker software. 2 The Growler Tracker is a survey that visitors and residents of the Olympic Peninsula can use to share information with NPCA about where and when they hear Growler jets. Survey users share data including date, time, and precise location of an instance when they heard a Growler jet overhead, as well as how it affected their listening experience.</p> <p>The green circles are the locations of actual noise observations of Navy</p>	<p>Current noise models for the audibility of aircraft are used for single events or a series of events that follow a precise flight track. Neither is true for airspace operations, which undergo varied flight tracks and profiles for training purposes.</p> <p>The noise modeling conducted for this analysis follows the standard noise modeling tools for assessing noise exposures from current and proposed airspace training operations. These procedures utilize noise level metrics to provide a comparison between the baseline (or no action) and proposed scenarios. This process allows a comparison of the changes in the cumulative noise exposure between (or among) the scenarios. These calculations are</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Jets. The purple circles are the location of the monitoring locations in the 2010 National Park Service report. The footprint (shaded area) was drawn by using the horizontal distance of the furthest Growler observation from the transit flight path and constructing a footprint from the flight paths and MOA borders based on that distance.</p> <p>As the number of observations in the Growler Tracker database is limited, Figure 1 probably understates the actual noise footprint of the Navy Jets. For example, OLYM003, which is the Hurricane Ridge monitoring location in the National Park Service report, experienced jet noise 8.3% of the time and therefore should be included in the footprint. Nevertheless, the estimated footprint encompasses the majority of Olympic National Park and Daniel J. Evans Wilderness Area.</p>	<p>based on the operation of the aircraft and estimated over an area of exposure.</p> <p>Audibility, on the other hand, is a complex process that involves a source, a receiver, a background sound spectrum, and localized atmospheric conditions. Although noise models can predict audibility for an individual flight trajectory, no current audibility noise model exists for aircraft operations within an airspace. These operations are dispersed over the entire airspace volume and vary widely from operation to operation. A new section has been added to Appendix J describing audibility of the EA-18G. In this new section, a table indicates the lateral distance of audibility for the EA-18G is typically 12 NM or greater.</p>
NPCH-06	<p>1.4. No Nighttime Analysis</p> <p>The Navy claims 6% of the flights occur during the nighttime, yet conducted no nighttime noise analysis. Given the number of campsites within the park, sleep interference should have been considered in the DSEIS. The southern transit route is almost directly over the Three Prune, Lake Beauty, Low Divide, Chicago Camp, Camp Wilder, Hayes River, Upper Cameron, Lower Cameron, Falls Camp, Camp Ellis Moose Lake, Grand Lake, Three Forks, and Greywolf Camp campsites. There are also several campsites under the northern transit route or nearby the northern and southern transit routes.</p> <p>There are dozens of campsites under the MOAs, including South Beach, Kaloloch Ranger Station, Mosquito Creek, Jefferson Cove, To leak Point, Strawberry Point, Scott Creek, Third Beach, Second Beach, Hole-in-the-Wall, Chilean Memorial, Cedar Creek, Norwegian Memorial, Yellow Banks, South Sand Point, Sand Point, Ericksons Bay, Wedding Rocks, Ozette, Queets, Spruce Bottom, Hoh Rain Forest, Bogachiel, Flapjack, Bob Creek, Three Lakes, Three Prune, and Elip Creek. There are dozens more that are close to the MOAs. And there are a number of campsites not within Olympic National Park, such as Cottonwood, Hoh Oxbow, Minnie Peterson, South Fork, Willoughby Creek, Slide Camp, Camp Tony, Cliff Camp, Two Mile, Dungeness Forks and Bogachiel State Park campsites.</p> <p>Tent walls do not attenuate jet noise like homes do, so a more rigorous sleep interference assessment is required than in residential areas, yet no assessment of sleep interference was conducted.</p>	<p>The cumulative exposure does include the effect of acoustic nighttime operations, as specified by the DNL metric. Sleep interference estimates for airspace operations are not accurate due to the varying nature of the flight operations as well as the occupation levels of the campsites.</p>
NPCH-07	<p>1.5. No Analysis on Park and Wilderness Area Wildlife</p> <p>The DSEIS did not undertake an assessment of the noise impacts on wildlife within Olympic National Park, the Daniel J. Evans Wilderness Area, the</p>	<p>The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS did contain a thorough analysis of impacts to wildlife, wherever they may occur in or near the Study Area. Please see Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences).</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Buckhorn Wilderness Area, and the Colonel Bob Wilderness Area. Given the unique natural soundscape, the unique ecosystem, and the presence of endangered species, this absence is striking.	
NPCH-08	<p>2. Fatally Flawed Transit Analysis</p> <p>The Navy aircraft accesses the MOAs by crossing Olympic National Park. The noise analysis of aircraft flying between the Whidbey Island and the MOAs is fatally flawed with respect to its impact on Olympic National Park. The transit noise analysis deserved its own section and appendix, but received neither. Instead, it received a disjointed and incomplete analysis.</p> <p>2.1 Disjointed Analysis</p> <p>The noise analysis of the transit flights is scattered over three unrelated subsections of the DSEIS: Space and Airspace Deconfliction, Navigation and Safety, and Impacts on Airborne Acoustics Under Alternative 1 for Training Activities. The analysis is incomplete, both individually and together, with no recognition that one transit path is almost entirely over Olympic National Park, no assessment of cumulative impacts with the MOA noise, no cumulative impact from multiple aircraft, and no assessment of the acoustic footprint of the transit path.</p> <p>The DSEIS states that, "The transit of aircraft to and from these areas is discussed in the body of this Supplemental in Section 2.3.3.2 (Sea Space and Airspace Deconfliction), Section 3.0.3.1.3.1 (Navigation and Safety), and Section 3.12.3.2.1.1 (Impacts on Airborne Acoustics Under Alternative 1 for Training Activities)." (DSEIS, Appendix J, J-1) The following is a critique of each section.</p> <p>2.1.1 No Analysis of Noise Impacts on Olympic National Park in Section 2.3.3.2 (Sea Space and Airspace Deconfliction)</p> <p>Section 2.3.3.2 has no noise analysis of the transit flight path on Olympic National Park, no decibel levels of the flights, and no acoustic footprint of the flights. Only normal and typical altitudes for a couple locations are presented. As the quote above suggests, the "transit of aircraft to and from these areas is discussed," but that is all. No noise analysis is discussed.</p>	<p>The Navy revised the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include additional analysis of aircraft transits to and from the Olympic MOA. The analysis includes the areas beneath the Olympic MOA as well as all areas on the Olympic Peninsula. For more information about the analysis of transits, please see Section J.6.2 (Transit to/from the Olympic MOA) in Appendix J of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
NPCH-09	<p>2.1.2 Very Limited Analysis of Noise Impacts on Olympic National Park in Section 3.0.3.1.3.1 (Navigation and Safety).</p> <p>The title of this section, Navigation and Safety, raises the question, why place the transit flight path noise impact assessment in Navigation and Safety, and not give it its own section or appendix? Whatever the Navy's reasoning, the effect is to hide the lack of a hard look at the transit flight noise impacts.</p> <p>The noise analysis in Navigation and Safety is a mere two paragraphs long.</p>	<p>The additional transit analysis provided in Appendix J of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes the information requested in the comment.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>We learn that maximum noise levels are between 57 and 69 dBA when aircraft are at a certain altitude. We do not know where these noise levels occur and if they are truly maximum levels, since aircraft at lower altitudes would be louder. In fact, the Section 3.12.3.2.1.1 discussed below contradicts these values.</p> <p>We are provided a map of the flight transition route (Figure 3.0-1), but critically, it does not show Olympic National Park. It does not show what is being impacted.</p> <p>Figure 2 provides the map that the Navy should have and failed to provide in the DSEIS that shows that the southern transit route from JQM 360040 to YETII is almost entirely directly over Olympic National Park and Daniel J. Evans Wilderness Area.</p> <p>Figure 3 shows a cross section of the southern transit route. One can see that nearly the entire route is over Olympic National Park, and that the distance between the ground and the transit aircraft is significantly reduced due to the elevation of the land.</p>	
NPCH-10	<p>Finally, the Navy's evaluation of the impact of the 69 to 57 dBA is vastly insufficient. The Navy states: "Although the flyover event noise levels during transit would be higher than average background noise levels in the national park and wilderness areas, they are not substantially above the range of noise levels that can occur under natural conditions. For example, leaves or tall grass rustling in a moderate wind can generate sustained noise levels of 55 dBA. Strong winds can generate relatively sustained noise levels above 65 dBA, with peak noise levels being even higher (Cowan, 1994)." (Volume 2, 3-22)</p> <p>There are literally dozens of more sophisticated ways to analyze the impact of the noise on Olympic National Park and Daniel J. Evans and other Wilderness Areas. One would be to state what the actual background levels were. Ironically, the only actual noise measurements in the DSEIS noise assessment were not even made for the DSEIS but done by the Park Service in 2010. Those measurements show that half the time, soundscape levels were below 34.1 dBA at the HOH River Trail, below 36.6 dBA at Third Beach Trail, below 23.1 dBA at Hurricane Ridge, below 32.3 at Lake Crescent-Pyramid Mt. Trail, and below 31.4 dBA at Lake Ozette. At Hurricane Ridge, soundscape levels were below 15.4 dBA 10% of the time. There was no need to site a noise measurement taken in an unknown location in unknown winds when there are actual noise measurement taken in the Park.</p> <p>Figure 4 below shows the impact of a 57 and 69 dBA noise on a 15 and 35</p>	<p>The information requested in the comment regarding ambient noise measurements was included in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, in Section J.7 (Acoustic Monitoring Report) of Appendix J.</p> <p>Use of the standard noise thermometer is not skewing the explanation of the difference between noise level versus perceived loudness. The EIS report states directly that a 10 dB increase will be associated with a doubling of loudness judgment. The representation of the standard noise thermometer has been used by a multitude of reports and acoustic primers from a wide range of organizations. Human hearing response follows a logarithmic scaling more than a linear scale.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>dBa soundscape. Most noise thermometers portray the loudness of noises on a linear scale, where the visual difference between 40 and 50 decibels is the same as the difference between 50 and 60 decibels. Using such a scale, it would be reasonable to presume that a 10 dBA increase from 50 dBA to 60 dBA is a 20% increase in the loudness. There are two problems with this presumption. One, the decibel scale is a logarithmic scale, not a linear scale. Two, our hearing is a biological system that does not respond linearly to noise. Human's hear a 10 dBA increase as a doubling of the loudness. The scale on the noise thermometer in Figure 4 matches our response to loudness. As shown on the loudness thermometer, a 10 dBA increase from 50 dBA to 60 dBA is actually a doubling of the loudness or a 100% increase, not a 20% increase as a linear scale would suggest.</p> <p>From Figure 4 it is clear that relative to the natural soundscape, the jet noise is very intrusive. In fact, the 57 dBA jet noise is approximately four times louder than the 35 dBA soundscape, and 18 times louder than the 15 dBA soundscape. The 69 dBA jet noise is approximately 11 times louder than the 35 dBA soundscape, and 42 times louder than the 15 dBA soundscape. The Navy does not acknowledge the intrusiveness of the jet overflights on the Olympic National Park soundscape and visitors in the DSEIS.</p>	
NPCH-11	<p>Another more sophisticated way to analyze the noise would have been to provide a noise map of the background and overflight noise levels so that the reader of the DSEIS could see where the events occur. This was not done.</p> <p>Yet another more sophisticated analysis would involve actually measuring the noise level of overflights rather than estimating them. This was not done.</p> <p>Instead of doing a sophisticated analysis of transit noise, the DSEIS resorted to basically saying, "sometimes when the wind is blowing hard, the background level can be 65 dBA." This point ignores all the times when the wind is not blowing hard. It equates jet noise with natural sounds in Olympic National Park. And it ignores all the more appropriate ways to analyze noise impacts.</p>	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
NPCH-12	<p>2.1.3 Limited and Contradictory Noise Analysis in Section 3.12.3.2.1.1. Impacts on Airborne Acoustics Under Alternative 1 for Training Activities This section is part of Section 3.12 Socioeconomic Resources. It primarily evaluates noise in terms of economics. As such, it is a limited assessment. The implied argument the Navy presents, which is not persuasive, is that because tourism to Olympic National Park and the area has increased, there must not be a noise impact. It should be noted that it does not follow from the fact that people still visit Olympic National Park that the noise impacts are minimal.</p> <p>Beyond this rather empty economic noise analysis, the noise analysis in Section 3.12.3.2.1.1 is notable primarily for how it contradicts the noise analysis in Section 3.0.3.1.3.1 described above. For example, instead of the 69 dBA noise level described in Section 3.0.3.1.3.1, Section 3.12.3.2.1.1 says: "The highest elevations along the flight transit routes between NAS Whidbey Island and the Olympic MOAs range from approximately 4,500 to 8,000 ft. MSL. An EA-18G flying at an altitude of 10,000 ft. MSL directly over an 8,000 ft. peak could produce maximum noise levels of up to 97 dBA at ground level (i.e., at a distance of 2,000 ft.)" Remember, the nearly 30 dBA increase from 69 to 97 dBA is an eight times increase in loudness using the 10 dBA is a doubling of loudness rule.</p> <p>Finally, the DSEIS blatantly misuses the 2010 National Park Service noise measurements at Hurricane Ridge. The DSEIS states: "At the Hurricane Ridge site, which is the closest site to the YETII reporting point, the daytime median ambient noise level was 24.4 dBA. After removing noise from all aircraft overflights, the median ambient noise level was reduced to 23.4 dBA, and noise from only natural sounds was measured at 23.1 dBA." While the statement is factually correct, the implied use of these data are wrong. The DSEIS seems to be using this sentence to imply that the aircraft</p>	<p>NPS uses L50 to monitor the health of its natural soundscapes. Thus, the effect of aircraft noise on this metric is a proper assessment comparison for national parks. For the aircraft noise to increase the L50, it must be above the natural L50 by definition. This change in the L50 metric does not inform the actual aircraft noise levels experienced at specific locations. Instead, the small 1 dBA rise in the L50 metric provides an indication of the overall short duration in which the aircraft noise is above L50.</p> <p>The statement that jet noise is incompatible with natural soundscapes is a personal judgment outside of the scope of the noise analysis.</p> <p>The commenter uses the level of 97 dB frequently, as though it would be experienced frequently by Park visitors. It is important to understand that this is a maximum noise level that is possible only when a Growler is flying at its highest power setting, at the lowest permissible altitude, over the highest terrain in the MOA; a very rare occurrence (Table J-13 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS).</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>add only 1 dBA to noise levels. Either the Navy does not understand the L50 metric used in the measurements or it is purposely trying to give the misleading impression that the Jets are 1 dBA greater than the natural soundscape. The L50 metric provides the decibel level exceeded 50% of the time. As such, half the time periods are quieter and half are louder than the L50 value. In Olympic National Park, the L50 metric provides a description of the soundscape, not the jet noise. The jet noise is 97 dBA.</p> <p>Like the case of the economic non-argument above, the Navy is careful not to explicitly say incorrect facts in the DSEIS, but is more than willing to imply incorrect conclusions, while not actually supplying any real analysis. The real value of the Hurricane Ridge data is comparing the 97 dBA jet noise to the soundscape on Hurricane Ridge and other ridges and summits. Figure 5 does just that. The conclusion from Figure 5 is that the jet noise is incompatible with the natural soundscape.</p>	
NPCH-13	<p>2.2 Incomplete Transit Route Analysis</p> <p>Perhaps the most important fact about the transit routes is that they are over Olympic National Park and Daniel J. Evans and Buckhorn Wilderness Areas. The DSEIS appears to obscure this fact, particularly in its presentation of the transit routes in Figure 2.3-1: Aircraft Transit to and from Olympic Military Operations Areas on page 2-18 of the DSEIS. As Figures 2 and 3 above show, the transit routes are over the park and wilderness areas. The DSEIS has not determined the impact on specific park resources under the transit routes.</p> <p>2.3 Summary of Transit Analysis</p> <p>The transit analysis is fatally flawed and incomplete. The DSEIS contains very little analysis of the transit noise impacts on Olympic National Park. What analysis it does contain is misleading and contradictory.</p>	Please see response to NPCH-08.
NPCH-14	<p>3. Lack of Cumulative Impacts</p> <p>The DSEIS has not looked at the cumulative impacts of noise from the transit routes and the MOAs. Moreover, it's Lmax analysis considers only one aircraft.</p> <p>3.1. No Cumulative Impacts of Transit Noise and MOA Noise</p> <p>The MOA noise analysis is found in Appendix J. The transit noise analysis is scattered between three sections, Section 2.3.3.2 (Sea Space and Airspace Deconfliction), Section 3.0.3.1.3.1 (Navigation and Safety), and Section 3.12.3.2.1.1 (Impacts on Airborne Acoustics Under Alternative 1 for Training Activities). The DSEIS has segmented the assessment in such a way that the cumulative noise impacts of both the MOA and transit routes cannot be assessed.</p>	Please see response to NPCH-08. The cumulative analysis of noise from all aircraft (MOA and transit) can be found in Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts).

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
NPCH-15	<p>3.2 No Noise Analysis of Cumulative Impacts of Multiple Aircraft Heard at One Time</p> <p>The Navy's Lmax analysis, due to the primitive nature of the NoiseMap software, does not consider the cumulative impacts of more than one aircraft. For its Lmax analysis, the Navy relied on Table J-17, which is merely the maximum EA-18G noise levels at various distances. This method of assessment is rather primitive, because there are only a few altitude heights and associated noise levels in the Table and because the table presents the results for only one aircraft. The cumulative impact of more aircraft was not considered.</p>	<p>The MR_NMap noise model is not "primitive." It is the noise model that is most appropriate for airspace noise analysis, and approved by the FAA for this type of analysis.</p> <p>Lmax values for aircraft operations are provided in Tables J-13 through J-17 (the commenter appears to be overlooking Tables J-13 through J-16). Table J-17 provides a simple illustration of Lmax levels for the EA-18G at various altitudes. The maximum additive effect of two aircraft would be 3 dB, and this occurrence would be rare given the improbable circumstance where two aircraft are at the identical slant distance to a single receiver at the same instance in time.</p>
NPCH-16	<p>4. Lack of Actual Noise Measurements</p> <p>Perhaps the most striking omission of the entire DSEIS noise analysis is the lack of noise measurements of jet aircraft, particularly as they affect Olympic National Park. This is a fatal flaw in the DSEIS. Noise measurements are critical to determining the existing baseline (soundscape) as well as to confirm and modify noise modeling assumptions.</p> <p>Instead of conducting actual noise measurements, the DSEIS relied on outdated modeling technology that cannot accommodate complex terrain (MOA and Range Noise Map's deficiencies are described in Section 1.2 above), and used modeling methods that do not take into account actual flight paths (the smearing technique used in the DSEIS is described in Section 1.2 above).</p> <p>Noise modeling is valuable to understanding noise impacts because noise measurements cannot be made at all possible locations, but noise modeling alone should not be used to assess noise impacts when actual noise measurements can be made. Ideally, with a model that can address complex terrain and multiple metrics, noise measurement should be used to calibrate and confirm the modeling.</p> <p>Noise measurements are even more important in the case of this DSEIS because the modeling results are of very limited value due to the limitation of the model with respect to complex terrain and the limitation of the modeling method, the smearing technique.</p> <p>The only noise measurements that were presented were performed by the National Park Service in 2010 and were seriously misrepresented in the DSEIS (see Section 8 below).</p> <p>Actual noise measurements are critical to any hard look at noise impacts. The DSEIS failed to undertake actual noise measurements, relying instead</p>	<p>The noise model used, MR_NMap uses state of the art science and is the appropriate method to evaluate aircraft noise in special use airspace such as the Olympic MOA. This model is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses. Regarding the use of a model, please see the response to NPCH-11.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	on outdated modeling technology and suspect modeling methods. As the DSEIS states: "Noise is one of the most prominent environmental issues associated with military training activities" (DSEIS, Appendix J, J-3), yet the Navy didn't even bother to measure the noise. The DSEIS cannot be considered a hard look at what it acknowledges as of one of the most prominent environmental issues associated with the Navy's activities.	
NPCH-17	<p>5. DSEIS Noise Metrics Poorly Suited to Assess the Impact on the Soundscape of Olympic National Park and Wilderness Areas.</p> <p>A noise metric is a measure for quantitatively assessing noise. There are dozens of noise metrics available, such as dBA, dBC, octave band analysis, DNL, Lmax, LSO, L90, L10, L1, audibility, time audible, time above, Each noise metric has its advantages and disadvantages. Each noise metric provides some information on the noise. But no noise metric completely describes a noise. Acousticians rely on many noise metrics to quantify a noise, and in order to take a hard look at the impacts of noise the DSEIS should have done the same.</p> <p>The DSEIS mentions at least 8 noise metrics, including dBA, Lmax, DNL, Ldnr, audibility, time above, percent time audible, and LSO median level. Together, these metrics could give a fairly complete measure of the noise. However, an octave band frequency analysis similar to that found in the National Park Service report is also critical to understanding the intrusion of jet noise on Olympic National Park Soundscapes. The low frequency component of the jet noise travels further than the high frequency noise, and that noise is poorly captured using A-weighted decibel levels. Instead of using these nine measures of noise in the DSEIS analysis, however, the Navy relied primarily on DNL and Lmax, and did not provide a complete assessment.</p> <p>Moreover, the DNL metric is typically presented as a daily or yearly average noise level. As such it provides a measure of noise averaged over a day or year. As an average, it includes some assessment of the loudness of events and some assessment of the duration of events. But as an average, it has two fatal shortcomings. One, the DNL noise level is not a measure of any particular noise event-no one has ever heard a yearly average jet with a 10 decibel nighttime penalty. Two, averages hide the impacts of particular noise events. Just as a punch from Michael Tyson averaged over a day would be a love pat, jet noise averaged over a day can be made to appear quiet. But a Michael Tyson punch is not a love pat and a jet overflight is not quiet. To measure Michael Tyson's punch or a jet overflight in a meaningful way, instantaneous measures are required.</p>	<p>The engines used for the noise model were the F414-GE-400 engines, which are the current engines installed in the F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft. Appendix J has been revised to include the engine type modeled for the EA-18G aircraft. The GE F414-400 enhanced engine is currently only in a research phase for the Navy, and is not installed in any aircraft, nor are there plans to purchase or install it. If this engine were to be introduced to the fleet of F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft, the Navy would measure the noise emissions from this new engine.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	The Lmax metric provides an instantaneous measure, and to the extent the DSEIS used the Lmax metric, this is a vast improvement over the DNL metric. However, the Lmax metric lacks a measure of frequency and duration.	
NPCH-18	<p>The metric best suited to measure the impact of noise on a National Park and Wilderness Areas is the time audible metric. This metric was used in the 2010 National Park Service noise study reported in the DSEIS, but not in the new data the Navy presented in the DSEIS. The critical question about jet noise in Olympic National Park and Daniel J. Evans and other Wilderness Areas is not what the A-weighted sound pressure level would be if averaged over a year, when a 10 decibel penalty is added for night time noise, but whether the noise impairs the natural sound soundscape? Unfortunately, the DSEIS did not investigate noise using an audibility metric, and cannot assess the question of whether the jet noise impairs the natural soundscape.</p> <p>Moreover, the Navy's rationale for not using the time audible metric was arbitrary, or possibly doesn't exist at all. The DSEIS seems to be rejecting the audibility metric because the Navy didn't establish a threshold of impact for that metric. "However, no uniform criteria nor threshold on percent time audible has been established to determine a potential noise impact within these SUA." (DSEIS, Appendix J, J-5). Ironically, the Navy established a threshold for neither the DNL or Lmax metric, yet used both of them in its analysis. The Navy, therefore, arbitrarily rejected the most appropriate metric for measuring impact on the National Park.</p> <p>With respect to the DNL metric, the Navy's representations of its fitness are very questionable. First, while never establishing a criteria or threshold, the Navy seems to imply that 65 DNL is that threshold. It is Important to examine the Navy's rationale. In Appendix J, the Navy states: "In this analysis, noise from aircraft training activities within the Olympic MOA was assessed using noise metrics recommended by the Department of Defense (DoD), the Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN),² ANSI, and the FAA. Aircraft flight noise was assessed using the A-weighted Ldn and the Ldnr. Table J-2 provides the noise level limits associated with land use planning (DoD, 2011; Navy, 2008). In general, most land uses are considered compatible within Noise Zone 1. For Noise Zone 2, some land uses are incompatible with the noise. Within Noise Zone 3, most land uses are incompatible. In addition, the analysis provides Lmax levels from the EA-18G (Table J-13) to aid in the assessment of noise intrusions into the natural soundscape areas underneath and adjacent to the SUA."</p>	<p>Regarding the suggestion to use a time audible metric, please see the response to the Section 1.3 comment above, describing the unsuitability of that metric for airspace noise analysis.</p> <p>Supplemental Lmax values are provided to demonstrate the frequency of occurrences and changes between the scenarios. The choice of noise metrics is not arbitrary but is instead based on recommendations from FICON, FICAN, DoD, and FAA.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>There are a number of problems with this rationale, starting with the first sentence. In particular, the ANSI 512.9 Part 5 Standard specifically says, "This Standard does not address the effects of short-term exposure of people to intrusive sounds in locations such as parks and wilderness areas." The Navy's own citation does not recommend using DNL for parks and wilderness areas. Second, the Navy cites two local land use and planning programs (RUICUZ and AICUZ) as the source of Table J-2, but they do not apply to this DSEIS. Moreover, even if these land use planning programs did apply, local land use and planning does not include National Parks and Wilderness Areas. Third, the Navy merely states that most land uses are compatible with 65 DNL but does not specifically state which land uses in its study are not compatible with 65 DNL, and what criteria should apply to them. Fourth, the Navy selectively chose what it wanted from the RUICUZ and AICUZ documents, but didn't follow the noise mapping guidance contained within the documents. These problems show the arbitrary nature of the Navy's selection of metrics and thresholds or criteria. The Navy's choice of metrics is arbitrary, and it does not adopt a criteria or threshold for any metric it uses or cites. It merely implies that 65 DNL is compatible with most situations based on two documents which contain requirements for noise mapping the Navy did not follow, and based on one document that specifically says that parks and wilderness areas are not addressed by it.</p>	
NPCH-19	<p>6. Lack of Alternatives</p> <p>The DSEIS does not provide the required range of alternatives to the proposed action. Moreover, the DSEIS has not assessed alternatives that would minimize the adverse effects of jet aircraft on Olympic National Park.</p> <p>There were two very obvious alternatives not considered in the DSEIS. The first would be to not use Olympic National Park the Wilderness Areas as a transit route to and from the MOAs. The second is to not use Olympic National Park and Daniel J. Evans and other Wilderness Areas as training areas. The DSEIS didn't even consider reducing or minimizing either of the above.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
NPCH-20	<p>7. Misrepresented the NPS Report</p> <p>The DSEIS presentation of the 2010 National Park Service report is misleading and deceptive. This is true of every paragraph in Section J. 7 Acoustic Monitoring Report of Appendix J.</p> <p>For example, in the first paragraph the DSEIS states: "Two other sites were monitored [in the National Park Service report], but they lie well outside</p>	<p>The Navy revised the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include additional analysis of aircraft transits to and from the Olympic MOA. The analysis includes the areas beneath the Olympic MOA as well as all areas on the Olympic Peninsula. For more information about the analysis of transits, please see Section J.6.2 (Transit to/from the Olympic MOA) in Appendix J of</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the boundary of the MOAs. While they could be indicative of noise levels received during transit to the MOAs, the results at these two site were very similar to results seen in the other three sites, and so add no new information."</p> <p>There are a number of problems with this statement. First, it is notable that the transit analysis did not utilize the other two sites. See Figure 2 for the location of sites OLYM003 and OLYM004 to the transit routes. This is a critical oversight in a noise analysis devoid of actual noise measurements. The Navy appears to desperately not want to know what the existing noise conditions are under its transit routes.</p>	<p>the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Also, Section J.7 was revised to include all five locations analyzed in the 2010 National Park Service study.</p>
NPCH-21	<p>Second, contrary to the Navy's claim, the results from the Hurricane Ridge monitoring location (one of the excluded sites) would have added significant new information concerning the audibility of jet aircraft and the nature of the high elevation soundscape within Olympic National Park. If the Navy had used the two additional monitoring locations in the National Park Service report it would have found that the jets are audible a significant amount of the time, even though the Hurricane Ridge monitoring location was approximately 16 miles from the transit flight path. Moreover, the Hurricane Ridge data show that significant portions of the National Park soundscape are much quieter than the Navy admits. The three locations the Navy chose are not representative of the high elevation Park soundscape. The elevations of the three sites the Navy considered were 658 feet, 254 feet, and 69 feet. The Hurricane Ridge site was 5,156 feet and much more representative of the soundscapes of the higher elevations within Olympic National Park. Notably, the high elevation natural soundscape is substantially quieter than the lower locations, with 10 percent of the daytime levels below 15.4 dBA. This has very significant implications for the intrusiveness of jet aircraft on the higher elevations, where the quieter soundscape means the audibility and intrusion is much greater.</p> <p>Third, as seen in Figure 2, there are only two National Park Service monitoring locations within the MOA areas, and those are along the coast. The monitoring locations are the purple dots. OLYMOO1 is not in the MOA. Fourth, even though the Navy claims the Hurricane Ridge data does not add any new information, the Navy actually stated in Section 3.12.3.2.1.1 of the DSEIS that it is the "closest site to the YETI" and reported noise levels from the location (in a very misleading way described in Section 2.1.3 of these comments).</p>	<p>The Hurricane Ridge and Lake Crescent locations and data were added to the Appendix J discussion of the National Park Service monitoring study.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
NPCH-22	The second paragraph of Section J.7 was only one sentence long, but even that sentence was misleading. "The natural daytime ambient acoustic baseline was found to be 34.1 dBA for Hoh River Trail, 35.6 dBA for Third Beach Trail, and 31.4 dBA for Lake Ozette." The numerical values are correct but they lack a metric. The metric is the median or LSO value. This means that half the time the soundscape was quieter than the cited values. In fact, 10 percent of the time, the daytime soundscape was quieter than 32.9 dBA, 26.7 dBA, and 21.7 dBA for the three locations. The exclusion of the metric is important because from it we learn that the natural soundscape is quiet and that there are many times when the natural soundscape is very quiet. This is critical baseline information as the Navy considers the impact of aircraft that can be more than 80 dBA louder than the ambient conditions.	Appendix J in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been revised to include the LA50 metric for clarity.
NPCH-23	The third paragraph of Section J.7 repeats and is related to how the Navy misrepresents, in the main body of the DSEIS, the instantaneous and time above metric used in the National Park Service report. On page 3.12-29 the DSEIS gives the impression that Park Service feels the most important instantaneous noise level is 60 dBA, and implicitly assumes the only noise impact worth protecting against in a National Park is the ability of people to hold a conversation at a distance of 3 feet. "The [National Park Service] study reported the percentage of time that measured noise levels exceeded four noise thresholds indicative of disturbance at each of the measurement locations for the winter season. The fourth and highest level, 60 dBA, provided a basis for estimating impacts on normal voice communications at 3 ft., which is the most relevant threshold for hikers and visitors to the park. (DSEIS, Volume 2, 3.12-29, emphasis added) The Navy's second sentence above clearly states that 60 dBA is the most relevant threshold for hikers and visitors, and also gives the impression that this is the National Park Service's opinion. Neither of these are true. The Park Service document does not say the 60 dBA level is the most relevant threshold. If the Navy thinks 60 dBA is the most relevant threshold, they have provided no evidence for it.	The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been revised to eliminate the statement that the 60 dBA threshold is most relevant for hikers and visitors to the park.
NPCH-24	The fourth paragraph of Section J. 7 is most notable for what it leaves out. It is clear from the National Park Service report that jet aircraft have the greatest impact on the natural soundscape of Olympic National Park, and that this is most true as one moves away from the edge of the park and roads. The very places Navy jet noise penetrates. Nowhere in the Navy's analysis do we find that acknowledgement.	Nowhere in the National Park Service report is a conclusion that jet aircraft have the greatest impact on the natural soundscape of the Olympic National Park. It would be inappropriate for the Navy to make that unsupported claim.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The final paragraph of Section J.7 discusses the continued relevance of the National Park report, but misses the most relevant aspect of the report, The National Park Service report is exceptionally valuable to the DSEIS, primarily as a template for how the Navy should have conducted its analysis on the noise impacts to Olympic National Park.</p> <p>In summary, the Navy's representations of the National Park Service report are often not supported by the report, and more often than not, serve to obscure and obfuscate important data, such as that jet aircraft are the greatest threat to the natural soundscape.</p> <p>The Navy's "hard look" at the noise impacts on the Olympic National Park is comparable to a park visitor looking at park scenery and wildlife through blurry and unfocused binoculars backwards. When the DSEIS should be getting a close-up view of noise and impact, too often the DSEIS provides a fuzzy far off look. The noise analysis is incomplete, the transit analysis is flawed, cumulative impacts were not considered, actual noise measurements were not taken, the unique nature of the Park soundscape was not considered, and alternatives to minimize the impact were not considered. All too often the DSEIS presented limited or misleading data and analysis that cannot be considered a true hard look.</p>	
Nossaman LLP		
Nossaman-01	<p>These comments are submitted on behalf of Hood Canal Sand and Gravel, LLC and concern the Northwest Training and Testing Supplemental EIS/OEIS:</p> <p><u>Dabob Bay Range Complex</u></p> <p>The boundaries of the Dabob Bay Range Complex are incorrectly depicted in Figures ES-1, 1.1-1, 2.2-1, and 2.2-3. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("Corps"), which has jurisdiction over navigational access to U.S. waters, has designated a restricted area for the Navy's use in Dabob Bay (noise and vessel transit restrictions) and Hood Canal (vessel transit restrictions). See 33 C.F.R. §334.1190. The restricted area designated by the Corps for Navy testing and training operations does not extend as far within Hood Canal as depicted in these figures. The Navy does not have legal authority to unilaterally expand the boundaries of the restricted area, or to increase restrictions on civilian vessel traffic in U.S. waters beyond those adopted by the Corps or the U.S. Coast Guard. The boundaries of the Dabob Bay Range Complex should be revised in the Supplemental EIS to match the area that has been authorized for Navy use by Corps and U.S. Coast Guard regulations.</p> <p>The Corps' regulations also impose time limits and other requirements on</p>	<p>As described in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, the Dabob Bay Range Complex Site includes Dabob Bay and Hood Canal from 1 mile south of the Hood Canal Bridge to the Hamma Hamma River, a total area of approximately 45.7 square nautical miles. The Navy has conducted underwater testing at the DBRC Site since 1956. The areas depicted in the figures cited in the comment are the Study Area boundaries and are not intended to reflect any nearby restricted areas. The Study Area includes areas where activities may be conducted (some of which may occur outside of restricted areas) and where the potential impacts of these activities could reach. Therefore, no changes to the figures are required.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Navy testing operations in Hood Canal. 33 C.F.R. §334.1190(a)(2)(i) – (iv). Those time restrictions and other requirements should be reflected in the Supplemental EIS and the Navy’s training and testing plans.	
Nossaman-02	<p><u>Cumulative Impact Analysis</u></p> <p>The cumulative impact analysis presented in the Navy’s Draft EIS for its Northwest training and testing operations recognized the pending development of a commercial pier Thorndyke Resources (Pit-to-Pier) Project. DEIS Vol. 2, Sec. 4.3.6 (page 4-18). Hood Canal Sand and Gravel, LLC, which is developing that project, submitted comments clarifying and correcting several factual statements in the Draft EIS regarding the gravel mine and pier project. In the Final EIS, in response to those comments, the Navy incorrectly stated that the State of Washington had denied the Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Application (“JARPA”) for the project. FEIS Appx. I, page I-111.</p> <p>State and local land use and permitting applications for the gravel mine and pier project, including a JARPA for the project, were submitted to Jefferson County on March 29, 2003. Jefferson County determined the applications were complete a month later, vesting the project under Washington’s land use laws as of that date. An updated application packet was submitted for the project in 2014 but that did not alter the project’s vesting date. As of the date of this comment letter, no final action has been taken on the applications for this project and those applications remain pending. Accordingly, construction and operation of the pier on Hood Canal, which will be used exclusively for gravel loading operations, should be identified in the cumulative impact analysis in the Supplemental EIS, under non-military actions, as a reasonably foreseeable future action. Inclusion of Hood Canal Sand and Gravel’s project in the Supplemental EIS should have no adverse effect on the Navy’s planned training and testing operations. The Navy previously concluded that the project produced neither cumulative adverse environmental impacts nor any incompatibilities with Navy plans and actions. See Keyport Range Complex Extension NEPA Final EIS (May 2010) and US Navy NBK Bangor EHW-2 NEPA Final EIS (March 2012). In addition, the Navy’s encroachment plan for its Hood Canal facilities states that the Navy should “[c]oordinate with Thorndyke Resource, Jefferson County, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Transportation, and the Army Corps of Engineers, [...] to ensure mutually safe operations.” – Naval Base Kitsap Encroachment Action Plan (April 2010).</p>	Thank you for providing this information. The Hood Canal Sand and Gravel project has been added in Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
<i>Ocean Protection Coalition</i>		

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
OPC-01	<p>Northern California has one of the most nutrient rich productive coastlines on the planet thanks to upwelling and it's a major migration route for gray whales and humpbacks. Blue whales and Killer whales also travel past our coast. While the plan is to do test 12 miles off shore, sound travels. Even 300 miles from the source, sonar can be up to 140 decibels, which is 100 times more intense than the level known to alter whale behavior.</p> <p>The proposed trainings by the Navy will harm dozens of protected species of marine mammals -- Southern Resident killer whales, blue whales, humpback whales, dolphins, and porpoises -- through the use of high-intensity mid-frequency sonar. The use of sonar has been directly connected to many instances of beached whales that have died from barotrauma after military sonar exercises.</p> <p>The negative effects of noise pollution extends beyond marine mammals. And offshore waters are NOT dead zones. Several species of dolphins off our coast are primarily oceanic. And there are a huge number of oceanic fish.</p> <p>Ocean mammals depend on hearing for navigation, feeding and reproduction. Scientists have linked military sonar and live-fire activities to mass whale beaching, exploded eardrums and even death.</p> <p>How will the Navy guarantee marine animals will not be harmed when sound travels and there are no sound barriers in the ocean to stop it?</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal or fish populations in the Study Area or at any Navy Range Complex. In addition, the Navy's research and monitoring programs, described in Section 3.0.1.1.1 (Marine Species Monitoring and Research Programs) in Chapter 3.0 (Introduction), are focused on filling data gaps and obtaining the most up-to-date science to inform impact assessment. The Navy, in collaboration with National Marine Fisheries Service, continuously assesses emerging best available science under the adaptive management process.</p> <p>The quantitative analysis does not predict any marine mammal mortalities or non-auditory injuries resulting from the proposed activities. A small number of permanent threshold shifts, a permanent reduction in hearing sensitivity at the affected frequency range, to individuals of several species are predicted [see Appendix E (Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities)]. These limited impacts to individuals are unlikely to have any long-term consequences for the species or stocks. According to the best available science summarized in Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine species are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. The Navy has worked cooperatively with NMFS to develop a suite of mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts to protected species, such as the Southern Resident killer whale, to the maximum extent practicable, including numerous new mitigation measures developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS as discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).</p>
OPC-02	<p>The permit for "incidental take" - the number of marine animals the Navy is allowed to kill - is unfounded because there is literally no way to know exactly how many marine animals are killed because most will never be recorded due to sinking or counted because the delayed termination response will happen once the navy leaves the area. The "allowed take" numbers are not scientifically backed up because there are no definitive numbers and there have not been accurate population counts.</p> <p>How will the Navy make accurate counts for take and stay within the allowed incidental take numbers?</p>	<p>The vast majority of estimated "take" is from behavioral reactions. Information about the quantitative analysis is described in detail in the 2018 technical report titled Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing. The Navy's acoustic and explosive effects analysis looks at multiple factors such as marine mammal abundance across the study area in each season, the levels of sound that may cause certain effects, and the Navy's proposed time and space use of noise producing activities. As discussed in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Sections 3.4.2.1 and 3.4.2.2, a few instances of take per year are not enough to cause long-term consequences for</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>individuals. Stranding of marine mammals due to proposed activities is very unlikely.</p> <p>As described in Section 5.1.2 (Compliance Initiatives), the Navy's monitoring programs, research programs, and reporting initiatives have been ongoing for more than a decade and will continue as a compliance requirement for the MMPA or ESA, or both. The Navy and NMFS use the information contained within monitoring, research, activity, and incident reports when evaluating the effectiveness and practicality of mitigation and determining if adaptive adjustments to mitigation may be appropriate. These reports also facilitate better understandings of the biological resources that inhabit the Study Area and the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on those resources. The Navy's adaptive management review process and reporting requirements serve as the basis for evaluating performance and compliance. The process involves technical review meetings and ongoing discussions between the Navy, NMFS, the Marine Mammal Commission, and other experts in the scientific community.</p>
OPC-03	<p>Visual detection can miss anywhere from 25-95% of the marine mammals in an area. When sonar is used, it has been scientifically documented that marine mammals surface quickly to get out of the underwater sound that can damage their ear drums. In 2009, a 72 foot female lactating Blue Whale was struck off our coast and killed with a spotter on board a research vessel.</p> <p>How will the Navy guarantee there will not be any strikes?</p>	<p>Please see Section 3.4.2.4.1 (Impacts from Vessels and In-Water Devices) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for the analysis of marine mammal vessel strike. While the Navy believes it is unlikely that any vessel strikes of marine mammals would occur, the Navy is seeking authorization from NMFS for a take to account for the possibility of an accidental strike. As presented in Chapter 5 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy also includes mitigation measures designed to avoid or reduce impacts to marine mammals.</p>
OPC-04	<p>The Navy's own documents reveal that it plans to use 20,000 tons of heavy metals, plastics and other highly toxic compounds over the next two decades in the oceans where it conducts its war games.</p> <p>According to the Navy's Northwest Training and Testing environmental impact statement (EIS), in the thousands of warfare "testing and training events" it conducts each year, 200,000 "stressors" from the use of missiles, torpedoes, guns and other explosive firings in US waters happen biennially. These "stressors," along with drones, vessels, aircraft, shells, batteries, electronic components and anti-corrosion compounds that coat external metal surfaces are the vehicles by which the Navy will be introducing heavy metals and highly toxic compounds into the environment.</p> <p>How will the Navy guarantee that they are not releasing toxins into the oceans? How will the Navy guarantee it will not cause stressor that severely injure and kill marine life?</p>	<p>Please see Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for the analysis of impacts to sediments and water quality from the Navy's proposed activities. See the various resource sections elsewhere in Chapter 3 for an analysis of potential impacts to those species (3.4 Marine Mammals, 3.5 Sea Turtles, 3.6 Birds, 3.7 Marine Vegetation, 3.8 Marine Invertebrates, and 3.9 Fishes).</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
OPC-05	<p>The U.S. Navy has proposed training and testing that would allow the Navy to harm marine mammals approximately 15 million times over five years. Testing and training activities that would affect marine mammals include the use of explosives, electromagnetic devices, physical strikes from missiles, underwater detonations and ships, entanglement and ingestion of toxic chemicals and munitions.</p> <p>These activities often result in the disruption of basic behaviors of marine mammals including activities necessary for survival such as migration, surfacing, navigating, hearing, nursing, breeding and feeding. Many of the species that would be affected are listed as threatened or endangered, making the Navy's proposed project a direct violation of the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>How will the Navy guarantee they will NOT disrupt life sustaining behaviors marine mammals depend on for survival?</p>	<p>The commenter significantly over-estimates the impact to marine mammals predicted under this proposed action. Additionally, instances of harm, as defined by the regulations implementing the Endangered Species Act, are a small portion of the total predicted impacts. The Navy does not expect any marine mammal mortalities resulting from the proposed activities. The number of impacts to marine mammals predicted under this proposed action are provided in Appendix E (Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities). The Navy has consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service for this proposed action under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal or fish populations in the Study Area or at any Navy Range Complex. According to the best available science summarized in Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), there are currently no direct correlations between an observed behavioral response and a loss of an individual. In addition, based on the analysis in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals), long-term consequences for marine species are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. The Navy has worked cooperatively with NMFS to develop a suite of mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts to protected species, such as the Southern Resident killer whale, to the maximum extent practicable, including numerous new mitigation measures developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).</p>
<i>Olympic Forest Coalition</i>		
OFC-01	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the NWTT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic Forest Coalition incorporates submitted comments (OFCO/WCAA Comment on Draft EIS Navy Draft EIS – EA-18G Growlers at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, February 2017;;, OFCO/WCAA Comment, Scoping, NWTT Supplemental EIS/OIES, October 2017, among other comments on related activities). The Coalition joins the West Coast Action Alliance, the Olympic Park Associates, and the National Parks Conservation Association in their comments on this draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Our comments include the following areas of concern: a) unjustified</p>	<p>The Navy has a number of unrelated actions taking place in the Pacific Northwest, and the Navy has prepared separate NEPA documents for each. The Navy prepares separate NEPA documents covering different proposed activities because each document is focused on a specific proposed action, is separated from other actions by its purpose and need, has independent utility, has different timing, and involves differing geographic locations. Specifically, this Supplemental, which is designed to address the Navy's statutory responsibility to maintain ready forces, analyzes the potential impacts of training and testing activities from the year 2020 forward. The 2019 Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS contains a thorough analysis of potential</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>reliance on the flawed NWTT FEIS (2015); b) the 2019 study on impacts of military flights on the Olympic Peninsula soundscape was not included; c) inadequate analysis of impacts on threatened and endangered species (Marbled Murrelets and Northern Spotted Owl); d) inadequate cumulative impacts analysis; e) Inadequate consideration of reasonable alternatives; and f) inadequate mitigation measures.</p> <p>Unjustified Reliance on the Flawed NWTT FEIS (2015).</p> <p>The Draft SEIS/OEIS incorporates in part the NWTT FEIS published in 2015, unless the literature review undertaken for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS on scientific studies published since 2015 identified new findings. The NWTT FEIS was flawed due to incomplete and inadequate information, segmentation of functionally related Navy action into several “actions” limited in scope, inadequate analysis of all impacts (including noise, prey resources, air, water and soil contamination, and climate change), and lack of cumulative impacts analysis of all functionally related Navy actions. The NWTT FEIS incorporated the US Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion that was completed on inadequate and incomplete information provided by the Navy to the Service. The biological determination made in the BiOp are flawed. WCAA/OFCO commented on this problem and the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not address the critique. The Navy should undertake a full and adequate Revised EIS that fully addresses all inadequacies before consideration of expanded training activities is completed.</p>	<p>environmental impacts from the Navy's proposed activities using the best available science. Therefore, a revised EIS/OEIS is not required.</p>
OFC-02	<p>2019 Impacts of Military Flights on Olympic Peninsula Soundscape Findings Not Incorporated in Analysis</p> <p>The Draft SEIS/OIS does not incorporate a very recent, significant and relevant piece of scientific research directly on point: “Impacts of Military Flights on Olympic Peninsula Soundscapes” (Kuehne, 2019). The research has been presented in regional symposia in beginning stages, and should have been included in the analysis. The two-year study of the impacts on the soundscape by the Navy Boeing EA-18G (“Growler”) aircraft is particularly relevant, and one of a kind. The study was conducted by Lauren Kuehne, MSc Research Scientist at the University of Washington’s College of the Environment, School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences. Ms. Kuehne carried out one of the only scientific studies of the soundscape on the Olympic Peninsula. Ms. Kuehne “sought to answer two questions: 1) What are the current noise levels and contributions of different aircraft on the Olympic Peninsula soundscape? and 2) How might these levels change with proposed increases in military training and</p>	<p>The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was released to the public before the Kuehne report was made available. The Navy has considered this report in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS (see Section 3.12 and Appendix J).</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>operations?” The study captured sound data from three areas – within the Olympic National Park and adjacent to the Military Operations Area for the Navy training activities that fly out of Naval Air Station Whidbey Island (NASWI). The three study locations on the west side of the Olympic Peninsula were: “Third Beach (elevation 64 m), River Trail (199 m), and Hoh Watershed (28 m)”. The study recorded and distinguished commercial aircraft, military aircraft, and helicopters. The study including capturing data from the Navy Boeing EA-18G “Growler” aircraft in 2017 and 2018, before the proposed increase of 36 added aircraft (2019). With the decision to increase the Navy fleet from 82 to 118 jets (Record of Decision for Growler Environmental Impact Statement - 2019), monitoring the increase in noise and related impacts becomes more imperative. Read Ms. Kuehne’s report [link to PDF]. Results of Ms. Kuehne’s study (excerpts):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The data were compared with the Whidbey Island airfield public notice of flights, 83% of which are the Growler aircraft. • Of the 4,644 flight events identified. • Of these, 85% were classified as military, 8% commercial, 6% propeller, and <1% were helicopters. • On the busiest days, we recorded an average of up to 70-85 flight events per location. • The maximum number of flight events recorded on a single day at locations were 73 (Hoh Watershed), 104 (River Trail), and 81 (Third Beach). • The duration of time in each day and hour that military aircraft were audible was highly correlated across the three locations, indicating flight activities impacted a large geographic area at any given time. • Military aircraft are a dominant contributor to the soundscape of the Olympic Peninsula, representing 85% of the total time aircraft are audible. • Percent time audible was substantial during daytime hours, particularly at the coastal sites, which averaged 12% audible during daytime hours across all 40 recording days. However, to achieve this average level meant that on some individual days the percent time audible during these hours was far greater (e.g., 49-52% of the time). Individual locations can experience in the range of up to 80-100 events in a single day.” • Data showed that areas outside of the MOA are clearly impacted, with the Hoh River location averaging 9-12% audible during daytime hours (with a maximum of 52% recorded on one sampling day- hour). • The River Trail location, positioned 1.8 km outside the MOA, receives consistent noise from military aircraft indicates that the noise footprint extends well beyond the MOA. 	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>• An important outcome of this study was demonstrating feasibility in identifying different types of aircraft from audio recordings, that were processed using widely available software. [Kuehne] then used these data to calculate metrics relevant for people and wildlife, which do not experience and respond to noise and disturbance as calculated by long-term averages (i.e., the 24 hr day-night average sound level that is the standard applied by the Federal Aviation Administration).</p> <p>These findings are particularly relevant in wilderness areas, the Olympic National Park, and rural communities. As the Olympic Peninsula shoulders the burden for the entire country of training pilots on the new aircraft, Ms. Kuehne's study definitively demonstrates that ground monitoring of noise is feasible and can produce reliable data that on impacts, which can and should be used to drive mitigation strategies for endangered species like the Northern Spotted Owl and Marbled Murrelet, and rural resident's health. The Draft SEIS/OEIS provided a modeling study of sound impacts (Appendix J), but no actual data. The model employed day nit [sic] averages, critiqued in WCAA/OFCO previous comments, and unaddressed in the modeling. The Navy must consider this important new science in a revised EIS and incorporate a full spectrum of mitigation strategies for wildlife, human health and economic losses due to the detrimental impacts on the soundscape of the Olympic Peninsula. The Navy must also implement an independent monitoring program modeled on Ms. Kuehne's study and report to the public in the operational area on findings annually.</p>	
OFC-03	<p>Inadequate Analysis of Impacts on Threatened and Endangered Species</p> <p>The Draft EIS/OEIS does not provide new nor adequate information on impacts to threatened and endangered species such as the Marbled Murrelet and the Northern Spotted Owl, species that will be impacted by the training and testing exercises of the aircraft. The Draft SEIS/OEIS also proposes to use new technologies, such as the "high energy laser" equipment, without adequate information about the potential environmental impacts on threatened and endangered species. OFCO incorporates the concerns about threatened and endangered species in previous comments, as the concerns are not adequately addressed in the Draft.</p> <p>Marbled Murrelets, threatened throughout the MOA, will be impacted both on land and in the marine waters area. The populations are in decline in Washington State, as compared to the stable populations in Oregon and California. The expanded and increasing military operations in both the habitats of the Marbled Murrelet – terrestrial and marine – is of grave</p>	<p>The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS included a thorough analysis of endangered species, and the Navy consulted with both the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service pursuant to the Endangered Species Act. The Navy's use of high-energy lasers and other new technologies, while new to the NWTT Study Area, have been tested on other Navy ranges and evaluated in previous environmental documents. Their use in the NWTT Study Area has been thoroughly analyzed in this NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS for impacts specific to their use in this environment. In each case, as described throughout Chapter 3, impacts are expected to be minimal to undetectable.</p> <p>The analysis of potential impacts to northern spotted owls was conducted in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, and was also included in the consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, resulting in the 2016 Biological Opinion in which the Service stated, "the proposed aircraft overflights are likely to affect spotted owls through intermittent exposures to aircraft noise</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>concern. The increased military operations will impact Murrelet nesting habitat, diving and foraging, marine habitat, and prey fish. The expanded MOA encompasses the marine and terrestrial areas designated as critical habitat for the Marbled Murrelet. While the SEIS made note of new scientific information about sound and climate impacts, no mitigation measures were proposed to address impacts to Murrelets. The Draft SEIS/OEIS reports that a sound study of impacts on Murrelets is in progress, but does not give the scope, methodology, timeline of the study. The Draft indicates no mitigation strategies are proposed for the impacts to Marbled Murrelets. The Navy should not expand the MOA without including mitigation measures to address this threatened species.</p> <p>Northern Spotted Owls, also threatened throughout the MOA, will be impacted by expanded and increased terrestrial training activities. While the SEIS made note of new scientific information about sound and climate impacts, no mitigation measures were proposed to address impacts to Northern Spotted Owls. The SEIS indicates no mitigation strategies are proposed for the impacts to owls. The Navy should not expand the MOA without including mitigation measures to address this threatened species.</p>	<p>throughout the year, including during the nesting season. However, because Navy aircraft will maintain minimum flight altitudes well above the distances at which any significant behavioral responses by affected spotted owls are likely to occur, the effects to spotted owls by these aircraft overflights are considered insignificant." The Navy is not proposing to expand the Olympic MOA or decrease flight altitudes, so the conclusion of insignificant effect to spotted owls remains correct. Therefore, no mitigation measures for the spotted owl are required.</p>
OFC-04	<p>Inadequate Cumulative Impacts Analysis</p> <p>The SEIS/OEIS includes a discussion of cumulative impacts that is overly narrow in scope, and does not incorporate all the functionally related activities and impacts, and clouds the analysis by relying on cumulative impacts "tiered" in other documents. The SEIS/OES excludes impacts outside of the narrowly defined project scope (Sec. 4.2), stating:</p> <p><i>"NEPA documents that analyze a specific type of aircraft operation at a military airfield (in this case, the Growler) are focused in and around that airfield and its facility needs. While the Navy has analyzed, and is currently analyzing, various other projects in the area, those projects are not preconditions for Growler operations at the NASWI complex. Growler operations at the NASWI complex are not a precondition for larger military readiness activities on range complexes in the Pacific Northwest. Even in the absence of these Growler operations, military training in the Pacific Northwest would continue independently from this Proposed Action..."</i></p> <p>The aircraft will fly beyond the air fields where the craft are stationed to conduct the training, including the MOAs and transit areas to the MOAs, therefore, cumulative impacts of flights in the MOAs and outside of the MOAs, and the area immediately surrounding the airfields must be considered. In particular the Navy must to assess the impacts over the northern tier of Olympics, including the National Park (Lake Crescent,</p>	<p>The Navy revised the Cumulative Impacts analysis to include additional activities that have occurred or will occur in the vicinity of the Study Area. The Navy then considered the cumulative impacts of its activities in addition to all of the activities listed in Table 4.3-1.</p> <p>The Navy has expanded the noise analysis to include the transit of aircraft to and from the Olympic MOA, and that is also included in Cumulative Impacts. No scoping comments were received by the Navy from WCAA/OFCO about these issues.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Hurricane Ridge areas), the coastal communities such as Port Townsend, Port Angeles, Sequim, Forks and others, as flight activities transit between Whidbey Island air base and their official military airspace over the west side of the Olympics.</p> <p>The impacts from the increased flights to air quality, soils and water from chemical loading due to the training flights are not considered adequately in the SEIS/OEIS, nor is the impacts of carbon. WCAA/OFCO pointed out these inadequacies in our comments on the Draft and scoping for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Supplemental EIS/OEIS has not addressed these shortcomings.</p> <p>The cumulative impacts of functionally related Navy activities must be fully disclosed and not obfuscated by narrow scope and tiering off other documents, equally narrow in scope. The Navy must undertake a revised EIS that adequately and fully analyzes the cumulative impacts, or take the no action alternative.</p>	
OFC-05	<p>Reasonable Alternatives Not Considered</p> <p>The Draft SEIS/OEIS does not adequately consider reasonable alternatives, such as moving the training to areas more suitable to the mission and that protect the environmental resources. The Navy relied on its own personnel for the analysis of alternatives (Section 2). The Navy eliminated any consideration of other areas with the statement that no other area could provide the training needed for the Pacific Northwest region. This is circular reasoning. The Navy must train pilots for warfare, not only in the Pacific Northwest region. The analysis for dismissing other reasonable alternatives was not adequately shared in the Draft SEIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy dismissed setting geographic restrictions to protect specific species as creating a “patchwork” of training times and areas that would prevent the Navy from fulfilling its training requirements. This analysis also lacks validity and clearly dismisses mitigation for threatened and endangered species. If a species breeding season and forage areas create too great a burden for the Navy to manage in a scheduled training activity, it leaves open to grave concern how the Navy may handle any real-time complexity.</p> <p>The Navy dismisses the “no action” alternative out of hand. The Navy must fully consider specific alternatives that would reduce impacts on marine, terrestrial and aquatic species and rural residents and economies in a revised EIS/OEIS and present the alternatives for public comment before a final decision is made.</p>	<p>The Navy fully considered the specific alternatives raised in the comment. The reasons alternative locations did not meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Action were presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS. Those reasons remain valid.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
OFC-06	<p>Inadequate Mitigation Measures</p> <p>The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS included a description of mitigation measures that will be taken by the Navy, indicating that the mitigation measures are updated from the NWTT FEIS (2015). Section 5 covers the mitigation measures. The Navy reports that it is conducting a study on Marbled Murrelets to refine its assessment of impacts and mitigation measures, but does not incorporate any preliminary findings nor information about the study. The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS is premature and does not have adequate recommendations to mitigate impacts.</p> <p>The Navy reports that it uses a “Protective Measures Assessment Protocol” software tool in planning phases to provide instructions during operations, which includes mitigation measures. The Protocol was not adequately described nor presented in the Draft SEIS/OEIS and should be made available for independent review to determine if it adequately provides mitigation measures for all natural resources and residents in the MOAs and affected areas.</p> <p>The Navy indicates that it carries out monitoring and reporting, as well as research on its activities. These reports were not incorporated nor made publicly available for review, with the exception of the Marine Species Monitoring Program. The Navy monitoring, research and reporting regime on terrestrial and aquatic species should be made public for affected communities in the MOAs, for independent review, and to expand and assist academic research in relevant fields.</p> <p>The Navy indicates that it established in 2010 and 2011, an “Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program” and a “Scientific Advisory Group”, which adopted planning level assessments, goals and strategies, but provided little in terms of concrete data on impacts, recommendations for mitigation. The Navy indicates it does and will report on Training and Testing activities, but the reports seem limited to wildlife “strikes” and incidents, and not environmental impacts. The reports are not made public.</p> <p>The Navy reports that it adopted, and will expand, on mitigation measures in two areas: procedural and geographic based “mitigation zones”.</p> <p>Procedural mitigation is planned, but not specific in the Draft. Procedural mitigation includes “look outs” pre and during activities. The Navy will supplement look outs with “passive acoustic devices” that may detect marine mammals, but does not indicate the steps to mitigate the impacts if detected of other species. The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS focus’ on marine mammals and turtles, and states it “may” include seabirds. The</p>	<p>The Navy consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on those ESA-listed species that could be affected by the Navy’s proposed activities. The consultations concluded after the release of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Any mitigation measures or reporting requirements determined to be necessary by either USFWS or NMFS are included in this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Chapter 5 (Mitigation).</p> <p>The Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program and the Scientific Advisor Group are outgrowths of Navy consultations with the National Marine Fisheries Service. As stated in the NWTT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Section 3.0.1.1.1, “Additional information on the program is available on the U.S. Navy Marine Species Monitoring Program website (https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/), which serves as a public online portal for information on the background, history, and progress of the program and also provides access to reports, documentation, data, and updates on current monitoring projects and initiatives.”</p> <p>The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been revised to clarify that areas such as national parks are to be avoided by U.S. Naval aircraft when flying at altitudes less than 3,000 ft. above ground level except when in compliance with approved special use airspace, such as a military operations area.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	section focus' in any specificity on sea turtles as an example, without stating how this is relevant to the MOAs and adjacent areas and specific studies that will be undertaken by the Navy. The mitigation steps to take focus on marine resources, and little information is provided for mitigating the impacts of the aircraft on terrestrial resources, even in the technical section on mitigation zones (Appendix K), focus' on marine resources in the water, and not the aircraft impacts. The mitigation measures given as examples seem to contradict with the actual activities presented. For example, the Navy states it provides guidance to pilots to not fly over national parks and monuments, and other sensitive habitat areas. The activities in the MOAs include flights over precisely these areas. The Navy must clarify the contradictory mitigation measures presented in the Draft. The Draft SEIS/OEIS states that final mitigation measures will be provided in the Final EIS/OEIS. The Navy must outline with more specificity its recommendations and plans for the threatened and endangered species, terrestrial, aquatic and marine, impacted in the MOAs and adjacent areas in a Revised EIS/OEIS before making a final EIS/OEIS determination, in order to give adequate information to the public to comment.	
OFC-07	For these reasons, the Olympic Forest Coalition requests that the Navy conduct a full, adequate and complete Revised EIS/OEIS, present the document to the public for comment, prior to making a final determination on a preferred alternative. In the alternative, the Navy must adopt the "no action" alternative and not increase the training and testing activities in the MOAs and adjacent areas.	As explained in the responses above, the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was in compliance with NEPA requirements. Minor revisions were made to the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to provide clarification where necessary.
<i>Olympic Park Associates</i>		
OPA-01	OPA supports the No Action Alternative as the only alternative acceptable to the Olympic Peninsula's environment. We also ask for a minimum 14-day extension to the comment period bringing it to 90-days because of the number of people it effects, the large area it encompasses, and the length of the SEIS - 2 vol., 1,800 pages. A study "Impact of military flights on Olympic Peninsula soundscapes Initial Summary of Findings, June 4, 2019, Lauren Kuehne, MSc, Research Scientist, University of Washington's College of the Environment School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences" needs to be completed. Follow-up studies need to be done to provide better answers regarding the impact of military flights on the people and wildlife of the Peninsula. In addition, we ask that all comments on this SEIS be made assessable to the public through the Navy Comment website for at least 60 days following the record of decision (ROD) on this EIS.	The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period. Notices announcing the extension of the public review and comment period were published in the Federal Register April 18, 2019 (84 FR 16250), and April 26, 2019 (84 FR 17826). The Navy received and reviewed the Kuehne paper. All public comments and Navy responses have been included in this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The public comments have been provided in their original format on the NWTT project website at https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/Public-Comments . The commenting feature on the project website, while not a NEPA requirement, was added by the Navy to further facilitate commenting by the

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>OPA opposes Alternatives 1 and 2 because of the damage they will do to Olympic National Park, Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, The Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges, Washington Islands Wilderness, Colonel Bob Wilderness Area, and the people and wildlife of the Peninsula.</p> <p>While trying to submit SUBSTANTIVE OPA comments on-line, OPA received the following message from the website (Please enter no more than 5000 characters). The site will also not accept reference maps. Our comments also make references to comments made available from Olympic National Park and the study by Lauren Kuehne. They are included in submission envelope. OPA will submit OPA substantive comments by mail. This is inefficient for both the Navy and OPA.</p>	<p>public. The Navy placed certain limitations on comments (5,000 characters of text and 1 MB limit for file attachments), to allow the Navy to continue supporting this feature in a cost-effective manner. Over 1,800 comments were received on this project through website commenting and attachments, with very few affected by this limit. The Navy will review this file size limitation for future projects.</p>
OPA-02	<p>There are two types of training involved in this SEIS. One, electronic warfare training using Growler G-18 fighter jets using the western side of the Olympic Peninsula to train. Two, or more, sea training exercises and testing using the ocean site of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary.</p> <p>Electronic emitter training has been done in Idaho and Nevada for several decades indicating that alternative sites are available. While Idaho's Mountain Home Air Force Base and surrounding area, as one example, was designed for military training, the Olympic Peninsula was not. This training activity should stay in a less environmentally sensitive area.</p> <p>Sea training exercises and testing using the ocean is also a century old Navy training need for an ocean environment. Because this training is not intended to obliterate sea animals, it could be done in an area already used and despoiled for these types of operations.</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		The Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Nevada are not reasonable. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. Additionally, the Olympic MOA is desirable for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure, environmental conditions that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness, and other factors stated in 2.5.1.1.
OPA-03	OPA supports the No Action Alternative as the only alternative acceptable to the Olympic Peninsula's environment. We also ask for a minimum 14-day extension to the comment period bringing it to 90-days because of the number of people it effects, the large area it encompasses, and the length of the SEIS - 2 vol., 1,800 pages.	The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period. Notices announcing the extension of the public review and comment period were published in the Federal Register April 18, 2019 (84 FR 16250), and April 26, 2019 (84 FR 17826).
OPA-04	A study "Impact of military flights on Olympic Peninsula soundscapes Initial Summary of Findings, June 4, 2019, Lauren Kuehne, MSc, Research Scientist, University of Washington's College of the Environment School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences" needs to be completed. Follow-up studies need to be done to provide better answers regarding the impact of military flights on the people and wildlife of the Peninsula.	The Navy received and reviewed the Kuehne paper. The Navy has considered this report in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
OPA-05	In addition, we ask that all comments on this SEIS be made assessable to the public through the Navy Comment website for at least 60 days following the record of decision (ROD) on this EIS.	All public comments and Navy responses have been included in this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The public comments have been provided in their original format on the NWTT project website at https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/Public-Comments .
OPA-06	While trying to submit SUBSTANTIVE OPA comments on-line, OPA received the following message from the website (Please enter no more than 5000 characters). The site will also not accept reference maps. Our comments also make references to comments made available from Olympic National Park and the study by Lauren Kuehne. They are included in submission envelope. OPA will submit OPA substantive comments by mail. This is inefficient for both the Navy and OPA. The request for SUBSTANTIVE statements and the restrictions placed on online input give the appearance of going through the NEPA motions but not really being interested in the results. The on-line input portal does not allow maps referenced in these comments. "You can only submit one file. If you upload multiple files, only the latest uploaded file will be accepted. Allowable File Types: Text, PDF, Microsoft	The commenting feature on the project website, while not a NEPA requirement, was added by the Navy to further facilitate commenting by the public. The Navy placed certain limitations on comments (5,000 characters of text and 1 MB limit for file attachments), to allow the Navy to continue supporting this feature in a cost-effective manner. Over 1,800 comments were received on this project through website commenting and attachments, with very few affected by this limit. The Navy will review this file size limitation for future projects.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Word. Maximum file size is 1MB." On-line input is greeted with (Please enter no more than 5000 characters).	
OPA-07	<p>OPA disagrees that the area selected to meet this goal, the Olympic Military Operations Area (Olympic MOA) is an absolute necessity for the Navy.</p> <p>Electronic emitter training has been done in Idaho and Nevada for several decades indicating that alternative sites are available. While Idaho's Mountain Home Air Force Base and surrounding area, as one example, was designed for military training, the Olympic Peninsula was not. This training activity should stay in a less environmentally sensitive area.</p> <p>Sea training exercises and testing using the ocean is also a century old Navy training need for an ocean environment. Because this training is not intended to obliterate sea animals, it could be done in an area already used and despoiled for these types of operations.</p> <p>The SEIS says, "Cessation of military at-sea training and testing activities in the NWTT Study Area would mean that the Navy would not meet its statutory requirements and would be unable to properly defend itself and the United States from enemy forces, unable to successfully detect enemy submarines, and unable to safely and effectively use its weapons systems or defensive countermeasures. Navy personnel would essentially not obtain the unique skills or be prepared to safely and effectively use sensors, weapons, and technologies in realistic scenarios required to accomplish the overall mission. Consequently, the No Action Alternative is inherently unreasonable because it does not meet the purpose and need." [EIS p. ES-4]</p> <p>OPA argues that this statement is untrue and self-serving. These training activities have been done in other places and could continue to do so. The Navy has picked a location most convenient to their current bases and is refusing to look seriously at the harm these operations would do to the people and environment selected.</p> <p>While the "Olympic MOA" may meet typical Navy location requirements, OPA argues that the Navy needs to think less typically. With satellite observation being able to locate a cell phone and this capability is available to nations capable of harming the United States, Russia, China, for example, OPA finds the statement to be 20th century thinking. Especially concerning, "The Navy also requires large areas of sea space because it trains in a manner to avoid observation by potential adversaries. Modern sensing technologies make training on a large scale without observation more difficult. A foreign military's continual observation of U.S. Navy</p>	Please see response to OPA-02.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>training in predictable geographic areas and timeframes would enable foreign nations to gather intelligence and subsequently develop techniques, tactics, and procedures to potentially and effectively counter U.S. naval operations.” [EIS p. 5-14] In this EIS the Navy has stated where they will train during daylight hours, Monday through Friday that are not holidays. There is nothing in the EIS that proves this is the only place where these operations can be performed.</p> <p>OPA wonders if the Navy is forgetting the lessons of Pearl Harbor by concentrating so many Naval facilities within the range of one atom bomb explosion. Namely, the growler arsenal at Whidbey, submarines at Keyport, with carriers & other naval vessels at Everett & Bremerton.</p> <p>The map on EIS, ES-3 shows the Olympic Military Operations Area. In includes “Approximately 24 percent of the Olympic National Park and 27 percent of the Olympic National Forest lies beneath the Olympic MOAs. All of the Colonel Bob Wilderness Area and Pacific Beach State Park underlie the Olympic MOAs as do several other points of interest and recreation areas located on the peninsula... The Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, located offshore of the Olympic Peninsula.” [EIS p. 3.12-19]</p> <p>Also, within the Olympic MOA is The Washington Islands Wilderness and the Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges which are not mentioned in the SEIS. Three Refuges within the Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges are included. They are (with the SEIS comments) Flattery Rocks National Wildlife Refuge, Quillayute Needles National Wildlife Refuge, and Copalis National Wildlife Refuge Table 6.1-2: [EIS p. 6-11-12].</p> <p>Since 1907, these critical areas of the Olympic Peninsula have been set aside to protect the Peninsula's wildlife and biodiversity. Beginning with Theodore Roosevelt and a series of congressional acts, this protection has resulted in the creation of wildlife refuges, a national park for the enjoyment of its citizens, elk, other unique wildlife, wilderness areas to protect natural resources from human damage, and a national marine sanctuary. The area, the Navy wishes to convert into an electronic warfare training area (Olympic MOA), has been designated as an environmentally sensitive area for 112 years.</p> <p>Also included in the "Olympic MOA" are Washington State Department of Natural Resources land; Hoh, Makah, Quileute, and Quinault Reservations; thousands of acres of private land, including the towns of Forks & Amanda Park, the people, birds, wildlife who live on the Peninsula & visitors to the peninsula; the birds migrating on the Pacific Flyway. The people and wildlife of the Peninsula should not have to live in a military training range.</p>	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
OPA-08	<p>Moving operations to the Olympic MOA, requires jets to fly from NAS Whidbey Island to the west side of the Olympic Peninsula. Upon reaching the west side the jets will begin a search for three electronic emitters randomly located at 15 different sites within the Olympic National Forest. This will require a search pattern of flights north and south over the western part of the Peninsula. It will be nearly impossible to not fly over the western appendages of Olympic National Park to accomplish this activity. (See PDN Map end of document)</p> <p>It will bring hours of Growler noise to the whole western side of the Peninsula. Despite the many paragraphs in the SEIS explaining that this noise should be of no concern, under the current Naval operations, people in Forks are recording flyovers of 94 dBA. Flights are heard as late as 9:30 pm - after sundown most of the year. Based on where the emitter sites are located, Forks would not be directly located under search flight paths. Despite that, they are hearing 94 dBA's and their shelves are rattling. According to the SEIS, Growlers transits will be routed Over Olympic National Park, Lake Crescent, Sequim and Port Townsend as they transit back and forth between their Whidbey Island base and the Olympic electronic training areas (EIS map on p. 2-19). OPA calculates this to be 19-20 times (5,000 divided by 260), transit passes over the northern Peninsula per day. The map also shows arrows of flight over the Olympic mountains to return to base from the Quinault area. This does not account for the number of north to south flights needed to search for the electronic emitters.</p> <p>This also does not account for flights coming over land from training activities in the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. [p. 24 Table 2. Proposed Training Activities., USFWS Biological Opinion on US Navy proposed NW Training and Testing Program, July 21, 2016]</p>	<p>The location of the emitters has no bearing on where within the Olympic MOA the aircraft will fly during electronic warfare training flights. However, the Olympic MOA does extend west of the coast off the Olympic Peninsula, so the areas described in the comment would continue to be exposed to noise levels similar to those experienced over the past several decades.</p> <p>The analysis in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, including the Airspace Noise Analysis in Appendix J, considered all of the proposed flights, at the altitudes, locations, and time of day when they could occur. The analysis accounted for all flights conducted in the Olympic MOA and in W-237, that area of the ocean that includes part of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary.</p>
OPA-09	<p>One activity listed in [p. 9 Table 2. USFWS Biological Opinion on US Navy proposed NW Training and Testing Program, July 21, 2016] (Air Combat Maneuver, (ACM), Offshore Area, (W-237, Olympic MOAs), 550 events) According to a Boeing website, when searching for emitters, the Growler jets operate in groups of three to enable triangulation on the electronic target [Boeing Growler website, April 2019]. This fact adds to the level of noise and/or the length of time the noise is present.</p> <p>Not mentioned, in a cultural analysis, are the effects on the towns of the Peninsula that will listen to the Growler roar Monday through Friday, during "daylight hours". As seen in the following SEIS paragraphs, the Navy dismisses noise as a meaningful stressor on the people living under the</p>	<p>The number of aircraft involved during any training activity are based on the requirements for that activity. Some activities could include as many as four aircraft, as described in the table in Section A.1.1.1 (Air Combat Maneuver). The total number of aircraft was considered during the analysis of noise impacts.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>aircraft overflights and visitors to the Peninsula. In the SEIS there appears to be a use of averages that smooth flyover noise levels. The examples following are a jumble of statistics that have little to do with the reality of this activity currently.</p> <p>While some visitors to a natural setting like the Olympic National Park may be disturbed by an aircraft overflight, others may not even register the event." [EIS p. 3.12-28,29] The last sentence maybe true if the visitor is deaf but Forks residents have also reported vibrations of floor boards and objects on shelves during these flyovers.</p>	
OPA-10	<p>The SEIS continues, "Visitors to the national park, national forests, and wilderness areas on weekends or at night will rarely hear an EA-18G aircraft, because EA-18G training flights typically occur Monday through Friday and during daylight hours." [EIS p. 3.12-31] This statement assumes that visitors to the Peninsula only come on the weekends. Park statistics show that 76% of 2014 backcountry permits issued were for people to be in the park Monday through Friday. In April, Forks residents reported hearing flights as late as 9:30 pm. The assumption seems to be that people living on the Peninsula don't matter AND that the Navy has been following its own declarations in this EIS. Current practice declares it does not. Flights occur past sundown.</p> <p>In total there will be 118 Growler jets at Naval Air Station Whidbey. This is the complete U.S. arsenal of Growler jets.</p> <p>The sound profile of the Growler is very different than other jets. It is not only loud but includes a low frequency vibration that travels farther and vibrates objects in its path. The people of the Peninsula, the people of Coupeville, and the San Juan people hear and feel this daily.</p> <p>The Navy admits to noise levels within the Olympic airspace will range from 80 dB to 100 dB. "Continued exposure to noise above 85 dBA (adjusted decibels) over time will cause hearing loss. The volume (dBA) and the length of exposure to the sound will tell you how harmful the noise is. In general, the louder the noise, the less time required before hearing loss will occur." [Center for Hearing and Communication, website]</p>	<p>The analysis and conclusions in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS account for weekday visitors. The sentence quoted in the comment was describing the potential impact for weekend and nighttime visitors to the park. The rest of the analysis includes the other visitors, as found in the next section in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS where those visitors "may experience aircraft overflight noise on multiple occasions during weekdays while they are staying the park."</p>
OPA-11	<p>It is telling that one reference in this SEIS is: Miller, J. D. (1974). Effects of noise on people. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 56(3), 729-764. [EIS p. 3.9-110] OPA finds it incredible that there are not more recent studies referenced in this SEIS on this subject.</p> <p>According to Noise Pollution: A Modern Plague, Lisa Goines, RN and Louis Hagler, MD, March, 2007 [http://www.nonoise.org/library/smj/smj.htm] noise causes: "Hearing Impairment, Interference with Spoken</p>	<p>The studies cited in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS are relevant given the type, level, and frequency of sound generated during aircraft flights in the Olympic MOA. Other research, such as those provided in the comment are relevant to chronic and much higher levels of noise than would result from the flight activities proposed in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Communication, Sleep Disturbances, Cardiovascular Disturbances, Disturbances in Mental Health, Impaired Task Performance, Negative Social Behavior and Annoyance Reactions can come from exposure to noise. "Noise represents an important public health problem that can lead to hearing loss, sleep disruption, cardiovascular disease, social handicaps, reduced productivity, impaired teaching and learning, absenteeism, increased drug use, and accidents. It can impair the ability to enjoy one's property and leisure time and increases the frequency of antisocial behavior. Noise adversely affects general health and well-being in the same way as does chronic stress. It adversely affects future generations by degrading residential, social, and learning environments with corresponding economic losses. Local control of noise has not been successful in most places."</p> <p>Regarding cardiovascular disease, OPA finds the following very interesting, "every increase in arterial hypertension can lead to more infarctions (heart attacks) and strokes."</p> <p>[https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2696954/]</p> <p>The Navy Purchasing Department issued the following warning regarding the health of its own personnel, "According to PMA265 representatives (Navy Purchasing Department), the F/A-18E/F aircraft emits, and the EA-18G will emit, a maximum of 150 dBs, which is well above the noise level considered hazardous to hearing (greater than 84 dBs). According to PMA265, they made no initial attempts to mitigate the flight-line/deck jet noise hazard through design selection. This is contrary to the system safety design order of precedence specified in the MIL-STD-882D "PMA265 representatives stated that they did not pursue minimizing noise generated by the F/ A-18E/F engines through design because warfare sponsors (Commander, Naval Air Forces representatives) did not identify noise requirements as KPPs within the Operational Requirements Document (ORD). "PMA265 did not attempt to mitigate the jet noise hazard in the initial design and development of the aircraft, did not follow required guidance relating to risk levels and risk acceptance authority levels, and did not track the flight-line/deck jet noise hazard and its residual mishap risk. These conditions may contribute to a hazardous environment of high noise exposure associated with jet aircraft that, according to the Naval Safety Center, increases the likelihood of permanent hearing loss to sailors and Marines. PMA265 representatives stated that many flight-deck personnel exceed total daily exposure limits in approximately one launch while</p>	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	wearing hearing protection that provides 30 dBs attenuation" [https://citizensofthereserve.wordpress.com/2013/05/05/very-disturbing-noise-facts-from-the-navy/]	
OPA-12	Regardless of formulas, etc. given in the SEIS, the noise, based on experience, will only get worse from the increased number of jets and will be consistently louder than many of the examples given in the SEIS. Growler jets are the jets equipped for electronic warfare training. [Boeing website] The electronic warfare training will be done with them. Other Navy jets flights will be in addition to the electronic warfare training. The Navy has consistently denied that noise is a problem to the people subjected to it. Their standard response is "it's the sound of freedom." The Navy has refused to work productively with the National Park Service, citizens of Coupeville, EPA asking for noise monitoring, and the Washington State Department of Health regarding noise issues. There are reasons when airports expand, that houses are purchased and destroyed or receive noise insulation services paid by the governments involved. The Navy's standard phrase "the sound of freedom" will not keep people from suffering bad health affects when continually exposed to it. The human body cannot tolerate Blue Angel noise for extended periods of time. OPA wonders what the reaction would be if this training were to occur over Seattle or other more populated Puget Sound regions. And, it is affecting many residents of Seattle and other Western Washington cities because the Peninsula provides vacation homes and recreational activities for them. Witness the ferry backups starting every Thursday afternoon, even in winter. City people leave for the Peninsula to enjoy nature's sounds not the Blue Angels. This access to nature has made Puget Sound cities great places to live and work. This training operation will change one of the quietest places in America, Olympic National Park's Hoh Rain Forest, to only when the Navy doesn't fly, and it will fly a lot. OPA found this bibliography on the Internet. Most later than 1974. OPA suggests that the Navy consider studying them: [list of dozens of references]	The studies cited in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS are relevant given the type, level, and frequency of sound generated during aircraft flights in the Olympic MOA. Other research, such as those provided in the comment, which the Navy considered, are relevant to chronic and much higher levels of noise than would result from the flight activities proposed in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
OPA-13	Economic: Because of the noise, the economic effects on Peninsula could be devastating. In 2017, people visiting Olympic National Park, alone, spent \$279 million in communities near the park. That spending supported 3,556 jobs in the local area and had a cumulative benefit to the local economy of \$385 million. That does not include visitors to the Peninsula to recreate in	The potential economic impact to the region was included in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The impacts of the training and testing activities on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism). Along with this, the potential impacts to socioeconomic resources from Growler activities was analyzed in Section 3.12.3.2 (Airborne Acoustics). The results of that analysis include in part, "Considering that trends in economic indicators have

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the surrounding Olympic National Forest or to fish, hunt, camp, or hike elsewhere on the Peninsula. And it doesn't include other outdoor activities like visiting lavender and music festivals. The harm to the Peninsula's economy and way of life will be far greater than the \$5 million in fuel savings to the Navy. [p.64, Navy Currents, fall 2015]</p> <p>However, the SEIS states, "Training and testing activities within the Study Area would result in an increase in energy demand over current activities. The energy demand would arise from fuel (e.g., gasoline, diesel) consumption, mainly from aircraft and vessels participating in training and testing. Details of fuel consumption by training and testing activities on an annual basis are set forth in the air quality emissions calculation spreadsheets available on the project website. Aircraft fuel consumption is estimated to decrease by approximately 28 percent and 26 percent per year under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, respectively, when compared to current rates of aircraft fuel consumption for training and testing activities. Vessel fuel consumption is estimated to increase by 140 percent under Alternative 1 and by 163 percent per year under Alternative 2, when compared to current rates of vessel fuel consumption during training and testing activities. Fuel consumption would result in a net total increase of 7 percent and 13 percent for Alternative 1 and 2, respectively. The alternatives could result in a net cumulative reduction in the global energy (fuel) supply. The significant increase in vessel testing fuel consumption for Alternatives 1 and 2 is due to additional testing operations compared to the baseline, including operations that were previously not analyzed; and updated fuel flow rates for vessels, which are significantly higher for certain vessels, including guided-missile destroyer. [EIS p. 6-13 to 6-14]</p> <p>The jobs brought to the Peninsula by this EIS is, will be, far fewer than the potential jobs lost if the noise resulting from this EIS reduces tourism to the Peninsula.</p>	<p>historically increased and are projected to continue to increase, disturbances from airborne acoustics on the Olympic Peninsula are expected to have a negligible impact on socioeconomic resources in the Study Area." Thus, no negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p>
OPA-14	<p>Environmental:</p> <p>Olympic National Park:</p> <p>Olympic National Park is the 8th most visited park in the national park system. There were 3.4 million visitors to the Park in 2017, exceeding visitation to Mt. Rainier National Park. The ONP is also an International Biosphere Reserve and a World Heritage Site. Olympic National Park's uniqueness has been formally recognized since 1907 when Theodore Roosevelt made it a national monument. The reasons listed below.</p> <p>Olympic National Park has several distinctly different ecosystems, including glacier-capped mountains, old-growth temperate rain forests, and over 70</p>	<p>To ensure compliance with the National Marine Sanctuary Program regulations and the interagency consultation requirements of National Marine Sanctuaries Act section 304(d), the Navy considered all proposed modifications to training and testing activities to determine whether they have the potential to destroy, cause the loss of, or injure sanctuary resources, or result in adverse impacts on sanctuary resources or qualities. Accordingly, the Navy and NMFS submitted a joint Sanctuary Resource Statement to the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>miles of wild coastline 94% of the park is designated as the Daniel J. Evans Wilderness. "Wilderness is " ... an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain." The Wilderness Act created our National Wilderness Preservation System and provides the means for Congress to designate "wilderness areas," our nation's highest form of land protection. Today millions of Americans enjoy wilderness for hiking, camping, backpacking, fishing, mountaineering, solitude, and more.</p> <p>"Olympic National Park and its surroundings are home to a wide variety of wildlife. Just offshore, whales, dolphins, sea lions, seals, and sea otters feed in the Pacific Ocean. Invertebrates of countless shapes, sizes, colors and textures inhabit the tide pools.</p> <p>"On land, some species, like raccoons, beaver and mink, live mostly in the lowlands. But others, like deer, elk, cougars and bears, range from valleys to mountain meadows. Park waters are home to Some of the healthiest runs of Pacific salmon outside of Alaska. Over 300 species of birds live in the area at least part of the year, from tiny penguin-like rhinoceros auklets offshore to golden eagles soaring over the peaks."</p> <p>"The park is a rare refuge for species dependent on old growth forests, including some species protected under the Endangered Species Act. Olympic provides one of the last remaining large tracts of Intact primeval forest in the lower 48 states. These moist forests provide essential habitat for northern spotted owls, marbled murrelets and a variety of amphibians. "The wildlife community of the isolated Olympic Peninsula is also unique. This community is noteworthy not only for its endemic animals (found only here), but also for species missing from the Olympics, yet found elsewhere in western mountains. Pika, ptarmigan, ground squirrels, lynx, red foxes, coyotes, wolverine, grizzly bears, bighorn sheep and historically, mountain goats, did not occur on the Olympic Peninsula. Meanwhile, endemic species like the Olympic marmot, Olympic snow mole and Olympic torrent salamander are found here and nowhere else in the world!" [Olympic National Park website, April 20, 2019]</p> <p>Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary:</p> <p>The Navy wishes to couple the electronic warfare training activity with training and testing activities which include new activities at sea, as well as activities that are currently ongoing and have historically occurred in the Study Area." [EIS Abstract] (See map 1) The historical training was much more benign than what is being asked in this EIS. It will include "asking for extension of a NOAA permit for "incidental takes of marine mammals...and</p>	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>incidental takes of threatened and endangered marine species." [EIS p. ES-04]</p> <p>"For more than 40 years, our national marine sanctuaries have worked to protect special places in America's ocean and Great Lakes waters, from the site of a single Civil War shipwreck to a vast expanse of ocean surrounding remote coral reefs and tiny atolls. Backed by one of the nation's strongest pieces of ocean conservation legislation, the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, the sanctuaries seek to preserve the extraordinary scenic beauty, biodiversity, historical connections and economic productivity of our most precious underwater treasures. By acting as responsible stewards of these special places, we strengthen our nation now and for future generations." [https://sanctuaries.noaa.gov/about/]</p> <p>"he National Marine Sanctuaries Act (NMSA) was enacted in 1972 in order to protect significant marine habitats and special ocean areas like Florida Keys and Monterey Bay. Under the NMSA, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to designate and manage certain areas of the marine and Great Lakes environment that he or she considers to be nationally significant and that merit federal management.</p> <p>While some people who hear the word "sanctuary" think that these areas are fully protected from all extractive uses, the reality is quite different. Under the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, sanctuaries are managed for multiple uses provided the uses are deemed compatible with resource protection by the Secretary of Commerce. The National Marine Sanctuaries Act does not prohibit any type of use, but leaves it up to the Secretary to determine through a public process which activities will be allowed and what regulations will apply to various uses. Under this process a secretary may exempt extractive uses from regulation, such as bottom trawl fishing. 11 [https://marine-conservation.org/what-we-do/programareas/mpas/national-marine-sanctuaries/legislative-history-national-marine-sanctuaries-act/]</p> <p>"Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary represents one of North America's most productive marine ecosystems and spectacular undeveloped coastlines." [https://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/living/]</p> <p>"The Olympic Coast is an example of the temperate Northeast Pacific ocean ecosystem. The ocean environment is influenced by global patterns of ocean currents and climate that interact with the unique geology of the Olympic Mountains, continental shelf and deep sea floor. The sanctuary is large enough to observe both variety and stability in the ocean processes - important qualities for studying short- and longterm changes." [Olympic</p>	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Coast National Marine Sanctuary website, April 20, 2019]</p> <p>"Marine life, ranging from minute ocean drifters called plankton, to humpback whales, thrive here. Twenty-nine species of marine mammals and scores of seabirds species spend parts of their lives here; gray whales visit as of the longest mammal migration on earth and albatross gather food here to return to nestling on mid-Pacific islands and atolls. Sea otters munch on macro-invertebrates such as urchins, which in turn graze on majestic kelp forests. Fishes occupy myriad niches from the deepest ocean canyons to the shallowest tide pools.</p> <p>"The sanctuary includes habitats as varied as broad sandy beaches, tide pools, rocky reefs, the open ocean surface and deep sea canyons. These habitats provide for shelter, feeding, nesting and other basic needs to sustain diverse and abundant marine wildlife populations.</p> <p>Because of its closeness to a wilderness park, the Sanctuary has a unique position to be a scientific test tube for understanding the natural interaction of sea and land. Preserved untrammelled it provides a library and laboratory of scientific information valuable to this and future generations. Activities requiring permits for "incidental takes of marine mammals...and incidental takes of threatened and endangered marine species." [EIS p. ES-4] would seem to nullify this ability.</p>	
OPA-15	<p>OLYMPIC PARK ASSOCIATES ALSO SUPPORTS:</p> <p>Study: Impact of military flights on Olympic Peninsula soundscapes Initial Summary of Findings June 4, 2019 Lauren Kuehne, MSc Research Scientist University of Washington's College of the Environment School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences 1122 NE Boat Street Seattle, WA 98105. {Attached separately)</p> <p>Following are excerpts from the study:</p> <p>Under Results</p> <p>This says, it appears, that the EIS 5,000 flights per year refer to take offs from Whidbey not the number of times the jets would be heard doing their training flights. Any calculations based on 5,000 flights would severely under estimate the noise impact on the people and wildlife of the western part of the Olympic Peninsula. Based on "25-50 flights" and an average up to 70-85 flight events (above) the impact would be conservatively 5,525 to 18,785 flights over areas of the MOA in a year.</p>	<p>The analysis in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, including the Airspace Noise Analysis in Appendix J, considered all of the proposed flights, at the altitudes, locations, and time of day when they could occur.</p>
OPA-16	<p>In June 2015, Congressman Kilmer asked the Navy to cooperate with the National Park Service & Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN) to investigate the impact of noise on the Park. No agreement was reached as to how this would be done.</p>	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>On February 24, 2017 the Washington State Department of Health submitted a letter asking the Navy to do further study on the effects of noise on the residents of Coupeville, WA. [https://www.doh.wa.gov/CommunityandEnvironment/Noise] As reported in the Seattle Times, March 25, 2017, "EPA faults study on expanding Growler jets at Whidbey, seeks on-the-ground noise monitoring." To our knowledge no studies or monitoring has been done. The Navy has repeatedly shown its disregard for the environment under their management. In Washington State alone, they allowed workers to be exposed to toxins for 7 years in the Bremerton Navy Yard. Despite warnings, workers became sick because of their irresponsible lack of oversight of Yard working conditions. [KINGS, November 2017] It is alleged by the Washington State Attorney General that the Navy, "committed multiple violations of the Clean Water Act by its decision to release toxic substances into the Sinclair Inlet, which flows into the Puget Sound, and failed to obtain the proper permits when cleaning a decommissioned aircraft carrier, the USS Independence." [AG Ferguson] The Navy broke off discussions "with state and local groups about easing the impacts of expanding EA-18G Growler jet training over a central Whidbey Island historic district. "A Navy statement Friday cited a 'fundamental difference of opinion' on what should be done to reduce the noise and other adverse effects of the training flights. "The breakdown of talks is the latest sign of a bitter divide between the Navy and many residents of the rural central part of the island who fiercely oppose plans to quadruple, in the years ahead, the number of Growler flights over the Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve." [Seattle Times Dec 3, 2018] In this SEIS, "ES.7.3 Monitoring As described in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy remains committed to demonstrating environmental stewardship while executing its National Security Mission and complying with the suite of federal environmental laws and regulations, and providing required and relevant reports to appropriate regulatory agencies." Given its actions to date, this statement rings hollow to OPA. To many OPA members who live in the northwestern part of Washington State, the Navy is becoming a very noisy and disruptive neighbor. To OPA's non-Peninsula residents, the Navy appears to have a lack of understanding of the Peninsula environment and its value to the nation. Unfortunately, OPA finds many statements within the SEIS of March 29, 2019 are made without sufficient facts to prove their accuracy.</p>	<p>these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015. ² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>CONCLUSION: OPA supports the constitutionally guaranteed right of domestic tranquility. OPA argues this SEIS will increase the noise heard on the Olympic Peninsula to levels that are harmful to human physical and mental health. This SEIS will also despoil a marine sanctuary with activities that can be done in an area not designated for wildlife protection.</p> <p>While OPA understands and supports the Navy's desire to be good warriors and to protect the U.S. citizens from foreign harm. OPA also argues that our environment also requires protection from harm. For over 112 years, presidents and congress have been trying to save examples of nature's work on the Olympic Peninsula. These areas belong to all. They are a National park, National wilderness areas, National marine sanctuary. They were created for all Americans. National parks, wildlife refuges, wilderness areas, and marine sanctuaries were created to preserve unique natural areas. OPA argues extra effort should be used to protect these places for future generations.</p> <p>We need to preserve the experience people expect in a national park – to hear the sounds of nature and for nature to hear itself.</p> <p>As important, our medicines come from nature. Materials for our food and shelter come from nature. OPA argues we are a part of nature and our ability to live in the natural world is also necessary for the human species survival. In wilderness, in natural areas, we learn from nature, so we can do this. To destroy these places destroys biodiversity. To ignore this reality, will bring our people to a condition no military operation can prevent. This SEIS disregards the people and wildlife of the Olympic Peninsula. It disrespects the national effort to protect these national treasures.</p> <p>To the Navy, it appears, it is about location. To have the training out of a base they manage. To allow them to cluster their operations. Despite citizen objection, the Navy is hoping that this will be a politically safe decision. That the protesting citizen's political representatives lack the power to stop its plans.</p> <p>To OPA it is about the environment. A healthy environment for people and wildlife living, working and visiting the Peninsula and the Salish Sea. Providing a healthy environment for the Olympic Elk; birds, local and migratory; and the sea mammals and other ocean critters.</p> <p>Olympic Park Associates doesn't want the 7 years under this SEIS to be an experiment on what Growler jet noise will do to humans and wildlife or what electronic noise, explosions, high-energy lasers, and chemicals will do</p>	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	to marine life. The SEIS is a convenience for the Navy, a sacrificial loss for the people of the Peninsula and the country.	
Orca Conservancy		
Orca-01	<p>Whether intentional or unintentional, anthropogenic noise in the marine environment is an important component of ocean noise. The Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) calls for the "least practicable adverse impact" on marine mammals and their habitats. To limit harm, the NMFS requires the USN to shut down or delay sonar transmission if there are nearby marine mammals. It also forbids the Navy to produce pulses of 180dB or more within about 14 miles of any coastline, or within 0.6 miles of several "offshore biologically important areas.</p> <p>Previous training and testing exercises in the Southern Residents' habitat, when the whales were nearby, disrupted their normal behavior and caused the whales to flee, indicating they are sensitive to sonar activity. For a population that is on the verge of extinction, any additional adverse effects will have a long-term consequence.</p>	<p>Information about the quantitative analysis is described in detail in the 2018 technical report titled Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing. The Navy's acoustic and explosive effects analysis looks at multiple factors such as marine mammal abundance across the study area in each season, the levels of sound that may cause certain effects, and the Navy's proposed time and space use of noise producing activities. As discussed in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Sections 3.4.2.1 and 3.4.2.2, a few instances of take per year are not enough to cause long-term consequences for individuals.</p> <p>The commenter's description of the Navy's mitigation for active sonar is not accurate. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict certain activities or types of sonar year-round within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, seasonally within the Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area and Stonewall and Heceta Bank Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, and year-round in the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to help the Navy avoid potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. Additional information about the Navy's mitigation areas is presented in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).</p>
Orca-02	<p>Orca Conservancy has previously proposed establishment of the Marine Protected Areas (MPA), where habitat enhancement and protection could be emphasized to increase prey available to whales. Our list is not intended to be comprehensive, but is a start based on information available to us. The USN would be better served in electing to be part of solution; until we start showing considerable growth in the SRKW population and the entire ecosystem trying to support them. This list is based on, first and foremost, SRKW distribution; 2) important areas for salmon rearing; 3) spawning areas for forage fish; 4) areas with high primary productivity due to unusually high levels of tidal mixing. Many of these areas already have</p>	<p>As described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy completed an extensive assessment to develop mitigation areas for the NWTT Study Area. The Navy considered Southern Resident Killer Whale habitat in its assessment, including the habitats mentioned by the commenter. The Navy will implement additional mitigation within the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area, which encompasses the entire NWTT Inland Waters portion of the Study Area, to avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine mammals, birds, and fish. Other efforts mentioned by the commenter, such as establishing protected areas to</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>some level of protection as Aquatic Reserves, Marine Stewardship Areas, or are already known as MPA's</p> <p>The west side of San Juan Island</p> <p>The west side of San Juan Island is the most heavily used portion of the SRKW range. Closing it to recreational fishing would offer two advantages. First, it would significantly reduce vessel traffic in Haro Strait. Second, it would maintain prey density through Haro Strait, rather than the reduced prey density after runs are heavily fished by sports fisherman. Shifting fishing effort to the waters north of San Juan Island should have minimal impact on the sport fishing industry, while significantly benefitting whales</p> <p>1) Hein Bank</p> <p>This is an area where prey appear to be concentrated, so it is an important feeding area for SRKWs. It should have the same protections as the waters off San Juan Island</p> <p>2) Cherry Point</p> <p>Cherry Point is an important spawning area for herring, which are a key forage fish central to the Salish Sea food web</p> <p>3) Protection Island</p> <p>This is an area of high productivity that is an important area for herring immediately prior to spawning</p> <p>4) Maury Island</p> <p>The waters off Maury Island have been identified as the most important area for juvenile salmon in the Central Puget Sound region</p> <p>5) Nisqually</p> <p>The recent restoration of the Nisqually estuary makes it an important area with the potential to increase salmon survival and production</p> <p>7) Elwha</p> <p>The recent restoration of the Elwha River makes its estuary an important area with the potential to increase salmon survival and production</p> <p>8) Camano Island</p> <p>Most of the island's nearshore is important spawning habitat for forage fish</p> <p>9) Other</p> <p>Other restoration efforts, such as the mouth of the Snohomish River and beach nourishment on the Snohomish County coast, may justify the elevation of such areas to MPA status in the future, to maximize the biological productivity of these areas</p> <p>These areas could be sites where habitat is closed to damaging activities. Shipping could be routed away from these areas to minimize the risk of damage from oil and coal.</p>	<p>prohibit recreational fishing activities, beach nourishment, and rerouting shipping lanes, are outside the scope of this Supplemental EIS.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Orca-03	<p>Rather than using a fixed received level threshold for whether a take is likely to occur from exposure to mid-frequency sonar, the USN has proposed a method for incorporating individual variation. Risk is predicted as a function of three parameters: 1) a basement value below which takes are unlikely to occur; 2) the level at which 50% of individuals would be taken; and 3) a sharpness parameter intended to reflect the range of individual variation. Parameters employed are based on the best available science, the implications of uncertainty in the values, and biases and limitations in the model. Data were incorrectly interpreted when calculating parameter values, resulting in a model that underestimates takes.</p> <p>Errors included failure to recognize the difference between the mathematical basement plugged into the model, and the biological basement value, where the likelihood of observed and predicted takes becomes non-negligible; using the level where the probability of take was near 100% for the level where the probability of take was 50%; and extrapolating values derived from laboratory experiments that were conducted on trained animals to wild animals without regard for the implications of training; and ignoring other available data, resulting in a further underestimation of takes.</p>	<p>The commenter is referring to the Phase II behavioral criteria. Since Phase II, the Navy incorporated emergent best available science into new behavioral response functions for Phase III that are described in the technical report titled Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a), available at www.nwtteis.com. The Phase III behavioral criteria were determined appropriate and adopted by NMFS.</p>
Orca-04	<p>The model also has limitations. For example, it does not consider social factors, and this is likely to result in the model underestimating takes. This analysis has important management implications.</p> <p>First, not only do takes occur at far greater distances than predicted by the USN's risk model, the fact that larger areas are exposed to a given received level with increasing distance from the source further multiplies the number of takes. This implies takes of specific individuals will be of greater duration and be repeated more often, resulting in unexpectedly large cumulative effects. Second, corrections need to be made for bias, and corrections will need to be larger for species for which there are no data than for species for which there are poor data. Third, the greater range at which takes would occur requires more careful consideration of habitat specific risks and fundamentally different approaches to mitigation.</p>	<p>The Navy Acoustic Effects Model considers social factors (e.g., group sizes) typical of the species modeled. The Navy Acoustic Effects Model also uses accepted propagation models and incorporates extensive databases of physical environmental data to accurately predict acoustic propagation as described in the technical report titled Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018c), available at www.nwtteis.com. (This includes modeling for potential impacts at distances far from a sound source. The energy from multiple exposures during an event (e.g., multiple sonar pings) are accumulated to assess auditory impacts. Takes of individuals are accurately accounted for in the quantitative analysis as described in this Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the above supporting technical report.</p> <p>The Navy compiled data from multiple sources and developed a protocol to select the best available density estimates based on species, area, and time (i.e., season), including those for species with poor data. This process is described in Section 3.0.1.2.1 (Marine Species Density Database) and the technical report titled U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2019), available at www.nwtteis.com.</p> <p>The Navy has worked cooperatively with NMFS to develop a suite of mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts to protected species, such as the Southern Resident killer whale, to the maximum extent practicable, including numerous new mitigation measures developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).</p>
Orca-05	<p>The USN distinguishes two types of takes: Level A, in which there is immediate injury or death; and Level B, in which there is no immediate injury, but cumulative exposure may lead to harm at the population level. However, in certain contexts, Level B harassment may lead to Level A takes through indirect mechanisms.</p> <p>The population effects of Level A takes on populations are relatively easy to assess, as individuals that are killed are obviously removed from the population, and those that are injured are more likely to die whenever the population is next exposed to stress.</p> <p>Calculating the population effects of Level B takes is a topic of contemporary research. For example, Bain (2002a) explored using energetic consequences of behavior change in conjunction with population dynamics models to estimate population effects of Level B takes. Stress concurrent with Level B harassment would have additional population consequences. Stress may occur in the absence of behavioral change, or the absence of change in significant behavioral patterns such as foraging or nursing, or exclusion from optimal habitat. Lusseau et al. (2006) concluded disturbance caused a decline in and posed a significant threat to the survival of the bottlenose dolphin population in Doubtful Sound, New Zealand. Therefore, the different magnitudes of takes will have different population consequences. Thus, it will be challenging to synthesize results of multiple studies, as different measured endpoints may belong on different curves relating them to noise, and different endpoint will have different population consequences. Furthermore, the population consequences can depend on the health of the population. Most notably the latter, as we know the SRKW population health is suffering due to the lack of their number one food source, Chinook salmon.</p> <p>Temporary Threshold Shifts in captive marine mammals are commonly used as an index of physical harm. Limiting experimental noise exposure to levels that cause temporary effects alleviates ethical concerns about</p>	<p>The commenter incorrectly defines terms under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. For military readiness activities, the correct definition of Level A harassment is “any act that injures or has the significant potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild.” Level A harassment is not mortality. For military readiness activities, the correct definition of Level B harassment is “any act that disturbs or is likely to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of natural behavioral patterns including, but not limited to, migration, surfacing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering to a point where such behavioral patterns are abandoned or significantly altered.” According to the best available science summarized in Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), there are currently no direct correlations between an observed behavioral response and a loss of an individual. No mortalities from acoustic or explosive sources are predicted due to the Proposed Action.</p> <p>Significant research is ongoing into the population consequences of disturbance, as summarized in Section 3.4.2.1.1.7 (Long-term Consequences) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). Still, it is not possible to utilize individual short-term behavioral responses to estimate long-term or population-level effects in available models based on available data. Also, the sound characteristics that correlate with specific stress responses in marine mammals are poorly understood, as are the ultimate consequences due to these changes, as described in Section 3.4.2.1.1.3 (Physiological Stress). Therefore, the best assessment of long-term consequences from Navy training and testing activities is monitoring populations over time within the Study Area. As the commenter mentions, substantial efforts are underway to better understand possible compounding impacts through data collection. The Navy has developed and implemented comprehensive monitoring plans since 2009 for protected marine mammals occurring on Navy ranges with the</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>deliberately causing permanent injury. However, repeated exposure to noise that causes temporary threshold shifts can lead to permanent hearing loss. In fact, chronic exposure to levels of noise too low to cause temporary threshold shifts can cause permanent hearing loss. Changes in behavior resulting from noise exposure could result in indirect injury in the wild. Therefore, damage to hearing from noise exposure is an example of unconditional injury from noise. OSHA (2007) requires limiting human exposure to noise at 115dB above threshold (equivalent to 145 dB re 1uPa for killer whales - pain threshold for killer whales begins at 135 dB re 1uPa) to 15 minutes.</p>	<p>goal of assessing the impacts of training and testing activities on marine species and the effectiveness of the Navy's mitigation measures. The Navy supports a wide range of research that continually improves the understanding of marine species presence on Navy ranges and the impacts of stressors on these species. More information on these efforts can be found at https://navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/. To date, the findings from the research and monitoring and regulatory conclusions from recent analyses by NMFS have been that the majority of impacts from military readiness activities are not expected to be deleterious with regard to the fitness of any individuals or long-term consequences to populations of marine mammals.</p> <p>The commenter cites two studies that considered the impacts of marine mammal watching vessels on their target species. These studies were considered in the Navy's examination of best available science in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). Unlike marine mammal watching vessels, however, the Navy does not intentionally approach marine mammals and implements procedural mitigation to avoid vessel interactions with marine mammals. Additionally, as described in Section 3.0.3.1.2 (Vessel Noise), Navy traffic is a very small portion of overall vessel traffic in the Inland Waters portion of the Study Area.</p> <p>The commenter incorrectly states that temporary threshold shift is used as an indicator of harm. This is not supported by Reference 14 [Au et al (2003)], which documented recovery of TTS in a bottlenose dolphin. Any instances of TTS are considered Level B harassment and are expected to be of low magnitude and of short duration. Additionally, the commenter cites Szymanski et al. (1999) in regards to applying OSHA general industry noise standards to marine mammals. The Navy's Phase III criteria for assessing threshold shift incorporate the best available science on marine mammal sound exposures, incorporating other mammal data as appropriate. The killer whale audiogram data in Szymanski et al. (1999) is incorporated into the Phase III criteria. See the technical report titled Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a), available at www.nwtteis.com, for detailed information on how the criteria and thresholds were derived. The marine mammal criteria and thresholds developed for that technical report were relied on by National Marine Fisheries Service in establishing guidance for assessing the effects of sound on marine mammal hearing (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2016I) and were re-affirmed in the 2018 revision (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2018e). In addition, these auditory impact criteria were recently published by</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>Southall et al. (2019a). Lastly, Section 3.4.2.1.1.5 (Hearing Loss) synthesizes the best available science on threshold shift in marine mammals.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the Southern Resident killer whales' plight in the Pacific Northwest and plans applicable activities with consideration given to their possible presence. The Navy's current and planned sonar and explosives activities occur largely in areas not frequented by Southern Resident killer whales. As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy worked cooperatively with NMFS to develop a suite of mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on Southern Resident killer whales and their prey species to the maximum extent practicable, including numerous new mitigation measures developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS in areas important to Southern Resident killer whales and salmonids for feeding, breeding, and migration.</p>
Orca-06	<p>A variety of mechanisms for Level B harassment to potentially lead to Level A takes have been identified. When speaking exclusively on killer whales, separation of individuals from social units is a consequence of noise exposure that may lead to mortality. In 2003, in Haro Strait, some killer whales responded to mid-frequency sonar by seeking shelter behind a reef. Others chose to flee, resulting in splitting of a pod that historically spent all of its time together as a single unit. While no deaths resulted from this particular incident, other killer whales have been observed separated from their social units resulting in death prior to reunion or requiring human intervention to restore the individual to its social unit.</p> <p>Temporary threshold shifts may conditionally lead to harm. Impaired hearing ability increases vulnerability to ship strike. In 2003, blunt force trauma was identified as a cause of death in the investigation of harbor porpoise mortalities following exposure to mid-frequency sonar in Washington State. A minke whale was nearly struck by a research vessel in the area where one had been observed fleeing mid-frequency sonar exposure.</p> <p>Same holds true, if not more, for killer whales.</p> <p>Therefore, temporary threshold shifts may conditionally lead to harm. Impaired hearing ability increases vulnerability to ship strike. In 2003, a harbor porpoise was found with ear damage following exposure to mid-frequency sonar in Washington State, although post-mortem changes could not be ruled out as a cause. A minke whale was nearly struck by a research vessel in the area where one had been observed fleeing mid-frequency sonar exposure. On February 11, 2012, the body of L112, a</p>	<p>There are no known instances of a behavioral response due to noise exposure resulting in mortality or injury of killer whales. Although the quantitative analysis predicts TTS in killer whales, a small number of which would be to Southern Residents, any instances of TTS are expected to be of low magnitude and of short duration. The combined impacts of all stressors on marine mammals are discussed in Section 3.4.3 (Summary of Impacts) in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals). Predicting cumulative impacts of multiple stressors currently relies on speculation based on the best available science (e.g., "hearing loss as a result of noise exposure may increase the risk of vessel strike"); however, substantial efforts are underway to better understand possible compounding impacts through data collection. The Navy supports a wide range of research that continually improves the understanding of marine species presence on Navy ranges and the impacts of stressors on these species. More information on these efforts can be found at https://navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/. To date, the findings from the research and monitoring and regulatory conclusions from recent analyses by NMFS have been that the majority of impacts from military readiness activities are not expected to be deleterious with regard to fitness of any individuals, or long-term consequences to populations of marine mammals.</p> <p>To avoid physical disturbance and strike from vessel movements, the Navy maneuvers to maintain a 500 yd. mitigation zone distance from whales. Navy studies from other range complexes demonstrated that median speeds near coasts are low, varying from 5-12 knots. There have been no vessel strikes involving minke whales, Southern Resident killer whales, or any other marine</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>young female SRKW was found on Long Beach, Washington. Based on findings from the gross examination and the absence of conclusive histopathology or ancillary test results, blunt force trauma was the primary consideration for the acute death of the animal. Weather and sea surface data for coastal Oregon and Washington, and drift patterns for the Columbia River plume suggested that L112 had likely been carried for some days in the Columbia River eddies or drifted from the south before being cast on Long Beach. Sonar and small underwater explosive activities were confirmed by the Royal Canadian Navy on February 4, 5, and 6, 2012 in Canadian waters off Vancouver Island and in the Strait of Juan de Fuca but no marine mammals were ‘observed’ during the activities. On Tuesday, December 20, 2016, the body of J34, a young male SRKW, was discovered floating in the Strait of Georgia just north of Vancouver, British Columbia and appeared to have suffered “blunt force trauma”.</p>	<p>mammal by Navy vessels conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area.</p> <p>In May 2003, killer whales in Haro Strait, Washington, exhibited what were believed by some observers to be aberrant behaviors, during which time the USS Shoup was in the vicinity and engaged in mid-frequency active sonar operations. Sound fields modeled for the USS Shoup transmissions (Fromm, 2009; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2005; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2004) estimated a mean received SPL of approximately 169 dB re 1 μPa at the location of the killer whales at the closest point of approach between the animals and the vessel (estimated SPLs ranged from 150 to 180 dB re 1 μPa). Per the Phase III behavioral response function for odontocetes, the estimated received level during this exposure would likely have resulted in a behavioral response. However, attributing the observed behaviors to any one cause is problematic given there were six nearby whale watch vessels surrounding the pod, and subsequent research has demonstrated that “Southern Residents modify their behavior by increasing surface activity (breaches, tail slaps, and pectoral fin slaps) and swimming in more erratic paths when vessels are close” (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries, 2014).</p> <p>A discussion of harbor porpoise strandings in May 2003 is available in the technical report titled <i>Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities</i> (available at www.nwtteis.com). The higher number of harbor porpoise strandings in 2003 were likely indicative of a start to a multi-year trend in increased strandings related to an increase in local harbor porpoise population sizes, and since little post-mortem evidence for acoustic trauma exists, it is likely the porpoises stranded around the time of USS SHOUP tactical sonar operations were unrelated to acute acoustic trauma from sonar exposure.</p> <p>The National Marine Fisheries Service investigated the stranding of Southern Resident killer whale L-112 (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-133). No U.S. Navy training activities involving sonar or explosives were conducted between 1 and 11 February 2012 in the Northwest Training Range Complex (which includes Washington, Oregon, and northern California). Other anthropogenic activity, including other U.S. military, Royal Canadian Navy, fishing, or construction activities, were also ruled out as potential causes of the observed injuries.</p>
Orca-07	<p>These species are familiar with boats in the aforementioned areas, and normally avoid them by a wide margin if need be, when they can actually</p>	<p>The commenter is referring to the Phase I and II behavioral criteria. Since Phase II, the Navy incorporated emergent best available science into new</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>hear them coming.</p> <p>Out of the three datasets used (captive cetacean, killer whales, right whales), the second largest dataset is killer whales exposed to mid-frequency sonar from the USS Shoup in Haro Strait, Washington, in May, 2003. The level quoted in the HRC SDEIS (Dept. Navy 008b) is an estimate of the received levels experienced when mid-frequency sonar was transmitted from about 3 km away. This level caused major behavioral changes in 100% of exposed whales (Risk=1 for Level B takes of a magnitude that in other contexts or species could lead indirectly to physical harm), but was not believed to have caused Level A takes (the whales did not strand, and received levels were estimated to be too low to have caused threshold shifts, MNFS OPD 2005) in any individuals (Risk = 0). However, much more data are available from the May 2003 USS Shoup incident. Behavioral changes were first observed at 47 km (where the received level was estimated to be 121 dB). The behavioral response was tail slapping by about 25% of the individuals observed, which is consistent with observed responses to vessel noise at a similar level. At a distance greater than 22km, the direction of travel changed away from a feeding area, and hence forage behavior was disrupted. At this distance, the received level may have increased to the neighborhood of 135dB re 1uPa with about 6 dB of reduced spreading loss and 6 dB reduced absorption. This would be comparable to a vessel traveling at a low speed approaching to within 10 m, which is very difficult to accomplish without causing whales to turn away. 100% of killer whales responded by abandoning their feeding ground and moving away from the noise source at the received level. While vessels cause diversion from straight-line paths, they have not been observed to displace killer whales from feeding areas (vessels have been observed to displace killer whales from resting areas, but this is likely mediated by presence rather than noise, as the effect is observed in the presence of silent vessels, Trites et al 1995). Thus, it is not surprising that a qualitatively different behavioral response was exhibited. The peak exposure level was estimated to be 175 dB re 1uPa (HRC SDEIS, although NMFS noted that estimated levels tended to overestimate measured levels by 1-10 dB [NMFS OPR 2005], so the peak exposure level may have been only 165dB). In addition to changing travel patterns, the pod split, with approximately 50% of the pod continuing to shelter in an acoustic shadow zone, and the other 50% fleeing at high speed. Such behavior has not been observed in the presence of vessels alone. It should be emphasized that the 100% of killer whales exhibited a disruption of a significant life process,</p>	<p>behavioral response functions for Phase III that are described in the technical report titled <i>Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)</i> (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a), available at www.nwtteis.com. The Phase III behavioral criteria were determined appropriate and adopted by NMFS.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	foraging, at a level that may have been less than 135dB re 1uPa, in contrast to the value used in the SDEIS, 163.3 dB re 1uPa for a 50% response.	
Orca-08	<p>Additional datasets are available for killer whale response to noise. E.g., in Bain and Dahlheim's (1994) study of captive killer whales exposed to band-limited white noise in a band similar to that of mid-frequency sonar at a received level of 135 dB re 1uPa, abnormal behavior was observed in 50% of the individuals. This is far lower than the level observed in bottlenose dolphins. In addition, Bain (1995) observed that 100% of wild killer whales appeared to avoid noise produced by banging on pipes (fundamental at 300Hz with higher harmonics) to 135 dB re 1uPa contour. This indicates the difference between wild and captive killer whales (non-zero risk in captive marine mammals might correspond to 100% risk in wild individual of the same species), as well as implying that risk of 100% may occur by 135 dB re 1uPa for this genus in the wild. However, while this may be the case, more emphasis needs to be placed on the captive-wild difference, as there are species differences, like Dall's porpoises, harbor seals, and California sea lions being relatively noise tolerant, and harbor porpoises, killer whales, and Steller sea lions relatively noise intolerant.</p> <p>Further, killer whales responded to vessel traffic at around 105-110 dB with conspicuous behavioral changes such as increased rates of threat displays and evasive swimming patterns. Subtle behavioral changes, such as inhibition of foraging behavior, were observed at lower levels. While inhibition of foraging is a Level B take, in a food limited population, inhibition of foraging is likely to result in increased mortality and/or reduced recruitment.</p>	<p>Since Phase II, the Navy has incorporated emergent best available science into new behavioral response functions for Phase III that are described in the technical report titled <i>Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)</i> (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a) available at www.nwtteis.com, including data on exposures to wild killer whales. As shown in the technical report, the Navy considered how captive and wild animals may respond differently to acoustic stressors when analyzing response severity.</p> <p>The Navy acknowledges in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS that the proposed training and testing activities have the potential to affect marine species, and provides a separate analysis and determinations of impacts for each species in the training and testing area. The Navy's acoustic effects model predicts impacts from acoustic stressors (e.g., sonar) on marine mammals, and the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS considers impacts from vessel noise as well (please refer to Section 3.4.2.1.3, Impacts from Vessel Noise). While stressors from Navy activities would contribute to other natural and anthropogenic stressors encountered regularly by marine species in the affected environment (e.g., commercial vessel traffic, natural fluctuations in prey availability), their impact would be minimal in comparison. For example, Navy vessel traffic is much lower than commercial and recreational vessel traffic within the Inland Waters portion of the Study Area.</p>
Orca-09	<p>Finally, the USN's characterization of the killer whale dataset is incorrect. They indicate the effects observed in the presence of mid-frequency sonar in Haro Strait were confounded by the presence of vessels. However, the effects of vessels on killer whales have been extensively studied, both prior to and subsequent to exposure. Behavioral responses attributed to mid-frequency sonar are qualitatively different than those observed to vessels alone. While the observations were based on a small sample, they were not inconsistent. The sonar signal was blocked from reaching the whales with full intensity by shallow banks or land masses during three segments of the observation period. The "inconsistencies" can be attributed to differences in behavior depending on whether there was a direct sound path from the Shoup to the whales. It should be noted there was extensive study of this population prior to exposure, as well as extensive post-exposure monitoring.</p>	<p>In May 2003, killer whales in Haro Strait, Washington, exhibited what were believed by some observers to be aberrant behaviors, during which time the USS Shoup was in the vicinity and engaged in mid-frequency active sonar operations. Sound fields modeled for the USS Shoup transmissions (Fromm, 2009; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2005; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2004) estimated a mean received SPL of approximately 169 dB re 1 µPa at the location of the killer whales at the closest point of approach between the animals and the vessel (estimated SPLs ranged from 150 to 180 dB re 1 µPa). Per the Phase III behavioral response function for odontocetes, the estimated received level during this exposure would likely have resulted in a behavioral response. However, attributing the observed behaviors to any one cause is problematic given there were six nearby whale watch vessels surrounding the pod, and subsequent research has demonstrated that "Southern Residents modify their behavior by increasing surface activity (breaches, tail slaps, and</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The USN incorrectly concludes that additional datasets are unavailable. In addition to the three data sets the USN relies upon; captive cetaceans, killer whales, and right whales -- the data set illustrating the use of acoustic harassment and acoustic deterrent devices on harbor porpoises illustrate exclusion from foraging habitat. Data are also available showing exclusion of killer whales from foraging habitat, although additional analysis would be required to assess received levels involved. The devices which excluded both killer whales and harbor porpoises had a source level of 195 dB re 1μPa, a fundamental frequency of 10 kHz, and were pulsed repeatedly for a period of about 2.5 seconds, followed by a period of silence of similar duration, before being repeated. Devices used only with harbor porpoises had a source level of 120-145 dB re 1μPa, fundamental frequency of 10 kHz, a duration on the order of 300 msec, and were repeated every few seconds. Harbor porpoises, which the USN treats as having a B+K value of 120 dB re 1μPa (with A large enough to yield a step function) in the AFAST DEIS29, 45 dB lower than the average value used in the HRC SDEIS, may be representative of how the majority of cetacean species, which are shy around vessels and hence poorly known, would respond to mid-frequency sonar. Even if harbor porpoises were given equal weight with the three species used to calculate B+K, including them in the average would put the average value at 154dB re 1μPa instead of 165 dB re 1μPa.</p>	<p>pectoral fin slaps) and swimming in more erratic paths when vessels are close" (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries, 2014).</p> <p>In regards to datasets used to develop behavioral criteria, the commenter is referring to the Phase I and II behavioral criteria. Since Phase II, the Navy incorporated emergent best available science into new behavioral response functions for Phase III that are described in the technical report titled <i>Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)</i> (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a), available at www.nwtteis.com.</p>
Orca-10	<p>An important property of the model is that the biologically observed basement value is different than the mathematical basement value. The USN proposes using 120 dB re 1μPa as the basement value. They indicate the selection of this value is because it was commonly found in noise exposure studies. I.e., many species are highly likely to avoid received levels greater than 120 dB.</p> <p>For example, many looked at changes in migration routes resulting from noise exposure, and found that 50% of migrating whales changed course to remain outside the 120 dB re 1μPa contour. These results might be interpreted in several ways. They could be seen as minor changes in behavior resulting in a slight increase in energy expenditure. Under this interpretation, they would not qualify as changes in a significant behavior, and are irrelevant to setting the basement value. They could be interpreted as interfering with migration, even though the whales did not stop and turn around, and hence 120 dB would make an appropriate B+K value rather than B value.</p> <p>Bowhead whales are one of the species on which the 120 dB threshold is based, because individuals near industrial noise were observed to remain</p>	<p>The commenter is referring to the Phase I and II behavioral criteria. Since Phase II, the Navy incorporated emergent best available science into new behavioral response functions for Phase III that are described in the technical report titled <i>Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)</i> (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017a), available at www.nwtteis.com. The Phase III behavioral criteria were determined appropriate and adopted by NMFS.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	just outside this contour. However, aerial surveys, which could observe individuals from far from the source, observed concentrations of individuals where the sound was barely audible. This suggests the 120 dB threshold only actually applied to a small fraction of the population, in contrast to data obtained by observers located at the noise source. Additionally, the change in course could have been accompanied by a stress response, in which case the received level at which the course change was initiated rather than the highest level received (120 dB re 1μPa) could be taken as the biological basement value.	
Orca-11	All that being said, the proposed action regarding impacts on Southern Resident killer whales (SRKW) continues to be inadequate. As of May 27, 2019, there are 76 remaining SRKWs, therefore, if even one member of the population is affected will result in population level impacts that could escalate the spiral towards indefinite extinction (PBR = 0.76). The EIS/OEIS continues to promote a range of responses on killer whales towards sonar to include; ignoring, alerting, altering movement, and avoidance is without basis. The USN is not adapting to direct, indirect or cumulative impacts to the SRKW and therefore, the USN must do better.	Based on the best available science, long-term consequences for marine mammal species or stocks, including Southern Resident killer whales, would not be expected from Navy training and testing activities under the Proposed Action. As described in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals), a single or even a few TTS or behavioral reactions by an individual killer whales per year are unlikely to have any long-term consequences for that individual. Direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to marine mammals are analyzed in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals) and Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts). The Navy has consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service as required by Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.
Orca-12	We feel strongly that the USN needs to incorporate better techniques to improve their detection rates of marine mammals, extend their exclusion zones around detected marine mammals, and utilize exclusion zones based on specific areas and times in their mitigation strategies. For example, in 2005 the European Parliament called for its member states to impose a moratorium on military sonars. The World Conservation Union, an organization of 70 nations and 400 nongovernmental groups, has passed a resolution to limit the use of loud noises until the effects are better understood. (The U.S. abstained in that vote). And the Scientific Committee of the International Whaling Commission found "compelling evidence" that entire populations of marine mammals are threatened by underwater noise.	Training and testing with active sonar is essential to national security. The Navy uses active sonar during military readiness activities only when it is essential to training missions or testing program requirements since active sonar has the potential to alert opposing forces to the operating platform's presence. Passive sonar and other available sensors are used in concert with active sonar to the maximum extent practicable. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict certain activities or types of sonar year-round within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, seasonally within the Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area and Stonewall and Heceta Bank Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, and year-round in the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to help the Navy avoid potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. Additional information about the Navy's mitigation areas is presented in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Orca-13	<p>The Supplement's additional analysis of Maritime Security Operations includes 286 annual activities all conducted within inland waters and in the critical habitat of the Southern Resident population. As previously stated, any additional anthropogenic noise in the Southern Residents' range, from vessel noise or sonar activities, will have a negative impact on this population. As Judge Martinez concluded in his review of the impact of noise on SRKWs from a proposed gravel mine expansion, it is non-sensical to design a policy around identifying initial factors that do not accumulate to put a population in jeopardy, allowing those; identifying the factor that brings the cumulative effect to the jeopardy level and prohibiting that single factor, and then allowing additional threats once the population is already in jeopardy.</p> <p>The annual census of the entire Southern Resident population allows an accurate count to be maintained and close observation of births and losses. At the end of 2018, the Southern Resident killer whale population numbered only 73 individuals, 14 fewer than is listed in the initial DEIS and 16 fewer than the most recent peak of 89 individuals in 2011. The USNs proposed increases in sonar and vessel activity within the range of this critically endangered population will cause additional stress and negative impacts on this struggling community. We urge the USN to reconsider the impacts of its proposed activities being imposed on SRKWs and to examine alternatives, and additional mitigation measures to ensure the protection and recovery of this population.</p> <p>Therefore, if marine mammals are sighted or detected within acoustic range, then exercises should be shut down, if in progress, and postponed or moved elsewhere if the exercises have not yet started. For example, an appropriate threshold for such a decision is whenever noise levels from naval operations as well as other sources at the location of SRKWs are expected to be greater than 130 dB re 1µPa; again, the pain threshold of killer whales. Notably, after the USS Shoup incident (https://vimeo.com/35584781) in 2005, the USN had put into effect a policy designed to further protect marine mammals in Puget Sound, according to Rear Admiral (ret) Leendert "Len" Hering, commander of Navy Region Northwest. Since his retirement, however, it appears that the USN has become lax on this policy. Additionally, with today's technologies, it behooves us to ask why the USN has not set up permanent hydrophones where they intend to train. The hydrophones not only could announce and track the movement of whales, but the information would be quite useful to scientific research.</p>	<p>No harm to Southern Resident Killer Whales is anticipated from proposed training and testing activities. Potential impacts to marine mammals from acoustic and explosive sources, which are part of the proposed action, are analyzed in Section 3.4.2.1 and Section 3.4.2.2, respectively. The Navy's acoustic and explosive effects analysis looks at multiple factors such as the southern resident killer whales abundance across the study area in each season, the levels of sound that may cause certain effects, and the Navy's proposed time and space use of noise producing activities.</p> <p>As described in Section 5.2.1.1 (Lookouts), the Navy's passive acoustic devices (e.g., remote acoustic sensors, expendable sonobuoys, passive acoustic sensors on submarines) can complement visual observations for marine mammals when passive acoustic assets are already participating in an activity. The passive acoustic devices can detect vocalizing marine mammals within the frequency bands already being monitored by Navy personnel. Marine mammal detections from passive acoustic devices can alert Lookouts to possible marine mammal presence in the vicinity. Lookouts can use the information from passive acoustic detections to assist their visual observations of the mitigation zone. Based on the number and type of passive acoustic devices that are typically used, passive acoustic detections do not provide range or bearing to a detected animal in order to determine its location or confirm its presence in a mitigation zone. Therefore, it is not practical for the Navy to implement mitigation in response to passive acoustic detections alone (i.e., without a visual sighting of an animal within the mitigation zone). As described in Section 5.5.3 (Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Devices), although the Navy is continuing to improve its capabilities to use range instrumentation to aid in the passive acoustic detection of marine mammals, at this time it would not be effective or practical for the Navy to monitor instrumented ranges for real-time mitigation or to construct additional instrumented ranges as a tool to aid in the implementation of mitigation.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Orca-14	<p>When permitting construction work by Washington State Ferries, NMFS allowed zero Level A and B takes for endangered marine mammals, and we urge the same standard to be applied in the training range. Further, upon review of data on responses of SRKWs to vessel traffic, Washington State enacted legislation intended to limit exposure to 95 dBRMS re 1μPa for continuous noise from nearby vessels, and 105 dB for sources beyond 0.5 nautical miles. We urge NMFS to use a threshold in this range for Level B take rather than the current 120 dB threshold applied to marine mammals for which inadequate data are available to set a species-specific threshold. Likewise, NMFS has recognized harbor porpoises are vulnerable to take at received levels well below 120 dB.</p> <p>These lower thresholds will extend far beyond the range at which marine mammals can be sighted from vessels responsible for explosives and mid-frequency active sonar. This will require the use of remote sensing technology such as drones (with infrared sensing capability for use at night) and sonabuys. The use of permanent hydrophone arrays wired to shore would allow more thorough tracking of marine mammal movement throughout the training range.</p> <p>In addition, exercises should be moved further offshore than currently planned to compensate for the greater ranges at which Level B takes could be expected under the criteria recommended here than for the 120 dB contour.</p>	<p>The continuous noise threshold of 120 dB, which has been used by NMFS to assess impacts due to continuous industrial noise, was not applied in the Navy's analysis of impacts. Rather, the Navy, in consultation with NMFS, used the best available science on marine mammal behavioral responses during acoustic exposures to develop behavioral response criteria. For more information about the Phase III criteria, please refer to the technical report titled <i>Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)</i> (June 2017), available at www.nwtteis.com. The Navy has consulted with NMFS under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act and will continue to coordinate with NMFS on criteria and thresholds for assessing impacts to marine mammals.</p> <p>The Navy developed several new mitigation measures for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to further avoid potential impacts on Southern Resident killer whales. For example, the Navy will initiate communicate with available sighting detection networks prior to the conduct of applicable activities in NWTT Inland Waters. The Navy developed a new mitigation area in the NWTT Offshore Area known as the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, where annual mid-frequency active sonar hours will be limited and explosives will be prohibited. It would not be practical to implement additional distance-from-shore restrictions or additional passive acoustic monitoring for the reasons provided in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) and Chapter 5 (Mitigation).</p> <p>Analysis of the potential for thermal detection systems as a mitigation tool was presented in Section 5.5.4 (Thermal Detection Systems and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Office of Naval Research Marine Mammals and Biology program funded a project (2013-2018) to test the thermal limits of infrared-based automatic whale detection technology. The Navy has also been investigating the use of thermal detection systems with automated marine mammal detection algorithms for future mitigation during training and testing, including on autonomous platforms. For example, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency funded six initial studies to test and evaluate infrared-based thermal detection technologies and algorithms to automatically detect marine mammals on an unmanned surface vehicle. Based on the outcome of these initial studies, the Navy is planning additional follow-on efforts and testing. The Navy plans to continue researching thermal detection systems to determine their effectiveness and compatibility with Navy applications. If the technology matures to the state where thermal detection is determined to be an</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		effective mitigation tool during training and testing, the Navy will assess the practicality of using the technology during training and testing events and retrofitting its observation platforms with thermal detection devices. The Navy will provide information to NMFS about the status and findings of Navy-funded thermal detection studies and any associated practicality assessments at the annual adaptive management meetings. Information about the Navy's adaptive management program is included in Section 5.1.2.2.1.1 (Adaptive Management).
Orca-15	<p>Lastly, Orca Conservancy would like to remind the government that in past requests for use of sonar to take protected species resulted in legal cases directly on point. Specifically, the ninth circuit looked at the 2012 rule making process and requests for take of protected species. The panel found that where the courts have held that "Although the National Marine Fisheries Service made a negligible impact finding under 16 U.S.C.S. § 1371(a)(5)(A)(i)(I) in authorizing a rule, this finding did not excuse the agency's failure to comply with the independent requirement of § 1371(a)(5)(A)(i)(II)(aa) to analyze whether proposed mitigation measures would reduce the effects of low frequency active sonar on marine mammals to the least practicable adverse impact; [2]-Absent evidence that protecting offshore biologically important areas would impede military readiness training, the agency erred when it changed the selection criteria to exclude many areas based on lack of data, which did not result in the least practicable adverse impact on marine mammal species, stock, and habitat; [3]-Planning to consider future rule changes to accommodate new information did not satisfy mitigation requirements." The court also held that in the Navy's 2012 proposed rulemaking that is extremely similar to the current request, the court found held that the 2012 Final Rule did not establish means of "effecting the least practicable adverse impact on" marine mammal species, stock and habitat, as was specifically required by the MMPA. The panel further held that the Fisheries Service impermissibly conflated the "least practicable adverse impact" standard with the "negligible impact" finding; and concluded that to authorize incidental take, the Fisheries Service must achieve the "least practicable adverse impact" standard in addition to finding a negligible impact. The statute's text makes clear that to authorize incidental take, NMFS must achieve the "least practicable adverse impact" standard in addition to finding a negligible impact. NMFS also did not give adequate protection to areas of the world's oceans flagged by its own experts as biologically important,</p>	<p>The Navy worked cooperatively with NMFS during the MMPA consultation process and determined that the suite of mitigation developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS will effect the least practicable adverse impact on marine mammal species or stocks and their habitat.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>based on the present lack of data sufficient to meet NMFS's designation criteria, even though NMFS's own experts acknowledged that "[f]or much of the world's oceans, data on cetacean distribution or density do not exist." (NRDC, Inc. v. Pritzker (9th Cir. 2016) 828 F.3d 1125, 1128.)</p> <p>The lack of sensitivity to the SRKW's dwindling population and its need for a protected home in accordance with its endangered species status in 2005 remains a critical concern. In a perfect world, training should be excluded from their critical habitat. Additionally, proximity to Naval bases for the convenience of sailors and their families, or interesting underwater topography taken as a rationale for continuing exercises does not warrant even one "take" of this species.</p> <p>We adamantly believe that these creatures, because they are threatened with extinction, must be given the utmost priority -- and that training and testing within their entire range should be prohibited, if we are truly working together to save them.</p>	
<i>Pacific Whale Watch Association</i>		
PWWA-01	<p>The Pacific Whale Watch Association (PWWA) is a US/Canadian transboundary organization whose professional members responsibly take an estimated half million visitors annually to view wildlife throughout the region, including the southern resident killer whales (SRKW).</p> <p>Over the past several decades, with the help and dedication of impassioned, scientifically educated naturalists and professional captains, the PWWA has been supporting conservation efforts throughout the region. Our hope is to bring world-wide awareness of the plight of the SRKW population and the loss of wild salmon and healthy salmon habitat throughout the region, encouraging people to do everything we can to help recover this culturally significant community of beloved beings.</p> <p>Working closely with government agencies on both sides of the border the PWWA hopes to maintain a strong coalition with all our region's stakeholders to help our struggling SRKW pods recover and thrive during these challenging times.</p> <p>Therefore, while the PWWA recognizes the value of naval readiness to protect our respective countries, it is distressing to us that the United States Navy seeks to utilize SRKW designated critical habitat for naval exercises "which are known to present a risk to marine mammals... (including) permanent or temporary hearing threshold shifts, auditory masking, physiological stress, behavioral responses, injury, or even result in the death of an animal."</p> <p>With all the conservation efforts, world-wide attention, and public</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>concerns focused on SRKW pods at this time, we cannot support the Navy's desire to drop ordinance, test harmful—possibly fatal—sonar, and severely disrupt these populations to simply test our naval readiness.</p> <p>While we make every effort to support improved guidelines to protect these whales (keep safe distances, avoid critical habitat, reduce speed in the proximity of whales, and vessel sounds by reducing speed and turning off sounders when in the vicinity of whales) it seems a giant step backwards to—in essence—“wage war” on our SRKW along the outer coasts of Washington, Oregon, California, and Alaska.</p> <p>We also disagree with the Navy's conclusion that “the numbers of marine mammals potentially impacted by explosives are small as compared to each species' respective abundance, (and) long-term consequences for the species or stocks would not be expected.” Quite the opposite, the SRKW are precariously verging on extinction and every single animal is critical to their survival.</p> <p>We also find it disturbing that there is mounting evidence of SRKWs that have washed ashore in recent years with injuries, some massively bruised and bloody internally with no broken bones, “consistent with explosive blast or extreme pressure trauma caused by sonar at close range,” according to Ken Balcomb of the Center for Whale Research.</p> <p>Therefore, we encourage NMFS and the Navy to choose the “No Action Alternative,” discontinuing training and testing in SRKW designated critical habitat, lessening the potential for impacts on marine mammals that may result from training and testing activities.</p>	
<i>Quiet Skies Over San Juan County</i>		
Quiet Skies-01	<p>1. What are the mitigation proposals for curbing the noise over the Olympic Peninsula? Real noise data - not just computer generated data needs to be gathered. The EIS for the addition of 36 more Growlers at Ault Field did not use real data. An Outdated system which the Navy defines as “probably not legally defensible” was used. Here in San Juan County we know that the decibels projected by NoiseMap are not accurate. The same 36 Growlers are now flying over the Olympic Peninsula and it appears that the same faulty outdated computer software is being used to predict Growler impacts on the Peninsula.</p> <p>2. It has come to my attention that the Navy will be upgrading the Growlers Twin F414 Engines that have 17,000 pounds of thrust with new engines that will have 26,000 pounds of thrust. This means MORE GROWLER NOISE not less. WHEN DO WE GET TO COMMENT ON THE EIS THAT ADDRESSES THE NOISE IMPACTS OF THE NEW ENGINES WITH 26.000 POUNDS OF</p>	<p>The noise model used, MR_Nmap uses state of the art science and is the appropriate method to evaluate aircraft noise in special use airspace such as the Olympic MOA. This model is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses.</p> <p>The engines used for the noise model were the F414-GE-400 engines, which are the current engines installed in the F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft. Appendix J has been revised to include the engine type modeled for the EA-18G aircraft. The GE F414-400 enhanced engine is currently only in a research phase for the Navy, and is not installed in any aircraft, nor are there plans to purchase or install it. If this engine were to be introduced to the fleet of F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft, the Navy would measure the noise emissions from this new engine.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>THRUST?</p> <p>3. Convenience for Navy Personnel rather than what is good for residents and the environment of the Olympic Peninsula and the NW Washington region seems to be the priority. We have many members of the Navy in our family and have always respected the Navy community - but now it appears that the Navy is the BULLY IN THE ROOM and does not care at all for the tax payers whose homes are now being degraded and the veterans who have chosen the quiet of the Olympic Peninsula to help them recover from their tours of duty from the various wars they have served in. I have spoken with many PTSD veteran residents of the Peninsula who are struggling to understand why the Navy is not choosing to mitigate the noise or base the War Training Operations in more suitable locations. - which DO exist.</p>	
Quiet Skies-02	<p>4. As our resident Orca population struggles to survive, the Navy continues to use sonar where they live and hunt. These "takings" are excessive and should be stopped immediately.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Redwood Forest Foundation, Inc.		
RFFI-01	<p>On behalf of the Redwood Forest Foundation, Inc. (RFFI), I am writing to urge the U.S. Navy to address the concerns expressed by the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council relating to the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement. We support the Sinkyone Council in their requests for stronger protections for the ocean and for indigenous ways of life. Before moving forward, the U.S. Pacific Fleet should fully address these concerns through a collaborative process with the Sinkyone Council and its member Tribes.</p> <p>As a 501(c)(3) nonprofit that owns and manages timberland near the Northern California coastline, RFFI is deeply acquainted with the cultural and spiritual importance of this coastline to the Tribal Nations of Humboldt and Mendocino Counties. The land has been utilized and managed as a cultural, spiritual, and ecological resource for thousands of years. In its May 3 letter to the U.S. Navy, the Sinkyone Council stated that, "The Navy's</p>	<p>The Navy has addressed the concerns expressed by the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council in their comments to the Navy. The Navy continues Government-to-Government consultation with the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>future training and testing activities must be conducted in a way that provides greater respect and protection for cultural and spiritual values and resources, and marine species of significance to the Tribes.” RFFI is wholehearted in its support for the Sinkyone Council on this matter. Indigenous peoples’ needs and concerns have been minimized or ignored for generations – we urge the U.S. Navy to break with this tradition and respect the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council’s clearly articulated requests to protect the cultures, customs, and lifestyles of its member Tribes.</p>	
<i>Save the Olympic Peninsula</i>		
STOP-01	<p>For years now, Save the Olympic Peninsula (STOP) and its members have been commenting on various environmental documents generated by the United States Navy and/or the United States Forest Service relating to the Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range and Navy training and testing in the waters adjacent to the Olympic Peninsula. For just as many years, the Navy and the Forest Service have been ignoring those comments, and the comments of thousands of other people and organizations, and have been proceeding to severely damage the environment and peace and tranquility of the Olympic Peninsula and surrounding waters and islands. In large part, STOP’s prior comments have been directed at the noise impacts of the jets using the Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range (EWR). No such impacts were ever considered until October 1, 2015, when a noise analysis was finally slipped into the Northwest Training and Testing Final Environmental Impact Statement / Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (NWTT FEIS/OEIS) as its Appendix J. That noise analysis had not been included in the draft environmental impact statement and the public had not been afforded an opportunity to comment on it. That noise analysis was so extremely flawed it appeared to purposefully understate the impacts of the Navy jets.</p> <p>There is now a new noise analysis. It is included the Northwest Training and Testing Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Draft Supplement), again as an Appendix J. The new noise analysis is also so extremely flawed as too appear to purposefully understate the impacts of the Navy jets. But if anything in the new noise analysis in the Draft Supplement is correct, it is the part that proves how extremely flawed the former noise analysis was in the NWTT FEIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The new noise analysis shows 2224 EA-18G aircraft per year to have been entering and exiting the Olympic MOA’s from 2015 through 2017, of which 1194 are said to have been practicing to suppress enemy air defenses and</p>	<p>Since the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy has developed better tools to track historical training activities. Past training is one of the factors that goes into determining future levels of activities, so with more accurate data on past training, the Navy was able to better predict future levels of activity. The values in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are the best available information for both historical and predicted future activity.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>318 are said to have been training for electronic warfare close air support. See Table J-3, Page J-8, Draft Supplement, Exhibit J. However, the former noise analysis said there would only be 1558 EA-18Gs per year entering and exiting the Olympic MOA's in these same years, of which 572 were to practice suppressing enemy air defenses and 245 were to train for electronic warfare close air support. See Table 3-7, Page 14, NWTT FEIS/OEIS, Exhibit J.</p> <p>The Navy's own figures thus show that the NWTT FEIS/OEIS understated the number of flights that would occur in the MOAs by at least 666 flights annually compared to what the Draft Supplement says did occur. Discrepancies like this cast grave doubts on the reliability of the whole process through which the Navy is studying the impacts of its operations. And so do the flaws discussed below that exist in the new noise analysis. But first, one point that both noise analyses have made correctly is:</p> <p>"Noise is one of the most prominent environmental issues associated with military training activities."</p> <p>See Section 2, Noise Metrics, Page 4, of the original Exhibit J; and see J.4, Noise Metrics, Page J-3, of the new Exhibit J.</p> <p>Despite this acknowledgement, the Draft Supplement EIS/OEIS, and its Exhibit J, continue to give short shrift to the noise impacts of the Navy's training and testing activities in the following ways:</p> <p>1. The number of projected flights is again understated in the new noise analysis. The new Exhibit J contains the following wording that the old Exhibit J essentially contained.</p> <p>"The numbers reflected in the following tables are based on the number of aircraft sorties, while the numbers in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS are the number of activity events; therefore, a comparison between the two sets of data is not easily made. One aircraft sortie could result in the completion of multiple training events, as a sortie is simply a single operational flight by one aircraft. Similarly, in some cases, one event could include multiple aircraft sorties."</p> <p>See Draft Supplement, Exhibit J, Section J.5, Page J-7.</p> <p>It does not matter whether a comparison is easily made. But it very much does matter that an accurate comparison be made.</p>	
STOP-02	<p>The words quoted above are apparently intended to explain away the fact that Table 2.5.1 of the Draft Supplement calls for 574 air combat maneuver events and 3,938 aircraft electronic warfare training events in the Olympic MOAs annually, whereas the new noise analysis, Exhibit J, Table J-7, only calls for 2540 aircraft missions (presumably "sorties") in the Olympic MOAs</p>	<p>The Navy continues to improve its ability to forecast actual training activities for purposes of accurate noise modeling. The numbers shown in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are based on the most current, best available information. It is important to note, that a doubling of the number of proposed sorties would result in only a minor increase in the resultant DNL</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>annually.</p> <p>Table 2.5.1, contains a footnote 2 saying the 574 air combat maneuver events "typically involve two aircraft; however, based upon the training requirement, events may involve multiple aircraft." In this context, "multiple" apparently means more than two aircraft.</p> <p>Table 2.5.1, also contains a footnote 4 saying that for the 3,938 aircraft electronic warfare training events, "on average, two events occur per sortie."</p> <p>Applying these two footnotes to the events called for by Table 2.5.1, that table specifies there will be a minimum of 3117 (i.e., 1148 + 1969) aircraft sorties annually in the Olympic MOAs.</p> <p>Comparing this figure with the 2540 aircraft sorties that the new Noise Analysis assumes, it is evident that the projected flights is again understated, this time by at least 577 aircraft sorties.</p> <p>But the projected flights could be understated far more because there is a huge disparity between the events per sortie figures claimed in footnotes 2 and 4 referred to above, and the events per sortie figures used in the Biological Opinion 01EWF00-2015-F-0251 dated July 21, 2016 (Biological Opinion) under which the Navy received clearance under the Endangered Species Act to operate in the Electronic Warfare Range.</p> <p>Table 2 of the Biological Opinion, on Page 24, states there are typically 2 to 4 aircraft per air combat maneuver event, but no maximum number of aircraft per event is stated. Table 2 of the Biological Opinion, on Page 26, states there are typically 1 to 4 aircraft per electronic warfare operations event, but no maximum number of aircraft per event is stated. Using these figures, together with the number of training events called for by Table 2.5.1 of the Draft Supplement, there could be between 5,086 and 28,048 aircraft sorties in the MOAs annually. The new noise analysis would then understate the projected flights by a factor of between 2 and 11, or as many as 2,542 to 25,508 sorties.</p> <p>Considering that the old noise analysis understated the projected flights compared with the flights that subsequently occurred, and considering the large disparities discussed in this Section 1, it is essential that the Draft Supplement and its noise analysis get the ratios of aircraft per event correct. How these ratios are derived should be clearly demonstrated in a dedicated section containing supporting documentation. They simply should not be addressed in footnote statements.</p>	<p>estimated for the area beneath the Olympic MOA (approximately a 3 dB increase).</p>
STOP-03	<p>2. The impacts of aircraft activity at all points between Naval Air Station Whidbey Island (NASWI), where the training flights originate and return,</p>	<p>The Navy revised the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to include additional analysis of aircraft transits to and from the Olympic MOA. The analysis</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>and the Olympic MOAs, are again not adequately considered. Six paragraphs in Section 3.0.3.1.3.1 - Navigation and Safety (including one paragraph repeated from Section 2.3.3.2 - Sea Space and Airspace Deconfliction) contain only the following information from which noise impacts could be calculated:</p> <p>a. Aircraft normally fly southwest from a navigation point named MCCUL (20 NM west-southwest of NAS Whidbey Island) over the Strait of Juan de Fuca normally at or above 15,000 feet MSL to a fixed navigation point (65 NM west-southwest of NAS Whidbey Island) at the boundary of the Olympic MOAs.</p>	<p>includes the areas beneath the Olympic MOA as well as all areas on the Olympic Peninsula. For more information, please see Section J.6.2 (Transit to/from the Olympic MOA).</p>
STOP-04	<p>b. Aircraft normally exit the Olympic MOAs per instrument Flight Rules clearance given by the Seattle Air Route Traffic Control Center to the navigation point named YETII (30 NM southwest of NAS Whidbey Island). Aircraft normally cross YETII at or above 12,000 feet MSL and then enter the arrival pattern to return to NAS Whidbey Island.</p> <p>The only figures certain from the information given in the Draft Supplement, and that is qualified by the word "normally," is that MCCUL is crossed at 15,000 feet and YETII is crossed at 12,000 feet. The actual elevations of flights coming out of the MOAs depend on instructions giving by Seattle Air Route Traffic Control and are not specified. The actual elevations of the returning aircraft east of YETII depend on the arrival pattern, which pattern must necessarily decrease from 12,000 feet to ground level at Ault Field.</p> <p>The Draft Supplement assumes certain noise levels for certain spots in the MOAs and in Olympic National Park based on a flyover event at 14,000 - 15,000 feet MSL. Those noise levels, however, are totally speculative because the actual flight elevations are not specified in the Draft Supplement.</p> <p>The Draft Supplement does not address any of the noise impacts between Whidbey Island and MCCUL for westbound aircraft, or between YETII and Whidbey Island NAS for eastbound aircraft. These areas are subject to the lowest elevation flights, and include such special places as the Dungeness Wildlife Refuge, Protection Island, the City of Port Townsend, and depending on the takeoff and landing patterns, large portions of the San Juan Islands and the Salish Sea. The Draft Supplement is grossly deficient in not having considered the noise impacts on these areas.</p> <p>Compounding the seriousness of these deficiencies is the reference in Section 3.0.3.1.3.1 of the Draft Supplement to "flight transit routes between NAS Whidbey Island and the Olympic MOAs." In the context,</p>	<p>All aircraft normally fly the planned flight path, and the flight path into the Olympic MOA is typically used by the EA-18G as planned. However, the transition airspace to and from the Olympic MOA is highly congested with commercial and general aviation traffic in addition to the EA-18G. FAA controls the airspace to and from the Olympic MOA, and during a normal weekday a mass of aircraft are departing or arriving from multiple airports on the Olympic Peninsula and surrounding Puget Sound. Military aircraft make up only about 7 percent of that traffic. The FAA has a planned traffic scheme and the EA-18Gs are safely blended into that traffic scheme. At times, due to the dynamic nature of the traffic scheme, aircraft are given air traffic control instructions that take them off their planned flight routes. These instructions must be followed unless the pilot deems the instruction unsafe. There are a number of reasons for air traffic control to issue instructions that take an aircraft off its planned flight route; e.g., safety, orderly flow of traffic, or a more expeditious route of flight. Any or all of the reasons could apply in a given situation. The noise modeling used the best available information regarding route of flight and altitudes.</p> <p>Because future flight altitudes of aircraft maneuvering in the Olympic MOA cannot be known, the Navy conducted modeling based on estimated percent of time at various altitudes as shown in Table J-3. These altitude estimates were determined from interviews conducted with Navy personnel responsible for EA-18G aircrew training and is the best available information.</p> <p>Flight transit routes do not mean the same as "military training routes." Please note that EA-18G aircraft normally cross YETII at or above 10,000 ft. MSL.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	"flight transit routes" could mean the same as "military training routes," or "MTRs", as discussed in the NAS Whidbey Island Complex Growler FEIS, Section 3.1.2.1.4. Depending on their classification, MTRs can have floors between 200 and 500 feet AGL. Whether it is the Navy's intent to eventually establish these "flight transit routes" as approved "military transit routes," and what floors the Navy would seek on those routes, needs to be clearly addressed.	
STOP-05	<p>3. Aircraft events are again assumed to be uniformly distributed throughout the SUAs, including W237A, W237B, Olympic MOA A, and Olympic MOA B. See Exhibit J, Section J.5, Page J-7. This cannot possibly be accurate when, for one reason, the mobile emitter sites that the aircraft will be detecting and targeting are within the Olympic MOAs. This artificially distorts and dilutes the actual impacts of the aircraft within the Olympic MOAs, and within Marbled Murrelet and Spotted Owl Critical Habitat that exists there.</p> <p>Realistically, flight tracks such as those used to study sound effects at the OLF in the NAS Whidbey Island Complex Growler FEIS at Figure 3.1-6, should be established for each of the mobile transmitter sites and the noise impacts in the MOAs determined from them. Instead of asserting, as Draft Supplement does, that this is not possible "because the actual locations of any given event are unpredictable," the actual locations of the given events should be predicted as well as possible.</p>	<p>The location of the emitters has no bearing on where within the Olympic MOA the aircraft will fly during electronic warfare training flights.</p> <p>Aircraft conducting electronic warfare training flights would not fly predictable flight tracks within the Olympic MOA, which is the reason that the best method for predicting noise impacts in special use airspace is the model used by the Navy in its noise analysis. As stated in Appendix J, "In this analysis, noise from aircraft training activities within the Olympic MOA was assessed using noise metrics recommended by the Department of Defense (DoD), the Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN), ANSI [American National Standards Institute], and the FAA [Federal Aviation Administration]."</p>
STOP-06	<p>4. The number of aircraft training within a three nautical mile distance from the outside edge of the SUAs towards the interior of the SUAs, on the north, east and south sides of the MOAs, is again difficult to understand. The old noise analysis suggests that no aircraft will train in these offsets. The new noise analysis suggests maybe some aircraft will train (perhaps inadvertently) in these offsets at least some of the time. In both analyses, however, it is impossible to be sure how many aircraft will train in these offsets and for how much of the time. This uncertainty should be addressed by showing throughout the SUA the time that aircraft will be training in any portion of the SUA in any one year. This could be accomplished by a map color coded for different amounts of training time.</p> <p><i>A color coded map showing the time that aircraft will be using various locations within the SUA in any one year would also better help to address the inaccuracies discussed in Section 3. It is very unlikely that the far southwest corner of W-237A will see anywhere near as much traffic as the areas above the three main concentrations of emitter sites in the MOAs.</i></p>	<p>The Navy improved upon the analysis conducted in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS, by allowing some aircraft to occur in the buffer area or offset. While the aircrew typically establish this buffer to prevent spilling out of the airspace, due to the dynamic nature of realistic flight training, some aircraft may enter the offset but would correct their course prior to exiting the airspace. The analysis in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS considered that possibility by including some level of activity to occur in the offset. Based on the best information available, it isn't a discrete amount of flight activity in the offset area, but rather is a diminishing distribution from the offset to the SUA boundary.</p> <p>The Navy considered the recommendation of a color-coded map to show where training in the MOA would occur. However, the Navy cannot predict where in the MOA aircraft will fly during their training maneuvers, making such a map impossible to create.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<i>Different colors could be used to code for the different amounts of traffic at these locations, as well as other locations.</i>	
STOP-07	5. There are 40 more Growlers than the 118 covered in the Draft Supplement and previous environmental document. This was confirmed in an email from Mike Welding, T CIV NAS Whidbey Is, N01P, email address michael.welding@navy.mil, to Michael Monson, email address michaelmonson@outlook.com, on February 13, 2017. In that email Mr. Welding attempted to justify the failure to address these aircraft in any environmental document by calling them "preservation aircraft" and claiming they would just be "parked" at NAS Whidbey Island and other locations, and that they will only be used to "replace aircraft at the end of their service life." He also asserts that the number of aircraft is not significant, and that only the number of total operations is significant. STOP believes the number of aircraft is significant because of the likelihood of a "preservation aircraft" being used as a replacement for another Growler that is temporarily down for repairs. Having 118 Growlers as addressed in environmental documents always available for training will lead to many more flights than would happen if there were only 118 Growlers in existence. Furthermore, it is difficult to believe that perfectly operational "preservation aircraft" would be left on the sidelines for years until the other aircraft have reached the end of their service lives. If those "preservation aircraft" could be used to reduce the number of pilots in need of training, it is a very safe bet that they will be used. The result will be more than 118 Growlers being used at any one time, and more flights occurring. These additional aircraft, and how and when they will be used, should have been addressed in the Draft Supplement.	Regardless of the number of aircraft physically located at NAS Whidbey Island, the number of aircraft expected to fly to and train in the Olympic MOA remains based on the amount of training to be accomplished. Therefore, the data used to generate the noise model results is accurate and based on the best available information.
STOP-08	6. The new noise analysis uses very little real, accurate, and measured noise levels from aircraft utilizing the training areas. Noise predictions are based almost entirely on unreliable, computer generated approximations from dated information. As suggested in a letter dated March 8, 2017, from R. David Allnutt, Director, Office of Environmental Review and Assessment, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, to Ms. Lisa Padgett, EA-18G Growler Project Manager, of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command Atlantic, the Navy should have established and used data from a monitoring program to verify the actual noise impacts from its Whidbey Island operations.	The noise model used, MR_Nmap uses state of the art science and is the appropriate method to evaluate aircraft noise in special use airspace such as the Olympic MOA. This model is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses.
STOP-09	7. It is hoped that the United States Navy will seriously consider these comments, and work to eliminate the very adverse impacts of its operations on, over, above, and below the Olympic Peninsula and its	The homebasing decision discussed in this comment goes beyond the scope of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>adjoining waters. The best way to accomplish this is to move its Growler operations and/or training activities to one or more of the several different facilities such as those considered, but rejected, in the NAS Whidbey Island Complex Growler FEIS, Volume 1, at Section 2.5, or back to Mountain Home AFB, Idaho. Training at these locations would have much fewer adverse impacts on the surrounding areas than continuing to use NAS Whidbey Island.</p> <p>Using other facilities would have two very important advantages that the Navy has not seemed to consider. First, training in several locations, with varying conditions, would seem to better equip pilots with the experience and skills they would need to fight battles at various locations around the world, than does training at just one site. Second, with the OLF and the MOAs very close to Ault Field, the practice pilots receive does not replicate the fatigue factor the pilots will experience in actual combat.</p> <p>The reasons offered by the Navy in NAS Whidbey Island Complex Growler FEIS, Volume 1, Section 2.5, as to why a single-site for Growler operations at NAS Whidbey Island is necessary, and why training activities cannot occur anywhere but from NAS Whidbey Island, are contradicted by the email referred to in Section 5 above, from Mike Welding to Michael Monson. Therein Mr. Welding says:</p> <p>"The 117 or 118 operational Growler aircraft discussed in the DEIS will be assigned to carrier squadrons, expeditionary squadrons and the training squadron home based at NAS Whidbey Island.</p> <p>Other carrier-based aircraft will be assigned overseas in Japan, while some test aircraft will be assigned to NAS Patuxent River, in Maryland and the Naval Air Weapons Station at China Lake, CA. There will also be some training aircraft assigned to NAS Fallon, NV, as part of the Weapons School located there."</p> <p>The reasons offered by the Navy in said Section 2.5 as to why a single-site for Growler operations at NAS Whidbey Island is necessary, and why training activities cannot occur anywhere but from NAS Whidbey Island, are so emphatically negative as to offer scant hope for Growlers ever being effective in real military operations at distant locations around the globe. We know that is not the case. The arguments the Navy makes against the alternatives suggests the lack of any open mind. That is to the detriment of both the Navy and the public.</p> <p>Save the Olympic Peninsula (STOP) is a non-profit, public benefit corporation registered in Washington State since June 16, 2015. The undersigned Ronald N. Richards is the Chair of STOP, and he has been</p>	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>designated as its EWR Lead.</p> <p>STOP's purposes include ensuring "the best use of the land, the lakes, and the rivers on, and the skies above, the earth below, and the waters adjoining, the Olympic Peninsula of the State of Washington, in order to retain the unique character of the area, protect its environmental qualities, and provide for its enjoyment by generations to come." Through these comments we hope to educate our governmental officials as to why the EWR is not consistent with those purposes.</p> <p>All the members of STOP's Board of Directors live, work, recreate, hike, fish, or travel in areas of Olympic National Park, Olympic National Forest, and Clallam, Jefferson, Grays Harbor, Island, and San Juan Counties that will be adversely affected by the proposed Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range.</p>	
Seattle Aquarium		
Aquarium-01	<p>1. The Washington State Orca Task Force did explicitly recognize Navy impacts on southern resident orcas to be an issue.</p> <p>The EIS inaccurately claims that "Navy actions were not the sources for any of the identified threats" in the report by the Southern Resident Orca Task Force (Office of the Washington Governor, 2018) (page 3.4-46). In fact, concerns about the Navy's use of sonar equipment impacting the southern residents were raised in the very first Orca Task Force meeting (5/1/2018 meeting minutes). Recommendation 25 was "Coordinate with the Navy in 2019 to discuss reduction of noise and disturbance affecting Southern Resident orcas from military exercises and Navy aircraft." It also stated: "The governor should meet with the U.S. Navy's Commanding Officer for the region that includes Washington state to address the acoustic and physical impacts to Southern Resident orcas from Naval exercises in waters and air of Washington state. The governor should request the Navy participate on the Vessels working group in Year Two and identify actions to reduce the Navy's impacts to Southern Resident orcas" (emphases added) (Office of the Washington Governor, 2018).</p>	<p>The Task Force Final Report did not identify Navy sonar among the major threats. The major threats identified in the report are a lack of prey, disturbance from noise and vessel traffic, and toxic contaminants in the waters they inhabit. The Navy, as acknowledged by the Governor's Task Force in 2018, was not previously requested to participate in the Task Force. The Navy has since been invited to take part and, as a result, a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Task Force's working groups on prey and vessel traffic, to develop solutions to issues pointed out in recommendation #25. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.</p>
Aquarium-02	<p>2. Given the perilously small size of the endangered southern resident orca population today, harm to a single individual orca can easily mean a population-level effect.</p> <p>Each individual orca in the current population matters if the population is to avoid extinction. There has been a net loss of southern resident orcas since 2011. In 2016, NMFS declared that southern resident orcas are one of the marine species most at risk of extinction nationwide.</p> <p>The Draft EIS states that "the use of sonar and other transducers during</p>	<p>Since the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has incorporated new estimates of Southern Resident killer whale densities and distributions in the NWT Offshore Area into the quantitative analysis of impacts. The revised density estimates are shown in the technical report U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area (amended September 20, 2019), available at www.nwtteis.com. As a result, the Navy has revised the number of behavioral takes of Southern Resident killer whales in Appendix E (Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>training activities as described under Alternative 1 will result in the unintentional taking of killer whales incidental to those activities” (page 3.4-190). Table 3.4-40 estimates two behavioral impacts to southern resident orcas per year from sonar and other transducers. The Draft EIS also says that “while odontocete behavioral responses to Navy sonar will vary across species, populations, and individuals, they are not likely to lead to long-term consequences or population-level effects” (p. 3.4-115). We are concerned that there is in fact a serious risk of population-level effects. In a small population with strong family ties, the loss of one orca also directly affects the others’ chance of survival. When a female resident orca dies, it increases the mortality risk of her male offspring under age 30 by 3.1 times, and the mortality risk of her male offspring over age 30 by 8.3 times (Foster et al. 2012).</p> <p>Furthermore, the EIS Fact Sheet Booklet states that 99.84% of all estimated takes of marine mammals would be Level B harassment, disrupting natural behavior patterns such as feeding, surfacing, nursing, breeding, sheltering or migration to those point where those patterns are abandoned or significantly alter. These—and especially feeding, breeding, and nursing—are all critical activities for the southern resident orcas now, given that they have produced only one surviving calf in the last three years, at least two orcas are visibly emaciated and the others are also not getting enough to eat.</p>	<p>Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy does not anticipate any individual Southern Resident killer whale mortalities (“loss”) or PTS during training or testing activities. As described in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals), a single or even a few minor TTS to an individual marine mammal per year are unlikely to have any long-term consequences for that individual. Based on the best available science, long-term consequences for marine mammal species or stocks, including Southern Resident killer whales, would not be expected from Navy training and testing activities under the Proposed Action. As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy worked cooperatively with NMFS to develop a suite of mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on Southern Resident killer whales to the maximum extent practicable, including numerous new mitigation measures developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS in areas important to Southern Resident killer whales for feeding, breeding, and migration.</p>
Aquarium-03	<p>3. The designation for southern resident orca critical habitat is likely to change later this year, and the proposed activities must take that into account.</p> <p>The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has committed to proposing a rule with an expanded designation of critical habitat off Washington, Oregon and California by early October 2019. Changes in the Navy’s mitigation measures are likely to be necessary so that the proposed action does not “result in destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat.”</p> <p>The Navy should wait to make final decisions about training and testing in the potential new critical habitat areas, including off the Washington coast, until the new designation has been made later this year.</p>	<p>The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Aquarium-04	<p>4. Recent variations in southern resident orca presence in the Salish Sea are complex and should not be used as justification for exercising less caution in the inland waters.</p> <p>The EIS states that “foraging during the spring in Salish Sea by southern resident killer whales has declined in recent years as they shift their range and forage for Chinook salmon or other prey species elsewhere in response</p>	<p>The inclusion of references from Shields et al., 2018 was not included to imply that impacts in the Inland Waters would be reduced or otherwise avoided because of the species changing presence of Southern Resident killer whales within their summer-core habitat areas, but rather to present best available science on the species current status, including prey availability. This is a</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>to reduced prey availability in that historically used inland waters foraging area” (p. 3.4-26).</p> <p>The southern resident orcas are still sighted in the Salish Sea frequently. In fact, Olson et al. 2018 noted that K and L pods have been increasing the duration of their stay in the inland waters by staying in the Salish Sea through the fall and into the early winter.</p> <p>Even spending time elsewhere, southern resident orcas are not getting enough food and are showing signs of malnutrition. The inland waters foraging area is still critically important if they are going to survive and thrive.</p> <p>The EIS implies that changes in the southern residents’ presence in the Salish Sea mean that protections there are less important than they used to be. In fact, it should be reason for an extra layer of caution. Reducing noise and disturbance in the heavily-trafficked inland waters could enable the southern residents to forage there more effectively and therefore spend more time there as they have historically.</p>	<p>critical component of the environmental baseline the Navy then uses to estimate potential impacts resulting from the Navy’s activities.</p> <p>As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The commenter incorrectly asserts that the Navy suggests that protective measures in the Salish Sea are less important; however, the Navy has not suggested that and does not consider that to be true. The mitigation measures developed for both NWTT Inland Waters and the NWTT Offshore Area for the Proposed Action represent an increase over the mitigation developed for the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS.</p>
Aquarium-05	<p>5. The EIS should include two additional studies related to impacts on southern resident orcas.</p> <p>Emmons, C.K., M.B. Hanson, and M.O. Lammers. 2019. Monitoring the occurrence of Southern Resident killer whales, other marine mammals, and anthropogenic sound in the Pacific Northwest. Prepared for: U.S. Navy, U.S. Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, HI. Prepared by: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Northwest Fisheries Science Center under MIPR N00070-17-MP-4C419. 25 February 2019. 23p.</p> <p>This report states that there were 148 mid-frequency active sonar events detected between 2011 and 2017, with the peak overlapping with occurrence of the three killer whale communities (including southern residents). This is concerning because, as the EIS states, exposure to mid-frequency sonar has been directly linked to separation of a killer whale calf from its group (page 3.4-102); the separation and loss of a single calf would be a serious blow to the small population, given that there are so few calves and the southern residents have had limited reproductive success in recent years. Exposure to mid-frequency sonar has also been directly linked to mass strandings of cetaceans (page 3.4-127). In addition, the EIS states that newer high-duty or continuous active sonars have more potential to mask vocalizations, particularly for mid-frequency cetaceans like killer whales, and “longer-term consequences could include potential decrease in recruitment” (p. 3.4-102). The southern resident orcas cannot afford any further decrease in their already very low recruitment rates.</p>	<p>The Navy-funded research presented in Emmons et al. 2019 was considered in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, but the report was not cited because it was still in the process of being edited by the authors and had not been finalized. The report has since been finalized and is cited in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The report could be read to indicate that the Cape Flattery Offshore region is a high use area for the Navy. The Navy would like to clarify that it does not frequently conduct training or testing activities in the location of the Cape Flattery Offshore hydrophone since that area is highly utilized by commercial vessel traffic, making it an undesirable location for the Navy to conduct activities, especially sonar training or testing.</p> <p>Emmons et al. 2019 reported a number of detections at Cape Flattery Offshore, but this was not normalized for effort, which was also highest at the Cape Flattery Offshore hydrophone location. This would have the effect of overstating detections in that area. Also, Emmons et al. 2019 reported on detections of MFA sonar, but did not distinguish between various sources (U.S. versus Canadian navies, among other users). Historically, the annual usage of MF1 sonar by the U.S. Navy in this area over the last 10 years has been minimal.</p> <p>As described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy developed new mitigation for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to further</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on Southern Resident killer whales and other marine species in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitat areas. For example, the Navy developed a new mitigation area known as the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, which encompasses waters off Cape Flattery as recommended by the commenter. The Navy's mitigation now includes annual limits on hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and prohibits explosive Mine Countermeasures and Neutralization Testing in the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. All other explosive activities are required to be conducted 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. In addition, the Navy developed a new mitigation to issue annual awareness notification messages to alert ships and aircraft to the possible presence of increased concentrations of Southern Resident killer whales seasonally, which will further help avoid potential impacts from vessel movements and training and testing activities on this species.
Aquarium-06	Wieland, M., A. Jones, and S. C. P. Renn. 2010. Changing durations of Southern Resident killer whale 23 (<i>Orcinus orca</i>) discrete calls between two periods spanning 28 years. <i>Mar. Mam. Sci.</i> 26(1):195–201. This study found that the Southern Residents make a behavioral adjustment as a result of vessel noise, as measured through an increase in mean durations of discrete calls. "Because they are adjusting their vocal behavior, we must consider the very real possibility that engine noise is hindering their ability to communicate, and may well impact their efficiency at using acoustics to forage and navigate, as well" (Wieland et al. 2010). These findings should be incorporated into 3.4.2.1.1.4 on masking (page 3.4.103, which talks about other species but not killer whales) and into the odontocete discussion on page 3.4-120.	Wieland et al., 2010 was incorporated in Section 3.4.1.7.4 of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS as recommended by the commenter.
Aquarium-07	6. Whale report alert systems should be used for real-time sightings and advance warnings, complementing the limited visual range of lookouts. There are new real-time whale presence alert systems that the Navy should use to expand and speed up their awareness of likely imminent presence of southern resident orcas beyond what the lookouts can do visually. The Whale Report Alert System (WRAS), for example, from the B.C. Cetacean Sightings Network, alerts mariners to the presence of whales so that they may take mitigation measures to reduce the risk of disturbance and collision. Discussions are underway to potentially expand this system to Washington waters. Orca Network also has a Whale Sighting Network with Washington information online.	The Navy developed new mitigation for Navy biologists to initiate communication with the appropriate marine mammal detection networks in NWT Inland Waters prior to conducting explosive mine neutralization activities involving the use of Navy divers, Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training, Civilian Port Defense – Homeland Security Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Exercises, and Small Boat Attack Exercises. This mitigation will help the Navy plan activities in a way that minimizes the potential for exposure of Southern Resident killer whales, as described in Section K.3.3 (Mitigation Areas for Marine Species in NWT Inland Waters). The Navy will also continue to assess the practicality of other available monitoring techniques as technologies advance.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Aquarium-08	<p>7. Additional information is needed on the anticipated timing of the proposed activities.</p> <p>The EIS should detail the times of year during which the proposed activities will take place. The southern resident orcas and other animals like rockfish have seasonal movements and behaviors. Any overlap in their seasonal movements and the Navy's testing and training activities will increase impacts on these species. Information about timing should be made public in the EIS and the Navy should seek to adjust the timing of their activities to minimize such overlap.</p>	<p>As stated in Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities), because of the nature of training and testing requirements for forces that must be ready to deploy at all times, activities could occur throughout the year. The Navy added additional details on seasonality and day/night requirements of its activities to Appendix A (Navy Activities Descriptions) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy did consider seasonal movements and behaviors of marine species in its effect analysis. The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species either seasonally or year-round in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitats, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).</p> <p>The duration of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS is for the foreseeable future, while the Marine Mammal Protection Act permits would be in place for seven years.</p>
Aquarium-09	<p>8. Other agencies and operators are taking new, meaningful steps to reduce noise and disturbance affecting southern resident orcas. The Navy must also increase its protections to help ensure that there is a net positive outcome for the orcas.</p> <p>In 2019, Washington state has taken big steps to reduce impacts on southern resident orcas from a range of vessel types and in-water disturbances, recognizing that noise and disturbance have significant adverse consequences for this endangered population. In May 2019, Governor Inslee signed into law a bill that increases the distance that vessels must stay away from the Southern Residents and enacts a 7-knot speed limit within a half nautical mile of these orcas. An additional law requires tug escorts for additional oil tankers to reduce the risk of an oil spill. Washington State Ferries is also doing a baseline noise inventory and developing solutions to address noise and frequencies of concern. Meanwhile, in 2019, voluntary ship slowdowns will continue and expand for the third year through the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority-led Enhancing Cetacean Habitat and Observation (ECHO) Program – a Canadian program that directly benefits southern resident orcas in the inland waters. The Navy should increase its own mitigation efforts so that there is still a significant net benefit to the southern residents in terms of reduced noise and disturbance when all these other entities are increasing their protective measures.</p> <p>Everything we can do now to protect the southern resident orcas is critical. The biggest and most immediately actionable opportunities in the near</p>	<p>The Navy worked cooperatively with NMFS during the MMPA consultation process and determined that the suite of mitigation developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS will effect the least practicable adverse impact on marine mammal species or stocks and their habitat. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals wherever and whenever applicable acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors are used in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict all but one type of explosive activity from occurring within 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area year-round, which will help the Navy avoid potential impacts from explosives on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. Additionally, the Navy developed the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to enhance protections of Southern Resident Killer Whales throughout NWTT Inland Waters. Information about the Navy's mitigation areas is presented in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	term are in reducing noise and disturbance of all kinds—so that orcas can find the few salmon that are available—and in reducing the risk of direct injury or death.	
<i>Seventh Generation Fund for Indigenous Peoples, Inc.</i>		
SGF-01	<p>On behalf of Seventh Generation Fund for Indigenous Peoples, an Indigenous non-profit located in Humboldt County we are writing this letter in solidarity with the ten Tribes that are a part of the Inter-Tribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council regarding cultural, spiritual, and environmental impacts to the local tribes of Humboldt County and Mendocino County. On May 3, 2019, the ten Tribes submitted a letter in response to the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS (SEIS) for the Navy Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT) activities. Seventh Generation Fund attended the May 2nd Open House in Eureka, California. At this event Navy personal admitted that they did not seek nor receive Free, Prior, and Informed Consent from coastal Tribes as required by article 19 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.</p> <p>The Tribal Nations located along the coast maintain significant cultural and spiritual ties to the ocean, marine life, and the coastline. The Navy must incorporate the coastal tribes' Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) which has allowed them to manage the marine environment since time immemorial. The coastal Tribes have a deep understanding of the environment which has been passed down for generations and must be included in any consideration of Navy testing and must inform whether testing is appropriate. The majority of the Tribal Nations of Mendocino and Humboldt County have stated their opposition to Navy testing and have made recommendations that must be integrated and followed.</p>	<p>The Navy will continue to consult with the Tribes. Through Government-to-Government consultations, the Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.</p> <p>As stated in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the term “traditional resources” is used to encompass protected tribal resources.</p>
SGF-02	<p>The Navy has an obligation to ensure the mitigation measures taken are sufficient to achieve the "Least practicably adverse impact" on the marine life and environment according to Natural Resources Defense Council v. Pitzker, 823 F.3d 1125, 1133 (9th Cr. 2016). According to Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe v. Department of the Navy, 898 F. 2d 1410 (9th Cir. 1990) the Navy is obligated to act in the best interest of the Tribes which also includes requirements to reduce impacts to the lowest possible level. We urge you to uphold your obligation to ensure that the environment is not impacted by your testing and neither is the cultural and spiritual wellbeing of Tribal Nations on the Pacific Coast.</p>	<p>The Navy worked cooperatively with NMFS during the MMPA consultation process and determined that the suite of mitigation developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS will effect the least practicable adverse impact on marine mammal species or stocks and their habitat.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Skagit Audubon Society		
Skagit-01	<p><u>On-site monitoring of aircraft overflights, rather than modeling, is needed to truly evaluate impacts on people and wildlife in Olympic National Park.</u> We join many individuals and organizations in expressing concern for the impact that present and future military overflights of Olympic National Park and adjacent Olympic National Forest have on wildlife and on park visitors. These impacts will increase as more EA-18G Growlers based at Whidbey Naval Air Station fly over Puget Sound and the Olympic Peninsula to train in what the Supplemental EIS/OEIS calls the “Military Operations Area “ (MOA). Much of the MOA is what Audubon members and other civilians know and love as “Olympic National Park.” In the EIS/OEIS, the evaluation of impacts from sound is based on modeling rather than on actual monitoring of how aircraft noise affects wildlife and the experience of park visitors. This amounts to substituting speculation and unsupportable extrapolation for science. Potential serious impacts to Olympic National Park, a World Heritage site and International Biosphere Reserve famed for its natural quiet, should be based on science, not speculation.</p>	<p>DoD’s position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD’s position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015. ² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Skagit-02	<p><u>The aircraft sound information in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS unrealistically minimizes the jet noise levels and frequency of overflights park visitors are already experiencing.</u> Living in western Skagit County we have direct experience with the noise generated by the EA-18G Growler under various weather conditions and altitudes. While the Supplemental EIS/OEIS claims that overflights of the Olympic Peninsula will typically be at least 2,000 feet above ground level, the document admits that these flights could be as low as 1,500 feet. To then suggest that Growler noise at that elevation will be roughly equivalent</p>	<p>This paragraph contains a misunderstanding concerning how noise metrics are being applied: jet noise is not being compared to a whisper; instead, the metric under comparison is the cumulative noise exposure levels. The metrics cited in the comment (38 dB DNL and 39 dB DNL) are cumulative day-night average sound levels, which cannot be compared to a single noise event, such as a whisper.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>to a human whisper strongly contradicts our experience here in Skagit County. The Navy clearly needs to do monitoring, not just modeling, to realistically evaluate the noise impacts of the present, and soon to be expanded, overflights of the Olympic Peninsula.</p> <p>We note this statement on page 9 of the EIS/OEIS Fact Sheet Booklet (https://www.nwtteis.com/portals/nwtteis/files/public_information/dseis/NWTT_SEIS_OEIS-Fact_Sheet_Booklet.pdf) (my words in italics):</p> <p>“The noise modeling results show that the area underneath the Olympic MOAs (Military Operations Area, where electronic warfare training for Growler crews takes place.) would experience a cumulative noise exposure of less than 37 decibels (dB) DNL (day night average sound level) for current and proposed activities. The ocean area beneath W-237 (directly west of the Olympic Peninsula) would experience cumulative noise levels below 35 dB DNL. For comparison, 35 dB DNL would be considered the natural ambient noise level of a wilderness area, and 39 dB DNL the level of a rural residential area.”</p> <p>Figure 2 on page 9 states that 30 decibels is the volume of a whisper. This narrative ignores the fact that natural noises and aircraft noises have distinctly different effects on people and wildlife in a national park. The former is expected; the latter is discordant and disruptive. Implying that the noise of Growlers is little more than a whisper does not at all match the experience of those of us who frequently hear and see these aircraft overhead in western Skagit County. The standard described or implied is certainly not suitable for Olympic National Park, which famously is, or until recently was, one of the quietest places in the U.S.</p> <p>It should also be noted that cumulative, average noise levels do not reflect the lasting harm that can be done to species by single incidents. The one particularly loud overflight that flushes a murrelet chick off the nest does irreversible damage not reflected in a picture of average noise levels over time. Modeling does not capture this reality.</p>	
Skagit-03	<p><u>National Parks are, by law, to be preserved in their natural condition. The law does not exempt the Navy.</u></p> <p>The law which Congress passed in 1916 establishing the National Park Service states that the agency’s purpose is to, “conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.” (https://home.nps.gov/pipe/learn/management/nps-organic-act-of-1916.htm) Growler overflights whose noise degrades the natural</p>	<p>The Navy aircraft that train in the Olympic MOA do so in compliance with all applicable laws. Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Olympic MOA was established in 1977</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	conditions of Olympic National Park are not exempt from this act. It is highly inappropriate, and arguably illegal, to establish a “Military Operations Area” in whole or part over a national park. There are surely other places that the Navy could carry out its important training and equipment testing. These activities do not need to happen over or near a national park.	
Skagit-04	<p>The Navy’s training and testing activities are incompatible with the <u>protection of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary</u>. The Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary extends 25 to 50 miles seaward of the coastal area of Olympic National Park. As shown on the map at https://www.nwtteis.com/About-the-Study-Area#/images/3, the Navy’s Northwest Training and Testing Study Area appears to overlap this Congressionally established Sanctuary in its entirety. As vividly described in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, a wide variety of weapons are tested here involving the use of various ships and aircraft, live ammunition, and explosives; yet we are urged to see the likely impact to marine mammals, birds, and other living things as very minimal. Taken as a whole, this speculative conclusion defies common sense, the more so given that the activities take place in an area designated a sanctuary. In numerous places in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS we read that the reason for choosing the Olympic Peninsula and its offshore waters, as well as various locations in the Salish Sea/Puget Sound, for naval testing and training is that it is convenient and will save transit money. There are many Navy bases in Puget Sound, and it’s convenient to train in the nearest part of the Pacific Ocean and over the mountainous and shoreline terrain of the peninsula. No argument is made for why the Navy’s convenience preempts the protection of a premier National Park and a Marine Sanctuary, both established by Congress for preservation in perpetuity for the benefit of the American public. Navy testing and training can be done away from national parks and other protected areas.</p>	Information on the importance of training and testing locations in NWTT Inland Waters and the NWTT Offshore Area is provided in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives). To ensure compliance with the National Marine Sanctuary Program regulations and the interagency consultation requirements of National Marine Sanctuaries Act section 304(d), the Navy considered all proposed modifications to training and testing activities to determine whether they have the potential to destroy, cause the loss of, or injure sanctuary resources, or result in adverse impacts on sanctuary resources or qualities. Accordingly, the Navy and NMFS submitted a joint Sanctuary Resource Statement to the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. The Navy will implement mitigation within the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, such as not conducting explosive activities and limiting certain types of active sonar, as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation), and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). Additional information on Marine Protected Areas is presented in Section 6.1.2 (Marine Protected Areas).
Skagit-05	<p>The Supplemental EIS/OEIS fails to include a reasonable range of <u>alternatives</u>. The scale and complexity of the activities which the EIS/OEIS examines are massive, yet only 3 alternatives are examined: a continuation of the present testing and training with some additions (e.g. more Growler flights), a continuation with a greater increase in activity, and the required no action alternative, which would mean a cessation of training and testing in the study area. There is no alternative that considers avoiding overflights of Olympic National Park, for example, and restricting water-based</p>	The Navy complied with NEPA requirements in the development and consideration of alternatives. The Alternatives carried forward meet the Navy's purpose and need (see Section 1.4, Purpose of and Need for Proposed Military Readiness Training and Testing Activities) to ensure that it can fulfill its obligation under Title 10. The elimination or reduction of aircraft flights in the Olympic MOA would not allow the Navy to fulfill its obligation under Title 10. See Section 2.4 (Action Alternative Development) for more detailed information on the development of alternatives.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	activities to areas outside the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. That these changes would be inconvenient or more expensive for the Navy is not sufficient reason for not including such an alternative. Environmental Impact Statements are to examine a range of reasonable alternatives, which in this case would certainly include more than the three presented. At the very least, the Navy should design a solid, scientifically-based plan for eliminating or severely limiting negative impacts of aircraft overflights to Olympic National Park visitors and wildlife.	
Skagit-06	<u>The Supplemental EIS/OEIS fails to address all potential areas of negative impact in Olympic National Park.</u> To fly from Whidbey Naval Air Station to the Military Operations Area (MOA), Growlers pass over other parts of Olympic National Park, yet potential impacts in those areas, including such heavily visited year-round sites as Hurricane Ridge, are not examined. The EIS/OEIS only looks at impacts in the part of the park below the MOA. The study of sound which the National Park Service did in the park in 2010 (Olympic National Park Acoustic Monitoring Winter 2010 Natural Resource Report NPS/NRSS/NSNSD/NRR—2016/1310) found that Hurricane Ridge, beaches on the outer coast, the Hoh Rain Forest, and all other areas measured had very low levels of aircraft noise. Navy operations are already changing that condition and will increasingly do so unless there is mitigation to avoid degradation of the national park.	The Navy has expanded the noise analysis to include the transit of aircraft to and from the Olympic MOA.
Skagit-07	<u>The proposed mitigation related to Marbled Murrelets at sea is unrealistic and inadequate.</u> The Supplemental EIS/OEIS notes that the Marbled Murrelet is listed as a threatened species under the federal Endangered Species Act. (We would add that because of its precipitous population decline in Washington State, this species is listed under state law as endangered, which is not mentioned in the EIS/OEIS.) The EIS/OEIS states that murrelets in the marine environment where they forage could be affected by such Navy activities as testing and training with live ordnance. There is a vivid list of the harm which underwater explosions can do to the physiology of a Marbled Murrelet (p.3.6-56): “Marbled murrelets would be exposed to explosives during mine countermeasure and neutralization testing proposed in the Offshore Area, and existing mine warfare areas in Inland Waters (i.e., Crescent Harbor and Hood Canal Explosive Ordnance Disposal Training Ranges). ... In Inland Waters, marbled murrelets have an increased likelihood of exposure. Marbled murrelets exposed to underwater explosions may be subject to lethal or non-lethal injuries. Non-lethal	The Navy consulted with USFWS under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act to address potential impacts to marbled murrelets with implementation of the preferred alternative. Discussions about the level of benefit of the Navy's mitigation measures are presented throughout Section 5.3 (Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors on marine bird species wherever applicable activities occur. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals, sea turtles, birds, and fish in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict all but one type of explosive activity from occurring within 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area year-round, which will help the Navy avoid potential impacts from explosives on marbled murrelets in important foraging areas.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>injuries may include scarred or ruptured eardrums, or gastrointestinal tract lesions. ...”</p> <p>The related mitigation plan calls for having a single on-board observer watching for marbled murrelets and, when spotting one, calling a stop to the training or testing activity (e.g. at 5.3.2.2 Weapons Firing Noise” on p. 5-24). As birders experienced with observing murrelets off Skagit County shorelines from land, we know how difficult it is to spot this Robin-sized, cryptically-colored, low-profile bird when it is on water anything other than very calm. To do so while using binoculars on a boat that is rocking or underway is especially difficult. From our own experience, we are skeptical that a single observer under typical conditions can effectively and consistently spot Marbled Murrelets on the water. Some more realistic form of mitigation needs to be devised; better yet, this type of potentially highly disruptive weapons training and testing should not take place anywhere near murrelet foraging or resting areas.</p>	
Skagit-08	<p><u>Speculation about habituation is no substitute for careful study and consideration of cumulative effects on listed species.</u></p> <p>On page 3.6-41 the argument is made that Marbled Murrelets are habituated already to aircraft and ship noise and therefore more of that will have no effect:</p> <p>“Habituation has likely already occurred in many murrelets because helicopters have been used in Navy training exercises within Puget Sound for decades. Marbled murrelet nesting habitats surrounding Puget Sound and foraging habitats within Puget Sound underlie extensive commercial air traffic routes (see Section 3.12, Socioeconomic Resources), which also likely contributes to habituation to noise by murrelets.”</p> <p>There is no consideration of the cumulative effects of yet more noise on Marbled Murrelets, Spotted Owls, or other species, especially from the impressively loud EA-18G Growlers.</p> <p>This kind of speculation is unwarranted in an EIS where determinations should be made based on science, not speculation. As mentioned before, the Marbled Murrelet is in rapid decline in Washington. The noise they experience now may be one of the reasons. To speculate that one more stressor in the bird’s environment is just another inconsequential thing for the bird to get used to makes a mockery of the EIS process and the Endangered Species Act.</p>	<p>Habituation was but one of several factors considered, along with a number of scientific studies, that supported the conclusions stated in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Skagit-09	<p><u>There is insufficient information to evaluate whether Navy aircraft overflights will negatively affect Marbled Murrelet nesting success and fledgling survival in and near Olympic National Park.</u></p>	<p>The studies cited in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS support the Navy’s conclusions regarding aircraft noise disturbance to marbled murrelets.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Table 3.6-1 on page 3.6-2 acknowledges that Marbled Murrelet and Spotted Owl designated critical habitat exists in both the coastal part of the training and testing area and under the Military Operating Area. Two maps in the EIS/OEIS dramatically show the extensive overlap of the MOA and critical habitat for the murrelet (page 3.6-18 Figure 3.6-1: Critical Habitat for the Marbled Murrelet) and the Spotted Owl (page 3.6-19 Figure 3.6-2: Critical Habitat for the Northern Spotted Owl).</p> <p>The Supplemental EIS/OEIS depicts Navy jet flight paths over the Olympic Peninsula as being so high above ground level that the noise the planes generate will be at most a minor disturbance to birds such as the Marbled Murrelet. It should be noted that the flight path of murrelets from the marine waters where they forage to their nest sites is not always low and along river courses but can involve flying high enough to clear passes at 5,000 or more feet elevation. Murrelets are known to do this in transiting from the Strait of Juan de Fuca to the Hoh River Valley in Olympic National Park, for example. Pertinent to this point is the footnote in section 3.6: “Note: MOA = Military Operating Area. The Olympic MOAs overlay both land and sea (extending to 3 nautical miles off the Washington coast) and include areas above 6,000 ft. Mean Sea Level but below 1,200 ft. above ground level at the higher terrain elevations of the mountains.”)</p> <p>Thus, the proximity of aircraft and the impact of noise from jets such as the Growler are potentially much more severe than described in the EIS/OEIS. The temporary disturbance from aircraft noise which the EIS/OEIS acknowledges could, in the case of the Marbled Murrelet, readily result in nesting failure. The murrelet’s single chick leads a precarious existence in its moss bed atop a high, old growth branch. A chick once startled from the nest and fallen to the forest floor is unable to recover. The same is true during the fledgling’s first flight, when it must succeed in reaching marine waters as much as 50 miles distant or die on the ground. The rapidly declining state of this species in Washington calls for great caution in adding to the stress it is already under.</p>	
Skagit-10	<p><u>There is insufficient information to state that Navy aircraft overflights will not jeopardize Spotted Owls in and near Olympic National Park.</u></p> <p>There has apparently been no effort in preparing the Supplemental EIS/OEIS to study how Spotted Owls nesting and foraging in or near Olympic National Park are affected by Growler and other Navy overflights and could be affected by the planned increase in these flights. The EIS/OEIS extrapolates from a study of the Mexican Spotted Owl in relationship to helicopter noise, a subspecies in a very different habitat with significantly</p>	<p>The analysis of potential impacts to northern spotted owls was conducted in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, and was also included in the consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, resulting in the 2016 Biological Opinion in which the Service stated, “the proposed aircraft overflights are likely to affect spotted owls through intermittent exposures to aircraft noise throughout the year, including during the nesting season. However, because Navy aircraft will maintain minimum flight altitudes well above the distances at which any significant behavioral responses by affected spotted owls are</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	different foraging techniques. There is no specific study of the impacts on Spotted Owl foraging and nesting in Northwest old growth forests when the unusually loud EA-18G Growler repeatedly passes overhead. Like the Marbled Murrelet, the Spotted Owl is in serious decline in Washington. Adding stressors in its environment should not be done without carefully targeted studies rather than simply extrapolating from the very limited and not particularly applicable available science.	likely to occur, the effects to spotted owls by these aircraft overflights are considered insignificant.” The Navy is not proposing to decrease flight altitudes, so the conclusion of insignificant effect to spotted owls remains correct.
Skagit-11	<u>The Supplemental EIS/OEIS gives little or no attention to wildlife species listed under state but not federal law as endangered.</u> Although the Tufted Puffin is not listed under the federal Endangered Species Act, under Washington State law this seabird is listed as endangered. The EIS/OEIS mentions the species in one place only (Table 3.6-2: Representative Birds of the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area) and gives no attention to how Navy testing and training off the Olympic Coast will affect this iconic bird on its island nesting grounds or where it forages on the open water. It should also be mentioned that while the EIS/OEIS addresses possible impacts to the Northern Sea Otter and correctly states that this species is not federally listed as threatened or endangered, the EIS/OEIS omits that the sea otter is listed as a federal species of concern and is designated under state law as endangered. (3.4.1.37.3 Distribution, p. 3.4-8) For a list of species marked for special protection under Washington State law go to https://wdfw.wa.gov/species-habitats/at-risk/listed .	The Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes an analysis of potential impacts to marine birds found in the NWT Study Area. The Navy has consulted with USFWS on Federally protected species, including diving birds such as the marbled murrelet.
Sound Defense Alliance		
SDA-01	1) Noise analysis (Appendix J) uses airport noise analysis metrics (DNL averaging) instead of impulse noise metrics for overflights on National Forest and National Parks property. Visitors and residents are reporting being alarmed by the loud, intermittent jet noise and averaging the noise does not properly assess the impact.	Impulsive noise metrics are not appropriate for subsonic flight operations. Impulsive metrics are used for sonic booms and explosions, which are not part of this scenario. Cumulative noise exposure was denoted by DNL and is the recommend metric by the U.S. Government (FICAN, FICON, DoD and FAA).
SDA-02	2) Noise models of the EA-18G are reported to be based on a single engine sound measurement made over 10 years ago. The draft SEIS does not describe the source of the model, which engines were used for measurements nor what the range of variability is when two engines with independent controllers are used. Twin engines create harmonics that increase the low frequency noise signature and this phenomenon impacts biological organisms and should be assessed.	EA-18G noise data are from detailed noise measurements of the F/A-18E Super Hornet collected from a series of dedicated measurements in 1997 to 2001. The flyover data was collected from controlled overflights with both engines operating. The engines in these measurements were the F414-GE-400 engines, which are the current engines installed in the F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft. Appendix J has been revised to include the engine type modeled for the EA-18G aircraft. The data are not based on a single engine sound measurement. Twin supersonic jets do not generate low frequency harmonics.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
SDA-03	3) The Navy recently announced contracts to upgrade EA-18G jets with new, more powerful engines starting in 2019. The draft EIS does not account for the additional noise and potentially different noise signature of the new engines with an advertised increase in thrust of 20%. Throughout the analysis, the word “conservative” is used to imply that the impact will not be as great as stated. To be consistent, new noise models, based on actual measurements of EA-18G aircraft equipped with the more powerful engines should be used.	The engines used for the noise model were the F414-GE-400 engines, which are the current engines installed in the F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft. Appendix J has been revised to include the engine type modeled for the EA-18G aircraft. The GE F414-400 enhanced engine is currently only in a research phase for the Navy, and is not installed in any aircraft, nor are there plans to purchase or install it. If this engine were to be introduced to the fleet of F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft, the Navy would measure the noise emissions from this new engine.
SDA-04	4) The draft EIS confuses sorties and jets such that the reader cannot determine how many jets are involved in training activities. A recently issued FEIS concerning the addition of 36 EA-18G jets to NAS-WI brought the number of aircraft based at NAS-WI to 118 out of the 160 EA-18G fleet. The DEIS should clearly identify how many jets and flight crews are to be trained in the NWTT exercises.	The issue that is relevant for determining noise impacts of aircraft training in the Olympic MOA is the number of aircraft sorties flown in the Olympic MOA, regardless of the number of aircraft or aircrew based at NAS Whidbey Island. For noise modeling purposes, the proposed number of aircraft per year flown in the Olympic MOA is shown in Tables J-7 through J-10 in Appendix J.
SDA-05	5) The NWTT supplemental EIS and the NAS-WI FEIS to add 36 additional EA-18G aircraft are clearly linked and have been separated in violation of NEPA provisions. The entire region is impacted by transit flights to/from training areas, Electronic Warfare training using mobile and fixed transmitters and EA-18G jamming training. No analysis was produced on the impacts of communities not directly adjacent to the Special Use Airspace and the coastal training areas.	The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS included analysis of aircraft transit to and from the Olympic MOA. The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been revised to include the results of aircraft noise modeling during those transits.
SDA-06	6) The Draft EIS states, without any evidence, that there will be no socioeconomic impacts in implementing either alternative. An example of economic impact: EA-18G flights over the Olympic National Park has resulting in the ONP not being eligible for a “Quiet Parks” designation from Quiet Parks International. This is an immediate economic impact since tourists seeking a quiet park experience will no longer consider ONP. Tourism is a large part of the region’s economy and disruption of that industry will have potentially very large impacts. The DEIS should forecast the potential lost tourism revenue and the ripple impacts on the communities on the Olympic peninsula.	Based on aircraft training in the Olympic MOA for decades, sometimes with higher levels of activities, and increasing park visitors, the conclusions in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS are valid.
SDA-07	7) Other alternative not considered. The Draft EIS did not compare other training locations – far out to sea, for example where no land mammals and no communities exist to be impacted. NEPA requires actual alternatives, not just variations of a theme: More training or less training. The Navy is required to consider other alternatives so that comparative impacts are apparent.	The Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training farther from NAS Whidbey Island, either farther at sea or at other land training areas was considered but eliminated from further consideration. Additionally, the Olympic MOA is desirable for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure,

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>environmental conditions that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness, and other factors stated in 2.5.1.1.</p> <p>The Navy complied with NEPA requirements in the development and consideration of alternatives. The Alternatives carried forward meet the Navy's purpose and need (see Section 1.4, Purpose of and Need for Proposed Military Readiness Training and Testing Activities) to ensure that it can fulfill its obligation under Title 10. See Section 2.4 (Action Alternative Development) for more detailed information on the development of alternatives.</p>
<i>Surfrider Foundation - Mendocino County Chapter</i>		
Surfrider-01	We are extremely concerned about the health of our ecosystem and our local economy if the Navy is allowed to expand at-sea sonar and explosive training and testing. Although the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area begins in Southeastern Alaska and ends at the northern Mendocino County border, our local Mendocino County coastline will still be adversely affected because it is scientifically proven that sonar travels 300 miles under water.	Information describing ongoing and proposed training and testing activities, locations, and level of occurrence within the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area are provided in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives). Sound from these activities encounters acoustic transmission losses due to absorption from seawater, and interactions with the sea surface and seafloor. As a result, sound intensity will decrease with increasing distance as it propagates from a source. Sound transmitted from a source (e.g. sonar) is expected to attenuate appreciably at a distance of 300 miles from the source. Additional information regarding sound propagation can be found in Appendix D (Acoustic and Explosive Concepts) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Surfrider-02	It is well established that the high-intensity pulses produced by underwater military airguns can cause a range of impacts on marine mammals, fish, and other marine life, including broad habitat displacement, disruption of vital behaviors essential to foraging and breeding, loss of biological diversity, and, in some circumstances, injuries and mortalities. Until their hearing recovers, these animals will have a reduced ability to detect relevant sounds such as predators, prey, or social vocalizations.	No airguns are proposed in this project.
Surfrider-03	Changes in marine life feeding and migration patterns could drastically alter our local fishing economy. Also at risk would be the large revenue we receive from our local whale-watching tourism; people from around the globe flock to the Mendocino coast to watch the magnificent display of humpbacks, gray whales, and orcas breaching and spy-hopping on their way to and from breeding grounds farther south.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Surfrider-04	Of particular concern is the recent loss of over 70 gray whales off the West Coast because of malnutrition and vessel strikes. NOAA recently declared this die-off "a wildlife emergency." We cannot subject these marine	The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	mammals to more risk. At the very least, we request that the Navy halt their timeline for their Draft Supplemental EIS until a thorough investigation into the gray whale die-off is completed. Surfrider Foundation – Mendocino County Chapter believes that such impacts to our nation’s marine resources are not an acceptable price to pay for an increase in military training and testing.	Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.
<i>Vashon Maury Island Audubon Society</i>		
Vashon-01	The Vashon Maury Island Audubon Society supports the "No Action" Alternative in this EIS. The Olympic Coast and Olympic Peninsula are truly a sanctuary. Ever since 1907, the Federal Government has protected the mammals, birds, and other natural resources of this unique ecosystem. These protections include Olympic National Park (both the interior portions of the park as well as the coastal wilderness beaches), the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, Olympic National Forest and various designated wilderness areas. In all these areas, wildlife thrive undisturbed. The expansion of Naval Training in this area directly competes with the original purpose of preserving this remarkable ecosystem. Wildlife ... seabirds, whales and other marine mammals, and the creatures of the forest ... need the natural quiet of their landscape to reproduce and to thrive. This is not the place for Navy Growler jets. The Navy should resume its past practice of conducting this training in the interiors of Idaho and Nevada. There is no need to have substantial impacts on one of the most pristine ecosystem reserves in our country.	Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year. When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context: 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. Additionally, the Olympic MOA is desirable for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure,

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		environmental conditions that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness, and other factors stated in 2.5.1.1.
<i>Washington Environmental Council and Washington Conservation Voters</i>		
WEC/WCV-01	<p>The draft EIS, as presented, clearly identifies that the Navy's training and testing activities will harm endangered Southern Resident orcas. The Navy must shift these activities away from locations and dates that endangered species are present.</p> <p>In an already noisy underwater world, orcas need quieter waters order to effectively communicate with one another, to forage for food, to nurse their young, to breed, and to migrate. More active sonar disturbance and mine explosions will harm orcas.</p>	<p>Based on the best available science, long-term consequences for marine mammal species or stocks, including Southern Resident killer whales, would not be expected from Navy training and testing activities under the Proposed Action. As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy worked cooperatively with NMFS to develop a suite of mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on Southern Resident killer whales to the maximum extent practicable, including numerous new mitigation measures developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS in areas important to Southern Resident killer whales for feeding, breeding, and migration.</p>
WEC/WCV-02	<p>A March 2019 report by NOAA by Emmons, Hanson, and Lemmers (see citation below) records calls from both Southern Resident and Northern Resident Killer Whales at the same locations and months as explosive noises from Navy activities. That means the Navy is already altering the soundscape in ways that are harmful to these endangered species. Any harm to orcas constitutes an illegal "take" under the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>There are documented cases in this region of U.S. and Canadian naval activities, including active sonar training and explosive testing, causing direct harm, death, or displacement to the Southern Resident orcas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In 2003, an active sonar training exercise conducted by the U.S. Navy in the eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca and Haro Strait caused the J Pod to stop foraging and exhibit abnormal behaviors and movement, change direction multiple times, and group together in shallow water where they are at increased risk of stranding. - A juvenile Southern Resident female was stranded in 2012 with evidence of trauma consistent with an explosion or high-pressure impact, a week after the Canadian Navy had been conducting sonar exercises in the region. - In 2017, explosives detonated by the Canadian Navy near L Pod caused the whales to group together suddenly and flee the area. <p>* Citation: Emmons, C.K., M.B. Hanson, and M.O. Lammers. 2019. Monitoring the occurrence of Southern Resident killer whales, other marine mammals, and anthropogenic sound in the Pacific Northwest. Prepared for: U.S. Navy, U.S. Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, HI. Prepared by: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Northwest Fisheries</p>	<p>The Navy-funded research presented in Emmons et al. 2019 was considered in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, but the report was not cited because it was still in the process of being edited by the authors and had not been finalized. The report has since been finalized and is cited in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Emmons et al. 2019 reported a number of detections at Cape Flattery Offshore, but this was not normalized for effort, which was also highest at the Cape Flattery Offshore hydrophone location. This would have the effect of overstating detections in that area. Also, Emmons et al. 2019 reported on detections of MFA sonar, but did not distinguish between various sources (U.S. versus Canadian navies, among other users). Historically, the annual usage of MF1 sonar by the U.S. Navy in this area over the last 10 years has been minimal. The Navy does not generally schedule training and testing near Cape Flattery due to the high volume of commercial vessel traffic in that portion of the Study Area.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003. Also, please see the new procedural mitigation measures described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and the</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Science Center under MIPR N00070-17-MP-4C419. 25 February 2019. 23p. Signed, 2,042 members of Washington Environmental Council and Washington Conservation Voters	new mitigation areas described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
WEC/WCV-03	Also, the designation for Southern Resident orca critical habitat is likely to change later this year. The Navy should not make final decisions about training and testing in the potential new critical habitat areas off the coasts of Washington, Oregon and California until this designation has been made.	The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DOD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
WEC/WCV-04	While other agencies and operators are taking new, meaningful steps to reduce noise and disturbance affecting Southern Resident orcas, the Navy must also increase its protections, or it will become responsible for a larger share of the cumulative impact and potentially negate some of the benefits of the other actions being taken. In a time when we should be taking action to address and decrease threats facing the population, including reducing noise and disturbance, the Navy's proposed activities increase the risks from ocean noise, vessel strike and disturbance, potential direct harm and injury to Southern Resident orcas, and displacement from preferred habitat. The Navy must consider the current crisis facing the endangered Southern Resident orcas and make new adjustments in its testing and training activities. Despite being listed under the Endangered Species Act for nearly 14 years, this unique population is not recovering and is continuing to decline. Given their highly endangered status and continuing decline, the Navy should be considering how to reduce impacts and increase protections for Southern Resident orcas.	The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on Southern Resident killer whales and other marine species in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitat areas, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures specific to Southern Resident killer whales. For example, in the NWTT Offshore Area, the Navy developed a new mitigation area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, which encompasses waters off Cape Flattery. The Navy's mitigation now includes annual limits on hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and prohibits explosive Mine Countermeasures and Neutralization Testing in the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. All other explosive activities are required to be conducted 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. In addition, the Navy developed a new mitigation to issue annual awareness notification messages to alert ships and aircraft to the possible presence of increased concentrations of Southern Resident killer whales seasonally, which will further help avoid potential impacts from vessel movements and training and testing activities on this species. As described in Section K.3.3. (Mitigation Areas for Marine Species in NWTT Inland Waters), the Navy also developed enhanced mitigation measures in NWTT Inland Waters for Southern Resident killer whales, gray whales, and other marine species for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy's new Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area requirements will

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		result in training and testing activities being conducted in NWTT Inland Waters only when necessitated by mission-essential training or testing program requirements. Furthermore, the Navy will implement additional geographic mitigation for activities that are conducted in the mitigation area as applicable, such as seasonal awareness messages, communication with sighting information networks, limitations on the type and location of active sonar and explosive activities, and prohibition of live fire activities. The Navy's mitigation as described in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS represents the maximum level of mitigation practical to implement under the Proposed Action, and any further mitigation in NWTT Inland Waters would be impractical due to implications for safety, sustainability, and mission requirements for the reasons described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
West Coast Action Alliance		
WCAA-01	<p>For years the West Coast Action Alliance has provided extensive comments to the Navy on its proposed actions, including a 47-page letter that spelled out in detail the factual and ethical deficiencies of its previous plans and public processes to expand the Growler fleet and electronic warfare testing and training, in area waters and over our communities and public lands. Those comments remain standing, and those concerns, still unaddressed, are hereby brought forward onto the public record. Like many concerned citizens, we have spent hundreds of hours reading, analyzing and discussing Navy NEPA documents, have followed instructions to back up specific concerns with specific explanations, references, and facts, have attended public meetings, and have in turn, like every other commenter with serious, substantive concerns, been completely ignored.</p> <p>Despite the trappings of yet another NEPA process in a long confusing line of EISs, Supplements, and EAs, each concluding no significant impacts, the message the Navy continues to transmit to the public who are not in its immediate circle of supporters, is the same message we were given verbally and in person in 2014: at a meeting in Pacific Beach, the Navy's NWTT range manager said, "We're here to listen to your objections, but we don't have to do anything about them." Despite NEPA's intent, and with substantive and informed concerns being provided by the thousands over the years, and despite abundant evidence of harm to communities and wildlands, no concessions or changes in the Navy's plans to reduce impacts have been made evident. No significant impacts have ever been found in any Navy NEPA products dating back more than a decade. This defies logic.</p>	<p>The commenting feature on the project website, while not a NEPA requirement, was added by the Navy to further facilitate commenting by the public. The Navy placed certain limitations on comments (5,000 characters of text and 1 MB limit for file attachments), to allow the Navy to continue supporting this feature in a cost-effective manner. Over 1,800 comments were received on this project through website commenting and attachments, with very few affected by this limit. The Navy will review this file size limitation for future projects.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>If no significant impacts have ever been found, then why is the public so upset with the Navy's actions, and why are communities and wildlands suffering in ways that have been extensively documented and were not there before the Navy's actions? The Navy is also not responsive to FOIA requests for information that was once freely available to the public. Also: The limitation of 5,000 characters in your online comment form restricts the public's ability to comment on a proposed action that affects many lives. By not informing the public of this online limit in advance, the Navy does not fulfill its statutory obligations for a public process. All of this adds up, and the public is taking note.</p>	
WCAA-02	<p>With the determination of noise impacts by a recent scientific study, published by the University of Washington, that military traffic was responsible for 85 percent of all audible air traffic in three locations on the west side of the Olympic Peninsula, including outside the Olympic Military Operations Area, there is no doubt in anyone's mind but the Navy's that disturbance events, some numbering as many as 80 – 100 per day, are damaging the unique ecological, cultural, social, educational, and economic qualities of the area. And based on the steady stream of everexpanding EISs, there also appears to be no upward limit to the noise the Navy is willing to inflict on surrounding communities and wildlands.</p> <p>The Navy has failed to correct its own noise studies that omitted the low-frequency signatures of Growlers, used modeling and not actual measurements, and relied on software that the DOD's own Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program has determined to be outdated. Thus, the Navy routinely underestimates and understates noise impacts, not only to communities but also to a World Heritage Site and Biosphere Reserve containing many species that rely on hearing to survive. Our comment letter on the original EIS describes this in detail. One hour of nonafterburner Growler flight emits 23 percent more carbon dioxide than a Washington resident emits in an entire year. The increase in exhaust emissions was deceptively presented for the entire impact area; the Navy cannot segment the very air by failing to analyze impacts of exhaust emissions outside the MOA, as it did for takeoffs and landings only in the original EIS. Our previous comment letter described this in detail.</p> <p>The Navy does not consider impacts that occur outside the MOA, but Growlers fly and cause significant impacts well beyond MOA boundaries. Thus it renders estimates of noise and exhaust emission impacts invalid in yet another example of segmentation in the NEPA process. NEPA was never designed to provide the public with the equivalent of death by a</p>	<p>The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was released to the public before the Kuehne report was made available. The Navy has considered this report in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS (see Section 3.12 and Appendix J).</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>thousand paper cuts. Our previous comment letter describes segmentation problems in detail.</p> <p>The public largely views this incessant warfare activity newly expanded in and around civilian communities and public wildlands, along with the Navy's refusal to back off despite the evidence of harm, as if your neighbors are the enemy you are practicing on. In fact, it appears we are. This may sound off-topic for a Growler comment, but it is an example of the public's holistic view vs the Navy's segmented one: the intent was clearly stated by a Navy representative during a 2018 open house regarding SEALs training in our state parks, beaches, and on private lands along 260 miles of Puget Sound shoreline. He confirmed to a group of astonished listeners that civilians were intended to be used as proxies for the enemy: they would be surveilled as unwitting participants in military exercises, should they wander in unintentionally, and they will not be informed of this. He also said, "you should watch what you do in the woods, because you never know when we'll be watching."</p>	
WCAA-03	<p>Please do not assume that the public separates these issues—SEAL training, Growlers, at-sea exercises—and their impacts, which have been endlessly segmented to apparent insignificance, but which cumulatively are serious. You may win your NEPA argument by segmenting impacts, but only on paper, because the real impacts in their entirety cannot be segmented out of existence.</p> <p>Therefore, please DO assume that the public has a long memory. To most members of the public, the Navy is one giant behemoth of an organization, and when one of your commanding officers does a dress-uniformed meet and greet at our farmers market and tries to say he's at Indian Island and does not represent NASWI, nobody buys it. You wear the uniform, you represent the Navy. All of it. You cannot segment a Navy uniform. National Park Service employees cannot get away with such denial, and neither should the Navy. Any officer who believes that wearing the uniform entitles him to represent only part of the Navy is living in a bubble.</p> <p>Former Secretary of Defense Ash Carter said in a recent interview that when he was Secretary he always tried to be careful, and that he told the troops the same thing. He told them, "You're doing a serious thing. War is a serious business, the public trust is a serious business, and I expect you to behave yourselves. Your conduct and comportment really matters."</p> <p>By its behavior over the last few years, which includes an extremely low-altitude circling of my home twice by a Navy MH-60 helicopter shortly after</p>	<p>The Navy prepares Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) and Environmental Assessments (EA) in order to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). These NEPA documents are intended to ensure decision makers consider the potential environmental effects of a proposed action and its alternatives, provide an opportunity for public involvement, and promote transparency by informing the public of these potential environmental effects. Each NEPA document addresses a specific proposed action, separated from other actions by its purpose and need, independent utility, timing, and geographic location. Some NEPA documents are stand-alone documents; others tier off or expand the analyses of other NEPA documents. NEPA documents for training and testing, including this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, focus on training and testing activities occurring within a range complex or military operation area and involve different types of aircraft, ships, and range complex enhancements. NEPA documents for aircraft homebasing actions focus on aircraft operations in and around the airfield and their facility needs. NEPA documents for installations focus on infrastructure enhancements for host and tenant command missions. Importantly, every environmental document considers the cumulative impacts to the environment from other relevant past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (federal, state, local, and private) in addition to the proposed action.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>I wrote an opinion piece in the local paper, it appears that the Navy no longer prizes good conduct and comportment. I did not include an address in this letterhead, not because I do not wish to hear from you, but because my trust that the Navy respects people who disagree with it no longer exists.</p> <p>By promising its neighbors only a ten percent increase in Growler flights in the 2014 NEPA process and then increasing that to 400 percent in 2019, the Navy demonstrates what the public interprets as disingenuousness. Trust once lost is very slowly recovered, if at all.</p>	
Whale and Dolphin Conservation		
WDC-01	<p>I. Direct threats to Southern Resident orcas from Navy activities in the NWT</p> <p>The EIS incorrectly claims that “Navy actions were not the sources for any of the identified threats” in a report by the Washington State Southern Resident Orca Task Force. We argue that Naval actions including, but limited to, those listed above do significantly contribute to the recognized threats to Southern Resident orcas. Concerns about sonar use were raised in the very first meeting of the Southern Resident orca Task Force, and the final report for Year One included a recommendation to “coordinate with the Navy in 2019 to discuss reduction of noise and disturbance affecting Southern Resident orcas from military exercises and Navy aircraft.” The Task Force report may not specifically cite Naval activities as the source of threats to Southern Resident orcas, but the activities outlined in this draft SEIS all contribute to primary threats impacting the survival and recovery of Southern Resident orcas: noise, vessel traffic and ship strike risk, contaminants, and prey depletion.</p>	<p>The Task Force Final Report did not identify Navy sonar among the major threats. The major threats identified in the report are a lack of prey, disturbance from noise and vessel traffic, and toxic contaminants in the waters they inhabit. The Navy, as acknowledged by the Governor's Task Force in 2018, was not previously requested to participate in the Task Force. The Navy has since been invited to take part and, as a result, a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Task Force's working groups on prey and vessel traffic, to develop solutions to issues pointed out in recommendation #25. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
WDC-02	<p>The draft SEIS anticipates two behavioral responses per year for Southern Resident orcas from training and testing activities in the preferred alternative (Alternative 1), with a total of 15 responses over the 7-year time period of the draft SEIS. We are concerned that this underestimates the impacts to Southern Resident DPS. Resident orcas are highly social and travel in family groups or pods that typically number more than two individuals. Even with monitoring by trained observers and immediate shutdown of any activities likely to result in a behavioral response, it is</p>	<p>Since the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has incorporated new estimates of Southern Resident killer whale densities and distributions in the NWT Offshore Area into the quantitative analysis of impacts. The revised density estimates are shown in the technical report <i>U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area (amended September 20, 2019)</i>, available at www.nwtteis.com. As a result, the Navy has revised the number of behavioral takes of Southern Resident killer whales in Appendix E (Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>highly likely that more than two individual orcas will be impacted at any one time. For example, Hanson et al. 2018 notes that following one tagged Southern Resident orca in 2013 (K25) actually represented the movements of 60 additional orcas associated with the tagged individual, with both K and L pods traveling together. The Navy should consider and analyze the likelihood of impacts to a group of orcas representing the average pod size for the Southern Resident DPS.</p>	<p>Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy Acoustic Effects Model considers social factors like species-specific group size. The Navy coordinated with scientists at the Southwest Fisheries Science Center (SWFSC) and the National Marine Mammal Laboratory (NMML) to help identify the best available density estimates for marine mammals occurring in the Study Area. The Navy's Acoustic Effects Model accounts for depth distributions by changing each animat's depth during the simulation process according to the typical depth pattern observed for each species. Depth distribution information was collected by literature review and is presented as a percentage of time the animal typically spends within various depth bins in the water column. The distribution of animats in the Navy's Acoustic Effects Model starts with the extraction of species density estimates from the density database for a given area and month. In order to incorporate statistical uncertainty surrounding density estimates into the Navy's Acoustic Effects Model, 30 distributions were produced for each species for each season, each of which varied according to the standard deviations provided with the density estimates. Species-specific group sizes are estimated using literature review, survey data, and density data, and uncertainty of group size estimates are statistically represented by the standard deviation.</p> <p>The Navy Acoustic Effects Model uses Monte Carlo methods to estimate the expected value of behavioral responses. This is accomplished by running multiple simulations in which factors are randomly selected for the selected modeling area, including, but not limited to, the travel path of the platform with a sound source and animat distribution based on a probability density function for the species. Many simulations are run for any given testing and training event to ensure that the mean impacts predicted by NAEMO represent the likely impacts given the potential for a species to be present within the ranges to effect. In instances where the potential for a species to be present at any point in time is very low, as in the case of Southern Resident killer whales, the mean value will be weighted by the large majority of instances in which no impacts would occur. A detailed explanation of the Navy's Acoustic Effects Model is provided in the technical report <i>Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing</i> (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018), available at www.nwtteis.com.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
WDC-03	<p>Behavioral impacts include harassment and the disruption of natural behavior patterns like feeding, surfacing, nursing, breeding, sheltering, and migration. For a highly endangered population like the Southern Resident orcas, each of these activities can be critical for their survival and recovery; the disruption of normal behaviors including reproduction and caring for young may further impede the orcas' ability to reproduce, give birth, and raise offspring.</p> <p>The Draft SEIS itself states that "a lost reproductive opportunity could be a measurable cost to the individual, or for very small populations to the population as whole (e.g., Southern Resident killer whale); however, short-term costs may be recouped during the life of an otherwise healthy individual." This is correct in noting the potential population-level threat to small and vulnerable populations from a lost reproductive opportunity; however, the Navy must also consider that the Southern Resident orcas are not "otherwise healthy individuals." Research being compiled into a health database for the Southern Resident community shows poor body condition in multiple orcas (including three orcas currently visibly underweight),¹⁰ and compared to Northern Resident orcas, the Southern Resident population has lower survival and reproductive rates. The short-term cost of a lost reproductive opportunity may in fact be a long-term cost to the Southern Resident DPS.</p> <p>A major barrier to the recovery of the Southern Resident orcas is the lack of successful reproduction in the community, and research has shown that 69% of detected pregnancies in recent years are unsuccessful, ending in miscarriage. This is linked to nutritional stress in the population, and activities that interrupt foraging behavior or displace the population from preferred foraging areas may significantly contribute not only to nutritional stress, but also to reproductive failure. The Navy must consider the additional impacts to long-term survival and recovery from anticipated behavioral responses.</p> <p>There are documented cases of Naval activities causing Southern Resident orcas to abruptly change behavior and abandon foraging activities and areas, most notably the USS Shoup active sonar incident in 2003.¹³ More recently, the Canadian Navy set off explosives near a group of Southern Resident orcas from L pod, in federally-protected critical habitat, causing them to flee the area. Activities may also cause direct harm or injury to orcas. Examination of a young Southern Resident orca who died in 2012 found evidence of trauma consistent with an explosion or high-pressure impact. This orca has never been conclusively assigned a cause of death,</p>	<p>As described in Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III) (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017h), the Navy's analysis incorporates conservative assumptions to account for uncertainty and therefore likely overestimates potential impacts of TTS and behavioral responses. As described in Chapter 3.4 (Marine Mammals), a single or even a few minor TTS to an individual marine mammal per year are unlikely to have any long-term consequences for that individual. Based on the best available science, long-term consequences for marine mammal species or stocks, including Southern Resident killer whales, would not be expected from Navy training and testing activities under the Proposed Action. The Navy has been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and their salmon prey species. No significant behavioral responses such as panic, stranding or other severe reactions have been observed during monitoring of actual training or testing activities.</p> <p>In May 2003, killer whales in Haro Strait, Washington, exhibited what were believed by some observers to be aberrant behaviors, during which time the USS Shoup was in the vicinity and engaged in mid-frequency active sonar operations. Sound fields modeled for the USS Shoup transmissions (Fromm, 2009; National Marine Fisheries Service, 2005; U.S. Department of the Navy, 2004) estimated a mean received SPL of approximately 169 dB re 1 µPa at the location of the killer whales at the closest point of approach between the animals and the vessel (estimated SPLs ranged from 150 to 180 dB re 1 µPa). Per the Phase III behavioral response function for odontocetes, the estimated received level during this exposure would likely have resulted in a behavioral response. However, attributing the observed behaviors to any one cause is problematic given there were six nearby whale watch vessels surrounding the pod, and subsequent research has demonstrated that "Southern Residents modify their behavior by increasing surface activity (breaches, tail slaps, and pectoral fin slaps) and swimming in more erratic paths when vessels are close" (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries, 2014). For more details about this incident, please refer to the Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities Stranding Technical Report (May 2017), available at www.nwtteis.com. Under the Proposed Action, the use of hull-mounted sonars in the Inland Waters portion of the Study Area is limited, and the Navy would follow the mitigations prescribed for the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area as described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation).</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	but experts on underwater sound who continue to review the case believe her death was caused by an underwater military explosion. Just one training or testing incident involving Southern Resident orcas can cause significant harm, death, or displacement from preferred habitat.	<p>The National Marine Fisheries Service investigated the stranding of Southern Resident killer whale L-112 (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-133). No U.S. Navy training activities involving sonar or explosives were conducted between 1 and 11 February 2012 in the Northwest Training Range Complex (which includes Washington, Oregon, and northern California). Other anthropogenic activity, including other U.S. military, Royal Canadian Navy, fishing, or construction activities, were also ruled out as potential causes of the observed injuries. The investigation was unable to determine the cause of the observed injuries, although blast injury was deemed unlikely.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment), the Navy worked cooperatively with NMFS to develop an extensive suite of mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts on Southern Resident killer whales to the maximum extent practicable, including numerous new mitigation measures developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS in areas important to Southern Resident killer whales for breeding, foraging, and migration.</p>
WDC-04	The cumulative impacts of the threats to Southern Resident orcas should also be considered in the Draft SEIS, including the additional stress from Canadian Naval activities and other sources of noise and vessel traffic. Training and testing actions conducted by the Navy in the NWTT range should avoid, to the maximum extent practicable, intensifying the stress caused by these other sources of anthropogenic noise and disturbance.	The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been revised to consider Canadian naval activities in the Cumulative Impacts analysis. All other related activities were included in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
WDC-05	<p>II. Southern Resident orca habitat</p> <p>The draft SEIS incorrectly states that Southern Resident orcas have only a “seasonal” presence in offshore waters. This is directly contradicted in information from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), which, based on dedicated tagging and survey effort to identify offshore habitat for Southern Residents, states that “the whales spend well over 50% of their time on the outer coast.”¹⁶ Offshore habitat use reflects the different distribution of the three Southern Resident orca pods – J, K, and L – in different seasons, with J pod appearing more “resident” to the Salish Sea and Vancouver Island area year-round, and K and L pods ranging the west coast of the U.S. in the winter and spring.¹⁷ These studies have confirmed the extent of the Southern Residents’ range and indicated “hotspots” of high occurrence areas, including off the Columbia River and the northern coasts of Washington and California.¹⁸ The Navy must consider the full extent of habitat use by the different pods within the Southern Resident population, and analyze the impacts in offshore areas accordingly – with</p>	The Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS has been corrected to show the Southern Resident killer whale population as “Regular” in the Offshore Area. The analysis of potential impacts did consider their actual presence in the Offshore Area, not a seasonal presence.

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>different pods considered as a “regular” presence in both inland and offshore regions of the Study Area. With the majority of activities occurring in the offshore portion of the Study Area (91% of training and 65% of testing activities), it is alarming that the Navy analyzed the potential impacts on Southern Resident orcas while considering them only “seasonal” in offshore waters. Information on offshore habitat use should be updated and examined to determine the potential overlap with training and testing activities, and to identify potential time/area closures to protect these hotspots of high use.</p> <p>16. National Marine Fisheries Service. 2014. Southern Resident Killer Whales: 10 years of research and conservation. National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Region, Seattle.</p> <p>17. Fisheries and Oceans Canada. 2018. Amended Recovery Strategy for the Northern and Southern Resident Killer Whales (<i>Orcinus orca</i>) in Canada. Species at Risk Act Recovery Strategy Series, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Ottawa, x + 94 pp.; Ford, J.K.B., Pilkington, J.F., Reira, A., Otsuki, M., Gisborne, B., Abernethy, R.M., Stredulinsky, E.H., Towers, J.R., and Ellis, G.M. 2017. Habitats of Special Importance to Resident Killer Whales (<i>Orcinus orca</i>) off the West Coast of Canada. DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc. 2017/035. viii + 57 p.; See National Marine Fisheries Science Center data and reports on Southern Resident tagging project (https://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/research/divisions/cb/ecosystem/marinemmal/satellite_tagging/index.cfm) and winter distribution surveys (https://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/news/blogs/index.cfm); Hanson, M.B. et al. 2013. Assessing the coastal occurrence of endangered killer whales using autonomous passive acoustic recorders. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 134(5), 3486-3495; see also Brad Hanson, “Distribution and Diet of Southern Resident Killer Whales” (Northwest Fisheries Science Center, 2015), https://swfsc.noaa.gov/uploadedFiles/Events/Meetings/MMT_2015/Presentations/3.1%20PPT%20ProgramReviewSRKWDistributionDiet071515MBHv2.pdf</p> <p>18. Ibid.; Hanson, M.B., E.J. Ward, C.K. Emmons, and M.M. Holt. 2018. Modeling the occurrence of endangered killer whales near a U.S. Navy Training Range in Washington State using satellite-tag locations to improve acoustic detection data. Prepared for: U.S. Navy, U.S. Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, HI. Prepared by: National Oceanic and</p>	

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Atmospheric Administration, Northwest Fisheries Science Center under MIPR N00070-17-MP-4C419. 8 January 2018. 33 p.	
WDC-06	The draft SEIS also states that “some killer whales such as the Southern Residents have seasonal shifts in distribution from the inland waters of the Salish Sea and Puget Sound to locations that can be up to hundreds of miles both north and south of the Study Area,” which incorrectly implies that the range of the Southern Resident orcas extends far beyond the NWTT Study Area. While the Southern Residents have occasionally been seen as far north as Haida Gwaii in Canada, their primary habitat almost completely overlaps with the NWTT range, including the Salish Sea Inland region and offshore waters down to Northern California, and they are unlikely to leave this historic and accustomed habitat to avoid disturbance from Naval activities.	The range of the Southern Resident killer whale clearly extends as far south as Monterey, CA and north as far as Southeast Alaska as indicated in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and as presented in the NMFS 2018 Stock Assessment Report (see page 118 and Figure 1; Carretta et al. 2019). The range of the Southern Resident killer whales does in fact, extend far beyond the NWTT Study Area as presented in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The text in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not characterize or otherwise imply that their range is equal to their core areas or primary habitat. The Navy did not assume that the continuation of such activities would result in Southern Resident killer whales leaving the NWTT Study Area for other parts of their range as the comment suggests; this suggested departure of Southern Resident killer whales from the NWTT Study Area was not part of the Navy’s analysis.
WDC-07	<p>The Southern Residents’ coastal habitat is also currently under consideration for expanded critical habitat designation, a fact acknowledged in the draft SEIS with a plan for future consultation with NMFS. Given the proposed rule is expected by early October 2019, the Navy should not pursue any activities that could adversely affect new critical habitat until a final designation is made.</p> <p>We are also concerned with the potential impacts from NWTT activities in current Southern Resident orca critical habitat. Although Department of Defense sites, including Navy bases in the Salish Sea, are excluded from this designation, sound produced at those sites – especially the proposed increases in pier-side sonar testing described in the draft SEIS – will likely extend beyond the boundaries for the excluded areas and impact critical habitat. The Navy should consider this in analyzing impacts within the Inland portion of the NWTT range.</p> <p>The draft SEIS notes the recent changes in the presence of the Southern Resident DPS in the Salish Sea during their historical spring and summer foraging period, which has been linked to a lack of available Chinook salmon. The Navy suggests that protective measures in the Salish Sea are less important because of this changing presence, and we are concerned that this assumption will result in reduced mitigation efforts. We argue that changing habitat use by the orcas is not a reason to decrease mitigation or exercise less caution in the Inland portion of the Study Area, but instead requires that current levels of monitoring and mitigation be maintained, if</p>	<p>The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The commenter incorrectly asserts that the Navy suggests that protective measures in the Salish Sea are less important; however, the Navy has not suggested that and does not consider that to be true. The mitigation measures developed for both NWTT Inland Waters and the NWTT Offshore Area for the Proposed Action represent an increase over the mitigation developed for the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	not increased, due to the uncertainty of predicting when and where Southern Residents will occur. As their presence in any area is linked to available prey, it is likely that an increase in salmon abundance will result in increased presence in core summer habitat. The Navy should not assume a permanent shift in Southern Resident habitat use of the Salish Sea and continue to operate with caution maximum vigilance to avoid impacting the Southern Resident DPS in the Inland portion of the NWTT range.	
WDC-08	The Navy must also consider that if the Southern Residents are not present in the Salish Sea, they are likely to be increasing their use of their coastal habitat – the offshore portion of the NWTT range. NMFS notes that the orcas can be more difficult to detect and observe in coastal waters, a challenge that should be considered by the Navy when analyzing the impacts of NWTT activities. The Navy should explore the use of newly available apps and technology that can provide real-time monitoring of orca movements and provide an early warning system to mariners, such as the Whale Report Alert System (developed by the British Columbia Sightings Network).	The Navy developed new mitigation for Navy biologists to initiate communication with the appropriate marine mammal detection networks in NWTT Inland Waters prior to conducting explosive mine neutralization activities involving the use of Navy divers, Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training, Civilian Port Defense – Homeland Security Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Exercises, and Small Boat Attack Exercises. This mitigation will help the Navy plan activities in a way that minimizes the potential for exposure of Southern Resident killer whales, as described in Section K.3.3 (Mitigation Areas for Marine Species in NWTT Inland Waters). The Navy will also continue to assess the practicality of other available monitoring techniques as technologies advance.
WDC-09	<p>III. Changes in NWTT activities from the 2015 SEIS</p> <p>We are concerned that changes in activities from the 2015 Final SEIS will increase the effects of Naval activities on the Southern Resident DPS, including increased sonar use, impacts from torpedo and mine explosives, pier-side sonar testing within critical habitat, offshore sonar testing (which was not previously analyzed), and undersea warfare testing. Increased use of sonobuoys in both the offshore area – which, as has already been stated in these comments, contains the majority of the proposed activities and should be considered as regularly-occupied habitat by Southern Resident orcas – and the inland portion of the range, where sonobuoys have rarely been used, is particularly alarming.</p> <p>Mid-frequency active sonar is known to overlap with the hearing range of dolphins, including orcas, and can mask communication – a potentially significant threat for a highly social species. A report by Emmons, Hanson, and Lammers (2019)²¹ found 148 mid-frequency active sonar events detected between 2011 and 2017, with the peak overlapping with three orca communities including the Southern Residents. The draft SEIS states that exposure to mid-frequency active sonar has been linked to the separation of a Transient orca calf from their group, and although it is noted that the calf rejoined the group shortly after, there is no way to understand or assess the potential long-term impacts, or if any permanent</p>	<p>The Navy-funded research presented in Emmons et al. 2019 was considered in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, but the report was not cited because it was still in the process of being edited by the authors and had not been finalized. The report has since been finalized and is cited in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Emmons et al. 2019 reported a number of detections at Cape Flattery Offshore, but this was not normalized for effort, which was also highest at the Cape Flattery Offshore hydrophone location. This would have the effect of overstating detections in that area. Emmons et al. 2019 reported on detections of MFA sonar, but did not distinguish between various sources (U.S. versus Canadian navies, among other users). Historically, the annual usage of MF1 sonar by the U.S. Navy in the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (which overlaps with the Cape Flattery Offshore hydrophone) over the last 10 years has been minimal. The Navy does not generally schedule training and testing near Cape Flattery due to the high volume of commercial vessel traffic in that portion of the Study Area.</p> <p>In Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy considered the cumulative impacts of noise, vessel traffic, and</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>or temporary hearing damage occurred. New technology and increased use of mid-frequency sonar described in the draft SEIS has the potential to cause additional masking of communication. It is noted that the “longer-term consequences could include potential decrease in recruitment” for affected individuals, and as previously noted, the Southern Resident orca population already has very low recruitment rates, and any activity causing separation or loss of a calf from their family group, or impacting reproduction or pod cohesion can potentially have long-term, population-level impacts on this small community.</p> <p>The findings from Emmons, Hanson, and Lammers (2019) and Hanson et al. 2018 highlight the use of offshore areas by Southern Resident orcas, and should be used to minimize the adverse impacts of NWTT activities by shifting sonar and explosives testing, or limiting these activities by season and location. We also note that sonar travels much farther than observers or lookouts can reasonably monitor, particularly in offshore conditions when visibility is often limited by sea or weather conditions. Some of the new technology and instruments described in the draft SEIS can range up to 100 nautical miles, a distance at which it is impossible to observe or detect most marine species.</p> <p>The Navy should consider the cumulative impacts of noise, vessel traffic and disturbance that already occur in Southern Resident orca habitat, and how the NWTT activities contribute to overall risk to the orcas.</p> <p>Additionally, while other entities in the region are taking action to reduce the impact of their activities on Southern Resident orcas – including new vessel regulations in Washington state and Canada, an expanded ECHO program to slow ships down and reduce noise in critical habitat, and a sustainability plan by Washington State Ferries – the Navy is proposing to increase activities in the NWTT range. The Navy must increase mitigation efforts to provide a net benefit to Southern Resident orcas from these additional protective measures, otherwise the Navy will be responsible for a larger part of the cumulative impacts and may negate some of the benefits granted by these other actions.</p>	<p>disturbance on Southern Resident killer whales, and how the NWTT activities contribute to their overall well-being.</p> <p>The Navy will implement procedural mitigation whenever and wherever applicable active sonar and explosive activities occur in the Study Area. The active sonar mitigation zones (i.e., area of observation) include a 1,000 yd. and 500 yd. power down and/or a 200 yd. shut down, depending on the sonar source; therefore, Lookouts are not required to survey up to 100 nautical miles as the commenter suggests.</p> <p>The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on Southern Resident killer whales and other marine species in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitat areas, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures specific to Southern Resident killer whales. For example, in the NWTT Offshore Area, the Navy developed a new mitigation area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, which encompasses waters off Cape Flattery. The Navy’s mitigation now includes annual limits on hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and prohibits explosive Mine Countermeasures and Neutralization Testing in the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. All other explosive activities are required to be conducted 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. In addition, the Navy developed a new mitigation to issue annual awareness notification messages to alert ships and aircraft to the possible presence of increased concentrations of Southern Resident killer whales seasonally, which will further help avoid potential impacts from vessel movements and training and testing activities on this species.</p>
WDC-10	<p>IV. Entanglement Risk</p> <p>The draft SEIS states that “abandoned, lost, or otherwise discarded fishing gear constitutes the vast majority of mysticete entanglements,” citing a NOAA report from 2014. This should be corrected, as the report actually says that “While fishing gear, likely including at least some abandoned, lost, or otherwise discarded fishing gear (ALDFG), constitutes the vast majority of baleen whale entanglements, a broader array of ALDFG appears to pose</p>	<p>The language in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS regarding abandoned, lost, or otherwise discarded fishing gear is an accurate representation of the referenced sources and does not require correcting. The new information that the comment is asking the Navy to consider was considered and cited in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS as National Marine Fisheries Service, 2018a.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>entanglement risks for bottlenose dolphins and perhaps other odontocetes. Thus, most entanglement records pertain to incidental or by-catch in actively fished gear, instead of entanglement in marine debris” (emphasis added). In addition, a review of large whale entanglements in the U.S. found that no reporting regions were able to positively identify an entanglement as ALDFG with the exception of Hawaii. As noted in the report, fishing gear comprises the majority of confirmed entanglements identified to a source, with some ALDFG marine debris; however, most material entangling large whales is never identified –the origins for more than half of confirmed entanglements are unknown. Material originating from Naval activities can neither be confirmed nor ruled out as a potential entanglement risk for baleen whales.</p> <p>The Navy must also incorporate new information on increasing rates of entanglement on the West Coast. Entanglement rates for large whale species, especially humpback and gray whales, increased sharply starting in 2014 and remain well above the 10-year average. The Navy should include more recent information on entanglement risk to whales, available from NMFS as well as from state working groups in Washington, Oregon, and California.</p>	
WDC-11	<p>V. Other orca populations and species</p> <p>The Navy should also consider the potential impacts of activities in the Study Area to the Southern Resident prey base. Fish have hearing similar to other vertebrates, and are most sensitive to sounds between 100-1000 Hz. Lethal impacts and serious injuries have been observed from sound exposure exceeding 229 dB. Sonar use, explosives, and other activities may decrease salmon survival or abundance, causing the secondary effect of further reducing the amount of prey available for Southern Resident orcas. Other orca ecotypes in the Eastern North Pacific – Offshore and Transient orcas – are found in the Study Area and are likely to be affected by NWT activities. Transient orcas in particular are increasing in population size and are now being observed in new areas or for unexpected extended periods of time. This ecotype is especially reliant on sound to locate their prey, and may experience additional impacts from the noise and disturbance caused by NWT activities. The Navy should consider new information on increasing use of the Salish Sea by Transient orcas and the potential for larger observed group sizes as the population continues to grow. The Draft SEIS notes that Transient orcas are occasionally seen in Hood Canal, with sightings in 2003, 2005, and 2018. These random occurrences make their presence hard to predict, and as noted previously, this is not a reason to</p>	<p>The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS analyzed potential impacts to every component of the food web. See analysis of impacts to marine vegetation, marine invertebrates, and fishes (Sections 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9, respectively).</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	reduce observation or mitigation efforts – instead, observation may be even more important in areas where orcas occur more randomly, as they may come into an area unexpectedly.	
WDC-12	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>The practice of sonar testing is extremely harmful to beings that call the ocean their home. After years of conducting research, results indicate negative harmful effects to them. This practice leaves such beings with high levels of distress and some with loss of hearing. It is unacceptable and needs to be stopped immediately.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar and explosives training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
<i>Willits Environmental Center</i>		
Willits-01	<p>The Supplemental EIS/OEIS fails to adequately describe the current health of sea mammal populations and whether or not any or several of these species' populations are at a tipping point now. The SEIS/OEIS concludes that the Navy's proposed testing will not cause whole populations of sea mammals to become extinct, implying that an unquantified number of individuals can die without impact to the species. What is the scientific basis of this conclusion? Further, the SEIS/OEIS fails to assess the impacts on ocean ecosystems in which sea mammals cease to exist.</p>	<p>All of the descriptions and analyses requested in the comment are found in Section 3.4 (Marine Mammals) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Willits-02	<p>The Supplemental EIS/OEIS fails to look at a full range of alternatives to the proposed testing and training. It fails to address the alternative in which wars would be fought with wind and solar energy, and fought in a way that only those humans who want the war are harmed by it. These are the questions that should be asked when humans are endangering the stability of the Earth's climate. By engaging in war preparations using fossil fuels and other pollutants that contribute directly to increased GHG emissions, and indirectly by reducing the carbon sequestration capacity of the oceans, the Navy is contributing to the end of life on Earth as we know it.</p> <p>The Navy is not separate from the rest of life on planet Earth. Every sector of society - business, manufacturing, home life, government, health, agriculture, transportation, AND the military must dramatically reduce GHG emissions in their respective occupations.</p> <p>The Supplemental EIS/OEIS must first include a thorough look at the reasons for the proposed training and testing and justify them. What are the threats to the United States (and our allies and interests) that demand</p>	<p>The purpose and need for the Proposed Action were provided in Chapter 1 (Purpose and Need) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In this chapter can be found the reasons the Navy's proposed training and testing activities are required.</p>

Table H-4: Responses to Comments from Non-Governmental Organizations (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	preparedness for war? The SEIS/OEIS must than expand its range of alternatives that could reasonably reduce this threat to acceptable levels. For example, the Navy must assess as a legitimate alternative such as one or more of the following: diplomacy; international student exchanges; total emersion in reciprocal cultural and historical education programs; joint international scientific explorations; symbolic warfare, or international sports competitions.	

H.1.4.1 Form Letters and Petitions

The Navy received three different form letters from a number of individuals. The form letters were originally from the Center for Biological Diversity, Friends of the Earth, and National Parks Conservation Association non-governmental organizations. An example of each letters' contents and the Navy's response is provided in Table H-5. The responses to the letters were prepared and reviewed for scientific and technical accuracy and completeness.

Table H-5: Form Letters

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
<i>Center for Biological Diversity</i>		
CBD-1	I am writing to urge you to revise your training plans for the Pacific Northwest. Right now these plans would cause unacceptable harm to a wide range of marine life — including critically endangered Southern Resident killer whales, whose coastal habitat spans from Washington to California and includes Puget Sound. The Navy's environmental impact statement fails to fully disclose all the damage that its activities will cause. For instance, the plans will not only deafen and injure marine mammals, but they'll also disrupt feeding and breeding. Some of the animals will be exposed to sonar multiple times, and others will be displaced from their preferred habitat. The environmental impact statement also fails to fully disclose harm that will be done to fish and plankton, which could have effects all the way up the food chain. Please — adopt mitigation measures that will 1) fully protect the critical habitat of endangered orcas and entirely prohibit testing and training in Puget Sound, 2) ban sonar and explosives in biologically important areas, and 3) set limits on activities that can harm marine life.	The Navy thoroughly analyzed potential impacts of the Proposed Action on marine species in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The analysis considered the full range of potential impacts, including behavioral impacts, such as disruption to feeding and breeding, and other types of potential impacts, such as injury or physiological impacts. Based on the analysis in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, impacts are likely to be short-term and temporary in nature. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The Navy developed numerous new mitigation areas for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS to further avoid or reduce potential impacts on marine species, including Southern Resident killer whales, in key areas of importance for foraging, breeding, and migration.
<i>Friends of the Earth</i>		
Friends of the Earth-01	I am writing to express my concern that the Navy's testing and training activities in the Pacific Northwest will harm critically endangered Southern Resident killer whales and other sensitive marine life. These killer whales are in harm's way since the Navy plans to conduct activities in their coastal habitat spanning from Washington to California, including Puget Sound. The Navy's environmental impact statement fails to fully disclose the damage that its activities will have on marine mammals and their habitat. The massive scale of the proposed activities will not only deafen and injure marine mammals, but it will also disrupt feeding and breeding activities. Some of the same animals will be exposed to sonar multiple times, and whales will be displaced from their preferred habitat.	The Navy has conducted active sonar and explosives training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-5: Form Letters (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Friends of the Earth-02	The environmental impact statement also fails to fully disclose harm that will be done to fish and plankton, which will have effects up the food chain.	The Navy thoroughly analyzed potential impacts of the Proposed Action on marine species in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The analysis considered the full range of potential impacts, including behavioral impacts, such as disruption to feeding and breeding, and other types of potential impacts, such as injury or physiological impacts.
Friends of the Earth-03	I am writing to urge the Navy adopt mitigation measures that will fully protect the critical habitat of endangered orcas; entirely prohibiting testing and training activities in Puget Sound. The Navy must also ban sonar and explosives in biologically important areas and set limits on activities that can harm marine life.	The Navy worked cooperatively with NMFS during the MMPA and ESA consultation processes and determined that the suite of mitigation developed for the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS will effect the least practicable adverse impact on marine mammal species or stocks and their habitat. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals, including killer whales, wherever and whenever applicable acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors are used in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict all but one type of explosive activity from occurring within 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area year-round, which will help the Navy avoid potential impacts from explosives on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. Additionally, the Navy developed the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to enhance protections of Southern Resident Killer Whales throughout NWTT Inland Waters. Information about the Navy's mitigation areas is presented in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
National Parks Conservation Association		
NPCA-49	Olympic National Park is too special to be degraded by thunderous jet noise. I am requesting that the U.S. Navy use its considerable resources to avoid flying over the park and instead train in other designated military areas that do not interfere with Olympic and other national parks. The unique qualities of Olympic have been recognized as a national park, wilderness area, International Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Site. At the heart of the park is the Hoh Rain Forest, one of the quietest places in the Lower 48. Many of us visit places like this specifically to get away from noise, people, and the more obtrusive trappings of modern civilization. Warplanes are antithetical to the very qualities that draw us to this, one of the most quiet, wild, and protected areas in the country. Please consider a training alternative that would avoid Growler training and noise over and around the Olympic Peninsula.	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic MOA, it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p>

Table H-5: Form Letters (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude.</p> <p>2. The Navy, along with other U.S. military forces, have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Olympic MOA, one of about 460 MOAs across the United States, was established in 1977.</p> <p>3. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year).</p> <p>4. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day.</p> <p>5. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.</p> <p>6. Electronic Warfare training, which may use emitters in park-adjacent U.S. Forest Service areas, typically occurs at higher altitudes, usually greater than 20,000 feet, while other training activities, about 30 percent, involve a variety of maneuvers that may include a portion of flight time at lower elevations.</p>

H.1.5 Individuals

This section contains comments from individual members of the public received during the public comment period, and the Navy's response to those comments.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
A		
A-1	I have learned that underwater sonar tests are fundamentally disrupting the marine ecosystem, diminishing populations of some species as the noise levels disturb feeding, reproduction and social behavior. Some scientists say that it can cause death of sea creatures, from the giants to the tiniest — whales, dolphins, fish, squid, octopuses and even plankton. Other effects include impairing animals' hearing, brain hemorrhaging. This is immoral. The science is proven. Please. Stop.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Acker-1	This project is ill conceived - mainly as it relates to the larger environmental picture we find ourselves in these days. The ocean is in utter distress. A very slight change in acidity has had disastrous consequences for Abalone for example. They cannot form their shells anymore. Our kelp forest has almost entirely disappeared just by a slight change in temperature of 0.5 degrees. Over 70 whales have been found beached in California alone just in 2019. Whales, Dolphins and other ocean creatures are heavily impacted by Navy testing. This all also relates to the biggest challenge we humans have ever faced - the survival of our planet, without which nothing else matters because we won't be here. This project is headed in the completely wrong direction. We need to take care of our natural ocean system and not stress it anymore. Please abandon this ill conceived project and put your energy into restoring the ocean. Thank you.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Ackerman-1	<p>If the president says "they say the noise causes cancer" about windmills, then what will the noise from the increased number of test flights per day of the Navy growlers on the people and nature on Whidbey Island do? Now I don't know who "they" are, but I do know that noise pollution has been a known issue for over 40 years if not longer.</p> <p>Noise pollution, also known as environmental noise or sound pollution, is the propagation of noise with harmful impact on the activity of human or animal life. High noise levels can contribute to cardiovascular effects in humans and an increased incidence of coronary artery disease. In animals, noise can increase the risk of death by altering predator or prey detection and avoidance, interfere with reproduction and navigation, and contribute to permanent hearing loss. While the elderly may have cardiac problems due to noise, according to the World Health Organization, children are especially vulnerable to noise, and the effects that noise has on children may be permanent. Noise poses a serious threat to a child's physical and psychological health, and may negatively interfere with a child's learning and behavior.</p> <p>The large increase of tests per day is ignoring what is already known about the effects of noise in our world. Are you not tasked with the protection of the US territories and citizens? Are you not harming greatly, in the name of "protection"? Is this not insane?</p>	<p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety).</p>
Acosta-1	.	No response required.
Adams Am-1	Unnecessary and cruel. We need to protect what we have left, not destroy it further.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Adams An-1	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I'm writing to express my opposition to the proposed Navy sonar testing in the Salish Sea. At this time, the Southern Resident Killer Whales are on the brink of extinction. Likewise, we've had record numbers of Gray Whales washing up dead along the entire west coast (including a juvenile found in Elliot Bay).</p> <p>The fact that our apex predators are dying off in record numbers is a glaring sign that our waters are not healthy. Knowing this, it would be wise to stop and determine WHY our waters (and the creatures who dwell there) are so unhealthy. Sonar testing at this time will only contribute to these profound problems, and possibly cause these animals to go extinct. Please do not begin sonar testing in the Salish Sea.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p>
Adams J-1	<p>Stop trying to ruin the Olympic Peninsula and its environs. The noise level involved with your growler program will completely ruin the intention of that National Park. Idaho and Nevada training areas were created for warfare training, a National Park and surrounding Native lands were NOT. As a taxpaying US citizen I am outraged that your department thinks this move is a good idea. Do NOT invade this sensitive area with your obnoxious noise and pollution.</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Nevada are not reasonable. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Adams-Brown T-1	<p>Without sea life theirs no human life</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Addison-1	STOP! How could one consciously with intent torture any creature, what gives one the right. This is cruel in every way imaginable. Karma is real and it won't be remorseful. You're actions are ruining the most beautiful things our planet has to offer. STOP!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Agacinski-1	I personally feel distressed watching and listening to the noises that marine mammals are exposed to due to navy testing. These are animals that have absolutely nowhere to go and have sensitive hearing, required to communicate with one another and for their survival. It saddens me to see a group (ie, family) of orcas so close to these extremely loud noises. They have done nothing to deserve this. I sincerely hope this kind of testing is stopped!	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Agapoff-1	I am a sole proprietor of an art studio in Eastsound Washington that will be negatively impacted by increased flights over the Salish Sea. I depend upon tourism for my business. Additionally I feel that all Naval tests that could impact the Southern Resident Orcas and their habitat are wrong. These animals and their prey (salmon) are endangered and should be protected, not harassed.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ahern-1	The southern residents are dying and their very survival is in trouble. Please stop Allowing sonar testing there they forage for good and it's a known fact sonar effects their instinctual habits. Please stop studies have shown sonar is devastating to their tribes. The calves born struggle to survive.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Aist-1	You must end the use of sonar NOW! The effects on marine life, especially cetaceans, are devastating. You must use the immense resources at your disposal to find another way to achieve whatever you are trying to do via the use of sonar. Our oceans must be protected in all their immense complexity. My family votes and is politically active at the grassroots level. We the People WILL be seeking to bring change to military agencies that do not use ecologically sound, compassionate decision-making. How about you bring the change yourselves without causing the near/extinction of several whale species first?	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Akhgar-1	The coastline of Washington and Olympic National Forest was my proverbial back yard growing up. Although I don't live there anymore, it is still home to hundreds of species of land and water dwelling creatures. The Navy does NOT need to set up shop in this forest region or coastline. The risk of causing permanent hearing loss to hundreds of underwater species is unacceptable through the use of underwater sonar testing. We need to restore the biodiversity of the Salish Sea, and this new testing is anything but helpful for this. Marine mammals, forest dwellers, and humans can all, and need to co-exist; we truly depend on each other in more ways that are	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	not always clear on the surface. Please do not increase flights and sonar testing across the Olympic Peninsula.	
Albarran-1	Doing these tests will certainly and with no doubt put a deadly pressure for the endangered resident orcas. These are iconic animals loved by most of the world, and we want them safe and thriving. Your tests will do otherwise and we won't stand for it. Do the right thing and protect them, don't kill them.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Alberto-1	I am 100% against under water sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. These harmful military practices are in unacceptable!!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Alden-1	I do support a navy that have the knowledge to do what is necessary. However, I do NOT support an expansion of the test areas based on the following: 1. The Navy have existed for more than 200 years. By now the navy should be smart enough to know how to use the existing test areas to accommodate their needs for training. 2. The impact on the sea animals are already significant. Whales are slowly recovering from almost being extinct, but they are very sensitive to sound. https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a593622.pdf http://foodweb.uhh.hawaii.edu/MARE390_files/Miller%20et%20al.%202000.pdf https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/full/10.1098/rspb.2013.0657 3. I would prefer to see the whales going up and down our coast line. The economy in some of our area is dependent on the wild life we have. Both tourism and fishing. My vote would be NO to an expansion of the test areas.	The Navy is not expanding the area where training and testing are proposed to occur. The Study Area is the same as was analyzed in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS. All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Aldham-1	Please think of the survival of a species at serious risk of extinction before toy proceed with any sonar testing that will have a serious negative effect on the killer whales that reside in the Salish sea. I thank you in advance for any consideration dealing with this sensitive issue.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Alee-1	Protect our marine animals!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Alexander-1	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I am writing today to comment on the proposed extension to use the Olympic National Park and surrounding areas for military trainings. I am particularly focused on the increased presence of the Growlers. I have called Port Townsend home for over half of my life, and find the environment and way of life largely unspoiled, compared to so many other places in our nation. I feel gratitude every day for a quality of life that many do not get to experience.</p> <p>This quality of life, however, has been grossly degraded since the introduction of Growler training flights over the peninsula, home to a plethora of species, not just humans, that have appreciated the natural</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>beauty and quietude it affords so many. Once known as the quietest place on the planet, Olympic National Park is that, no more.</p> <p>To look beyond the personal, however, consider climate change and the related 6th Mass Extinction that we are facing. With the US military being the planet's largest consumer of fossil fuel, is there any justification, really, to continue furthering the circumstances that will actually lead to whole island nations going under water, coastal cities in our own country being inundated, and the eventual loss of a million species through extinction, for GOOD?</p> <p>Military action is typically justified in the name of "national security". What nation is really secure when climate change threatens our long range food supply, our weather demonstrates its increasing power to destroy entire towns, and when we know beyond a shadow of a doubt that the burning of fossil fuels makes this threat all more prevalent?</p> <p>Increasing numbers of us feel like the person saying "The Emperor is not wearing any clothes!" and that people in power are not attending to reality. With the current occupant of the White House seeming to be committed to ignoring scientific reality, does that give us all permission to do the same? I don't think so. No. We have to find the courage to face some very hard facts.</p> <p>Please wake up to the fact that our bloated military has to downsize. We have to learn to be at peace with other nations, not engage in endless war, justifying that as a cornerstone of our economy. I would like to see true leadership, based on real science, and for the military to show the courage to lead in this regard, by recognizing its need to shrink, not grow.</p> <p>War is not the answer. It never has been. We live at a true moment of truth where the very survival of life on our planet hangs in the balance. Start by facing reality. Please.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Alexandra-1	<p>Wildlife/Marine Life/Bird Populations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Puget Sound is the nation's second largest estuary. The waters of the Salish Sea are some of the most biologically significant and productive marine areas in the world, home to both abundant and threatened species of marine life. The rivers of Olympic Peninsula are important habitat where salmon reproduce. Aircraft noise and sonic booms have been implicated as a cause of lowered reproduction in a variety of animals. • The pod of Southern resident orcas that inhabits the Salish Sea is on the decline; only 74 remain. Both high and low frequency noise have negative impacts on whales' ability to navigate and identify food. The carbon dioxide in jet exhaust acidifies the water, damaging the web of marine life that 	<p>The issues described in the comment were addressed in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>sustain salmon, the orca's primary food source. Additionally, chemical compounds from the Navy's fire fighting fire retardant, already in Whidbey's aquifer, enter Puget Sound as surface run-off. These effects, taken together, will further stress the pod and may make the difference between survival and extinction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary includes 3,188 square miles of marine waters off the rugged Olympic Peninsula coastline. The sanctuary extends 25 to 50 miles seaward, covering much of the continental shelf and several major submarine canyons. The sanctuary protects a productive up-welling zone, home to marine mammals and seabirds. Along its shores are thriving kelp and intertidal communities, teeming with fishes and other sea life. Scattered communities of deepsea coral and sponges form habitats for fish and other important marine wildlife. • Olympic National Park is home to the endangered spotted owl and the endangered marbled murrelet. Its coastline is the biannual flyway for billions of migrating birds that depend on navigational signals disrupted by the jets. Growlers also collide with birds. The growlers are hazardous to humans and wildlife. These jets must be moved to a less sensitive and ecologically valuable location. 	
Alinger-1	<p>I would like to respectfully submit the following comments: I have been educated that the Navy's EIS clearly indicates that the Southern Residents will be harmed by testing and training activities, and that this is not acceptable. Our Southern Residents need quiet in order to "hear" their prey.</p> <p>I was informed that in 2003 during a training session, the J pod quit foraging and instead spent time and calories trying to leave the area instead of hunting and eating. In pursuing these activities, I have also been informed that the this will violate the Endangered Species Act, which should be protecting the orcas.</p> <p>The designation for the orcas' critical habitat is under review and it is important that the Navy should not be allowed to move forward until the designation is final.</p> <p>I am asking that the Navy respect the Southern Resident Orcas' Endangered Species status and take steps to mitigate further harm. Please protect the critical habitat of the orcas and prohibit testing and training in these waters. I am also asking that they ban sonar and explosives in these waters.</p> <p>It is absolutely vital that we protect the delicate status of our marine mammals and not engage in any activities that can harm marine life. It is</p>	<p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003. Also, please see the new procedural mitigation measures described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) and the new mitigation areas described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	disappointing and alarming that we do these things regardless of the cost. We should not make future generations try to undo the damage we cause because we were unwilling to listen to the science.	the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The Navy consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service regarding the Navy's Proposed Action and potential impacts to endangered species, as required under the Endangered Species Act.
Allegrone-1	Stop the sonar testing! Cetaceans are dying. We are living in a period of mass extinctions. Destroying the LIVING planet is NEVER the answer. Wiping out everything good is just that.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Allen D-1	The deleterious impacts from the increased naval operations made to the quality of experience one expects to find within Olympic National Park are substantial and significant. Peace and solitude are readily frangible. Partial mitigation would be to restrict the number of flights and the number of days in which operations occur. A better solution is to move the exercises off shore. Why couldn't they be marine based?	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTS Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Allen H-1	I adamantly oppose the use of sonar testing in the Pacific Northwest Ocean. It has been proven to cause irreversible harm to marine life-including our critically endangered Southern Resident Orca. Stop the use of sonar testing in our ocean now!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Alpha-1	It is very sad it is to see thousands of these beautiful creatures being killed in the oceans around the world because of sonar testing. It's their home the sea not ours to destroy!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Alsammach-1	Free all whales	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marine-species-monitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Alvarez D-1	Oceans are not polluted with rubbish only, but with noise also. Let's give marine animals the right to live without that noise.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Alvarez L-1	.	No response required.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Amanno-1	The whales and other marine inhabitants are in enough distress already. Look at the recent whale die-off in San Francisco beaches. Stop degrading the environment of ocean creatures. NO ARMS TESTING ON THE WEST COAST! Or, any body of water. Let's move forward, not backward.	The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.
Amella-1	Please cease from conducting naval sonar drills in the Salish Sea area. It has been scientifically proven that sonar is deleterious to not only marine mammals, but mostly all forms of marine life (to include fishes). The Salish Sea is home to both an endangered orca population as well as an endangered Chinook salmon population. The orcas are already suffering from lack of food due to decreased chinook salmon numbers. In addition, they face the dangerous effects of pollution and vessel noise in the area. Please do not add to the abuse humans have inflicted on these animals by increasing / continuing to hold disruptive and harmful sonar exercises within close range of their home waters. While the disruption, confusion, and harm that sonar causes marine mammals has been well documented for some time now, more recent research also proves that Sonar interferes with fish feeding and behavior, as well as causes permanent damage to their auditory senses. The SRKW and Chinook salmon they depend on as a good source are facing enough anthropomorphic challenges. Let's not add insult to injury with sonar in their home waters as well.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Anderson A-1	The Mendocino Coast is an area dependent on the sea for its livelihood. The Navy is proposing testing in this profoundly depressed economic area. The most recent posted census data states the number of those under 100% of FPL (Federal Poverty Level) in our county as 16.3%. We qualify for a number of federal rules disregards for receipt of public benefits. The passage of large cetaceans through this place, with no molestation is important to our economy now that the bulk of our trees have been logged, our abalone season is closed with little likelihood of return, our crab seasons have been suspended due to the recently annualized presence of neurotoxins undoubtedly related to warm water owed directly to global climate change. Due to same there is no longer a previously lucrative trade in urchins for the Japanese market presenting a great risk for those divers who try in vain to access what is left on peril of bends or embolism due to the lack of kelp and economically viable urchin for export. We have recently suffered a major coastal bird die-off which has been	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>attributed to starvation. These facts filter through our local economy. Lest one point to the panacea of legalised marijuana, those prices have dropped precipitously since legalisation.</p> <p>It is my conviction, as a resident of this place, that the Navy should go elsewhere to conduct such activities if at all. My preference is resolutely for "No Action." I base this statement on the preceding, and contradict without qualm the framing prohibition on any such iteration stated on the EIS/OEIS website which implies a default of we ultimately have no say but might comment on the inevitable. The site limits public comment to 5000 characters or 1 MB for an electronic submission. The Navy's public meeting in our town was no more accommodating, as I will describe below. While I have done my best to be concise, the website's admonishment to submit peer-reviewed studies runs directly counter to the limits placed on the electronic submissions.</p> <p>We as residents of the area must express our opinion on the topic given the likelihood that Navy testing in our waters, albeit outside the twelve-mile limit, may well violate international conventions on the protection of marine mammals. These animals are sensitive to takings similar to those the Navy and others have outlined in their literature regarding this coastline and similar testing areas ("Incidental Take Authorizations for Military Readiness Activities" ref US Navy Target & Missile Launch Activities at San Nicolas Island, California, 2019, "US Navy Operations of Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active Sonar" (SURTASS LPA) beginning in 2019,(from NOAA website) and US Navy Hawaii Southern California Training and Testing (HSTI) 12/21/18-12/20/2023, "Marine Mammals and Sonar: Dose-response studies, the risk-disturbance hypothesis and the role of exposure context" Harris, CM, Thomas L., Falcone E.A., Hildebrand, J., Houser D., Kradshiem P.H., Lam F.P.A., Miller PJO, Moretti D.J., Read A.J., Slabbekorntt, from the Journal of Applied Ecology vol 55 pp 396- 404, 0112018.</p> <p>It is not plausible to conclude that conducting the tests outside of the twelve-mile limit will absolve the Navy of responsibility for adverse effects on marine mammals protected by international conventions or domestic legislation like the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) which may well apply to these proposed exercises as having an effect within the twelve-mile limit even if conducted outside of it, for sound carries in water and marine mammals rely on a very acute hearing sense for survival.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>A December 20, 2018 press release from the Center for Biological Diversity (www.biologicaldiversity.org) noted that "In 2004, during war games near Hawaii, the Navy's sonar was implicated in a mass stranding of up to 200 melon-headed whales in Hanalei Bay, Kauai." The possibility of similar unusual mortality events should be completely proscribed here since we have become so reliant on the simple undisturbed presence of these animals offshore as a tourist draw. We cannot expect to survive as an economy if marine mammals are annoyed, injured, or suffer mortality. It is unacceptable to consider that scant remaining fish stocks might be affected in the slightest. To ignore this risk would be foolhardy and cavalier of us. The Navy has outlined the hearing ranges of fish stocks in the area. Given the destruction of nereocystis luetkeana beds locally also due in my opinion to global climate change (it should be noted in saying this the seldom-stated likelihood that the United States military is quite possibly the largest emitter of greenhouse gasses on the planet far and above any nation state including our own) there is more than a strong probability that sustainable fisheries are finished until further notice on this coastline due to the wholesale destruction wrought on the rivers and the sea by our civilization. Salmon stocks are not close to what they once were. The commercial salmon season here has been cancelled at least twice in the last decade. At one time a seemingly limitless source of food that provided sustenance for thousands of years has been destroyed.</p> <p>As a citizen, I can state forthrightly that I see no point in conducting yet another science experiment that might further endanger these weakened stocks which are far more crucial to our survival as a people and a nation than the testing of bombs which do nothing but further our collective suicidal entropic destruction by means of incessant war.</p> <p>Petroleum conglomerates have sought the ability to set off devices off the coastline here. They were rebuffed as the Navy was previously. How can those of us who oppose drilling here do so on a strong footing if the conglomerates are able to point out that the Navy has already conducted similarly invasive events in the sea here? I think the Navy knows how its ordnance works mostly, and if they don't I would like to suggest computer modeling or the open sea as a last resort. Putting this testing within range of the coastline, just outside the twelve-mile limit, exhibits institutional concern about running afoul of domestic regulations regarding takings of marine mammals. Outside the limit, there are still international conventions that exist for the protection of marine mammals whose</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>numbers have been vastly reduced to the point of near-extinction in some cases.</p> <p>It is my understanding from a local press account that a letter requesting "No Action" was passed on to the Navy by a representative of the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors at a recent public meeting held May 03, 2019 in Fort Bragg, California.</p> <p>At the Dana Gray elementary school in Fort Bragg, California the Navy held this non-responsive event which gave no outlet for public input in a transparent effort to neatly absolve the Navy of having to document what were likely to be a series of strongly stated verbal objections, a move I found scandalous. Upon arriving I puzzled over the lack of communications equipment for public input and found there instead various marketing 'stations' with displays at which one might ask questions of Navy personnel there dressed unthreateningly in civilian garb.</p> <p>I also saw upon entering the building curious locked boxes that I paused to examine on my way in. On the wall at a low level accessible to children were coin-operated vending machines which they could use to purchase pencils for up to 25 cents. In the post-proposition thirteen California I grew up in I remember scratchy paper, no air conditioning and few books in the library, but I was never asked to pay for a pencil. I daresay, to paraphrase president Dwight D. Eisenhower's farewell speech, that the irony was altogether too well-stated with regard to his use of the word "theft" when speaking of munitions that January in 1961. Has anyone in the Navy ever had to pay for a pencil?</p>	
Anderson Car-1	<p>The resident orcas are critically endangered. We've almost killed them off by building dams and keeping their food source from them. They are fighting for their very survival. Please don't harm their fragile ecosystem more with these sonar tests.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Anderson Cat-1	<p>The continued use of underwater sonar is contributing to extreme damage to wildlife. Added to the other stressors marine mammals are currently facing with ocean warming and acidification, and subsequent malnutrition</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar and explosives training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	issues, this is beyond irresponsible. Do your part globally, and show some decency.	summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Anderson Jene-1	The Olympic National Park is surrounded by small towns where tourism is a growing trend. Not only are you destroying the peace and tranquility that city folk seek, you're robbing sleep from the inhabitants--both 2 and 4 legged. It's a HORRIBLE RACKET--a perpetual Vitnam warzone. Cut it out!!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Anderson Jenn-1	Sonar testing is proven to cause deafness in marine animals and will cause a lot of harm. Please don't harm our marine life.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Anderson Jo-1	I have lived in the area my whole life and can remember hearing propeller driven aircraft shooting at the rocks at the mouth of the Hoh River. I picked 50 cal brass up on the beach afterwards. The chaff from the 50's and 60's fighter plane radar defenses was scattered in our hayfields. I watched low level jets almost on the grass in the fields so low the pressure wave under the planes flattened the hayfield. Training is valuable and please keep it going. Having served in Viet Nam in 1970 gave me the chance to see the good things training can provide. Don't let the negative statements overcome the good you can provide the country by training over the Olympic Peninsula. I don't mind the sounds of freedom.... Thank you, Spec 4,, Army veteran, VFW life member, American Legion member, Legion Rider, and a voting citizen	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Anderson M-1	My family has lived on Whidbey Island since 1909, four generations. My parents have had objections to the harm to our family and farm from the presence of the Navy for decades. We have observed destruction of our	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include aircraft flights in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>environment with loss of quality of life since 1942. It is devastating to learn our drinking water wells have been tested and found to be contaminated. Growlers fly just above our homes disrupting our sleep and conversation with family and guests at arms length. The foundations of our homes are shaken from loud invasive noise. We have lost friends who died from toxins coming from NAS Whidbey. We have lost property values with restricted rights of use.</p> <p>Our heritage has been destroyed with sprawling population. We are told by Navy personnel if we don't like it we can move. This is a major insult from those who have no roots or heritage living on Whidbey Island. How can citizens who move frequently judge us so harshly.</p> <p>Our serenity is gone our unique cherished space on Whidbey Island has never been a suitable environment for military activities. Our marine life is heavily impacted and in crisis with under water bombing and toxic run off into Dugwalla Bay and Puget Sound. We have lost our Salmon and Orcas. We can no longer tolerate the invasion of an ever expanding fleet of Growlers. There are far more suitable locations for training with less impact on public health and the environment.</p>	<p>location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>
Anderson M-2	Letter from U.S. Senator Brock Adams, no response required.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Anderson P-1	Please consider marine life and their right to life in our Oceans.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Andres-1	<p>I want to add my name to those who believe that the use of sonar in the waters used by whale populations and their migratory lanes is detrimental to these creatures. I also do not think that materials used in armaments should be added to the ecology of the oceans unless we are in a wartime navel battle.</p> <p>Explosives and sonar should be used outside the areas known to be used by whales.</p> <p>Please do not allow the Navy to "practice war" anywhere near any whale</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	population areas or migratory paths. Northern bottlenose whales in a pristine environment respond strongly to close and distant navy sonar signals ... https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2592	EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Andrews-1	It is bloody hot and last night I gladly for the first time threw open my windows and doors. I could not, however, sleep because of the close, loud grinding of the growlers over my home in Port Townsend. I think everything has already been said to you, so I am just adding: heckua way to live on this beautiful, quiet Olympic Peninsula.	For information about the Navy's analysis of noise impacts related to training in the Olympic Military Operations Area, please see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources), Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety), and Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis).
Anonymous-1	It is not possible for an organization or individual to perform an unbiased study upon themself. The results of your study are therefore invalid.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Anonymous-2	Call for Public Support of Tribal Comments on Navy SEIS May 2, 2019 Since 2005, Tribes in Mendocino & Lake Counties have opposed Navy training and testing in the Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT) range. The ten Tribes demanding that their cultural ways of life and the marine environment be protected from impacts of the Navy's training are: Cahto Tribe of Laytonville Rancheria; Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians; Hopland Band of Pomo Indians; Little River Band of Pomo Indians; Pinoleville Pomo Nation; Potter Valley Tribe; Robinson Rancheria of Pomo Indians; Round Valley Indian Tribes; Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians; and Sherwood Valley Rancheria of Pomo Indians. For countless generations, the Tribes have maintained deeply significant cultural and spiritual ties to the coastline and ocean waters adjacent to Mendocino and Humboldt Counties, California. The Tribes have commented on earlier reviews of the environmental impacts of the training and testing, and are now requesting the public to submit comments on the Navy's current Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS) to support the Tribes' position. The comment deadline is June 12, 2019. The adequacy of the assessment of Tribal cultural impacts as well as environmental impacts from the Navy's training and testing activities is especially important because these activities take place in the Pacific Ocean, which holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes and is critically important for the wellbeing of all people and lifeforms on	Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>this planet.</p> <p>Please include in your comments to the Navy your support of the following Tribal issues, along with any additional concerns you may have:</p> <p>Ask that the Navy work meaningfully with Pacific coast Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities.</p> <p>Urge the Navy to expand prohibited activities in the 50-mile mitigation area to include use of sonar. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals.</p> <p>Request that the "best available science" referenced in the Draft SEIS be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy's NWTT.</p> <p>Request that the Navy's monitoring program be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.</p> <p>Urge the Navy to expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing.</p> <p>Request that the cumulative effect of ocean acidification should also be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean.</p> <p>Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.</p> <p>For more details on the Draft SEIS, and how to submit your comments, go to: https://www.nwtteis.com.</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
	Thank you for helping protect the future of the sacred ocean and Tribal peoples along the west coast.	
Anonymous-3	With everything on our platter adjusting to maintain viability and balance, it seems to me insane to keep doing what we are doing, like damaging sea life by testing weapons. Please turn your attention to returning well being to all that calls the oceans their home environment. All is interconnected and every considerate act affects whomever is reading these words too. Thank you.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Anonymous-4	yeah [expletive deleted] all that ima blast sounds and point lazars at yall jets and [expletive deleted]. eye 4 and eye. stop the [expletive deleted] sonar of u know wtf it does to our neighbors in the sea!? u have any [expletive deleted] clue? [expletive deleted], sincerely the orcas	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Anonymous-5	Leave my [expletive deleted] whales alone you self centered [expletive deleted]	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Applegarth-1	<p>RE: NWTT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS</p> <p>I am advocating for a "No Action Alternative" for the proposed Navy plan. Marine species are under extraordinary stressors now due to climate disruption, environmental pollution and warming seas. A study by New Jersey's Rutgers University, released in April 2019, finds that ocean-dwelling species are dying off at "twice the rate of those on land." This alarming recent finding means the 2015 studies cited in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS are most likely out of date and not relevant today. With the U.N. reporting an average of 150 extinctions a day globally, we must be very careful not to disturb struggling marine species.</p> <p>The EIS/OEIS states in section 3.4.1.4 that "marine mammals occur in every marine environment in the study area" and that they are sensitive to noise pollution such as what would come from the proposed navy exercises. Stranding deaths of marine mammals can be due to many causes, one of the listed causes being excessive noise pollution, which interferes with many levels of marine mammal life: navigation, finding prey, avoiding predators, communication, reproductive activity and more.</p> <p>The EIS/OEIS lists human caused noise as a "potential habitat level stressor." The EIS/OEIS lists 130 marine mammals, but says hearing sensitivity testing has only been done on 25. This leaves 105 marine mammal species we do not have data on as far as the effect on them by the proposed Navy testing. Most likely the Navy testing would be harmful, as bombings and loud noises usually are on all life forms.</p> <p>Habitats locally are already very stressed from environmental causes due to</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>human influence. I heard a public talk by Dr. Cynthia Catton of the Bodega Marine Lab (Bodega Bay, CA.) on April 28, 2019 in Point Arena CA. She showed how the Northern California coastal ocean environment off Sonoma and Mendocino Counties has turned into an urchin barrens, with the massive die off of bull kelp forests, affecting all species (fin fish as well as most invertebrates) in the near coastal area. This die off also has negative implications for ocean species further out, as well as marine species that feed on invertebrates.</p> <p>Section 3.0.3, 7-7.4 lists the multiple injuries and physiological stressors to marine mammals that can occur due to the proposed testing. Just as with humans, any species living in an area under military bombing, noisy large vessel and aircraft travel become extremely stressed and possibly injured or killed.</p> <p>In addition, the bottom habitat disturbances from mines up to "2.5 meters" plus other dropped bombs/ordinances are a dangerous level of disruption for marine mammals and species who are bottom feeders or dwellers. To suggest that this would be mitigated by limiting the area to previously used exercise areas already disturbed is a poor argument. This does not allow those areas to recover.</p> <p>In short, I strongly oppose the proposed Navy testing exercises on the grounds of environmental harm to already stressed marine species and ecosystems.</p> <p>Robin W. Applegarth</p>	
Aquino K-1	<p>The Navy is part of the planet. They are also part of the population that has a harmful effect on the planet due to their practices. Between the radiation from Fukushima reaching our shores and the US Navy, there is a lot of stress on the ocean inhabitants.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Aquino L-1	<p>This is horrendous! This is unacceptable to cause hearing loss in all marine life for sonar testing! If is caused all people and species on land to go deaf, would you still do the testing?! Of course not! Where is the common sense in this senseless action?</p> <p>The world is watching with scrutinizing eyes on your next steps. No species or mammals are expendable. Be part of the solution, not part of the problem! Please stop this testing immediately!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Arce-1	Against the sonar testing	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Archer-1	This is completely unacceptable and needs to stop immediately.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Arias-1	Protect our wild species and stop Sonar Testing!	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Armon-1	Does this NWTT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS comply with the Ninth Circuit Court Opinion filed July 15, 2016?	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>If not, please comply. Cumulative impacts on individuals as well as populations of marine species must be considered.</p> <p>The Court held that NMFS must ensure the least practicable impact on marine mammals “even if population levels are not threatened significantly.” It also held that protecting marine mammal habitat from Navy sonar is “of paramount importance” under the law, and that, where data on marine mammal distribution are limited, the agency is compelled to err on the side of overprotection rather than underprotection. NOAA has recognized the coastal areas of California, Oregon, and Washington to be part of the Endangered, Species in the Spotlight, Southern Resident killer whale (SRKW) range, and is in the process of designating these areas as part of the SRKW critical habitat. The same areas are being used by Navy NWTT. How is this addressed, mitigated, in this Draft?</p> <p>I appreciate the Navy's efforts to support and include best available science, public outreach and input, and minimize impacts, however we can do better. Aquatic sounds travel beyond our sight and technology to detect all the marine mammals and other species in the training and testing range and beyond, that are being impacted. Sound is sight for many oceanic species. Even temporary blindness can be catastrophic. Has the Navy considered virtual reality training and testing, and/or conducting training and testing where there are the least amount of species, such as out past the continental shelf?</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy has considered the use of simulation, and in fact already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 2.4.1.4 (Simulated Training and Testing Only) and Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy has also considered conducting training and testing in other locations, such as beyond the continental shelf; however, as stated in Section 2.4.1.1 (Alternate Training and Testing Locations), other locations fail to provide all the attributes necessary for effective training and testing.</p>
Armstrong H-1	STOP the nonsense! No to military testing!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Armstrong K-1	<p>I don't care if this isn't considered a "substantive" comment, I'm going to share it anyway.</p> <p>I oppose the expansion of the Navy's training grounds on the Olympic Peninsula. The noise pollution caused by the growlers is obscene, and is negatively affecting home owners, business owners and residents that I am personally aware of, in Clallam and Jefferson County.</p> <p>The Navy's noise pollution threatens our peaceful rural way of life. The economy is going to suffer from so much noise pollution too, businesses that are heavily impacted by the disruption and tourists and locals alike are</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>turned off from participating in enjoying the beauty of the Peninsula if they have to compete with growlers jet noise.</p> <p>As a Board Member of Olympic Nature Experience, a local non profit that runs nature schools and "strives to nurture our communities connection with nature and each other through immersive outdoor experiences", your growlers threaten the very landscapes that we are trying to peacefully raise and teach children and adults.</p> <p>I am appalled by the impact the proposed Naval expansion will have on my community.</p> <p>Farmer, Mother Olympic Nature Experience, Board Member</p>	<p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic MOA, it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to approximately one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved. <p>The potential impacts to socioeconomic resources was analyzed in Section 3.12.3.2 (Airborne Acoustics). The results of that analysis include in part, "Considering that trends in economic indicators have historically increased and are projected to continue to increase, disturbances from airborne acoustics on the Olympic Peninsula are expected to have a negligible impact on socioeconomic resources in the Study Area."</p>
Armstrong M-1	<p>This is criminal - please STOP.</p> <p>We need these creatures - my first thought is to put EACH OF YOU underwater to be faced with the same abuse.</p> <p>With all the technology there IS ANOTHER WAY!</p> <p>PLEASE STOP AND USE WHATEVER ELSE YOU ALREADY HAVE UP YOUR SLEEVES.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Arndt-1	Please stop any sonar testing near any whales. It clearly bothers them and the whale population is in a serious decline.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Arnn-1	<p>Best scientific information based on my experience living here on the Olympic Peninsula: These flights are LOUD. They are disruptive of daily life, and physically and emotionally stressful for me.</p> <p>Good for Boeing, maybe; good for the Navy, maybe, but useless otherwise. Aircraft carriers in the 21st century?</p> <p>The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS appears to be nothing but a piece of marketing theater. It now seems apparent that the Navy was never going to pay any attention to public comments or criticisms of its carefully engineered document.</p> <p>Still, I implore you--some other human reading this, to stop this insanity and make the boys in the planes practice their craft in the Yakima Range.</p>	<p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic MOA, it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to approximately one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved. <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Arnold Je-1	With the reports of a huge increase in the number of dead whales showing up along the California coast, it is unconscionable that the Navy would even consider further stressing these majestic yet struggling animals, This type of testing should never occur, not now, not ever.	The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.
Arnold Ji-1	My wife and I understand the importance of military aircraft and their training needs. However, the Navy's Environmental Impact Statement does not provide any legitimate reason that the training cannot occur in an area designated for warfare training. The Olympic National Park is not a warfare training ground; it is a refuge for people who seek peace and renewal. Growlers thundering overhead make such an experience impossible and threaten the health and well-being of those who live on the coast. Please move your training to an area designated for warfare training. This change would be appreciated so many for so many reasons.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Arves-1	Je suis pour la préservation de la planète x	Merci de participer au processus NEPA.
Ash J-1	I was dismayed to learn our country's Navy would like to conduct sonar testing in the Salish Sea, the home of countless marine animals and the endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales. I am 100% against underwater sonar testing and question why, with all the data regarding sonar testing and sea life, we are still wanting to conduct sonar testing. I am not a scientist or expert in marine animals; however, one does not need to be an expert or have a degree in science to watch a video from 2003 to determine the pod of SRKW are attempting to escape the disruption in their environment that is coming from the Naval vessel that is performing sonar testing. A quick search for "whales and sonar testing" produces a plethora of articles and statistics about whales beaching themselves near areas or time frames of sonar testing. Most interesting were articles of the Navy's own admission that sonar testing leads to hearing loss in marine mammals. We, the citizens of the US, ask other countries to stop the harm done to marine life. We, as a county, have enacted laws to protect our marine life.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i> . Pearl

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Yet we continue to choose actions that are detrimental to the well-being of marine life. Our Navy has some of the smartest, most innovative, brilliant people on this planet. We can do better.	Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.
Ash R-1	Please no. Our Marine animals are suffering enough. the best part about living in Washington state is the wildlife in The great outdoors. You will destroy it.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ashby-1	I am totally against sonar testing or any other kind of underwater activities that have been proven to harm whales and dolphins or any other animal.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ashford-1	I am opposed to any actions by the U.S. Navy that would endanger marine life along the California coast, particular mammal species such as whales and porpoises.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Aspey-1	NAVY SONAR WAR TESTING ALONG THE COAST OF CALIFORNIA Thank you for taking the time to review my comment. We are powerless against the agenda of the Navy regarding the Navy sonar war testing along the coast of California. The marine life that will be affected that uses sonar at a low frequency for survival is also powerless against the effects it will cause to their existence and environment. Perhaps using another location not the coast of California that has been a marine sanctuary could perhaps be an alternative to sonar war testing. Using ice bergs as a sound barrier and the minimal amount of testing required to preserve our marine life that will be effected by the low frequency testing and the sound of explosions and bombs constantly going off in the ocean and the emissions might be an alternative testing ground instead of the migration path of the gray whales along the coast of California. 1966 Congress establishes a Marine Sciences Council led by Vice President Hubert Humphrey. In 1972 October 23 - Congress passes the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act which, among other things, establishes the National Marine	The issues described in the comment were addressed in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences). All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Sanctuary Program. Title III of the law is later renamed the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (NMSA).</p> <p>Now up to date in 2019 The Office of National Marine Sanctuaries serves as the trustee for a network of underwater parks encompassing more than 600,000 square miles of marine and Great Lakes waters from Washington state to the Florida Keys, and from Lake Huron to American Samoa. The network includes a system of 13 national marine sanctuaries and Papahānaumokuākea and Rose Atoll marine national monuments.</p> <p>It is our responsibility to keep the oceans safe and habitable and live in harmony with the marine life that reside there in their home in the ocean. The marine sanctuaries were set up for that purpose.</p> <p>If we do not honor and protect our marine life future generations will not have the marine life as it exists today. Once a species is extinct it is permanent.</p> <p>A global effort needs to take place to preserve our oceans. It is not only the Navy that is disrupting the ecosystems of the oceans but all countries.</p> <p>It is up to mankind to decide do we want to continue to destroy each other and destroy our planet and make it uninhabitable or do we want to live in harmony with nature and preserve it. That is the main question on this earth. So far we live in a low frequency of destruction that is in a downward spiral.</p> <p>Educating our children and future generations the importance of keeping our oceans clean and habitable for marine life is one way to move forward. We can continue to support the National Marine Sanctuary, organizations, groups, clubs, and individuals that are cleaning up the pollution, untreated sewage, garbage, fertilizers, pesticides, industrial chemicals, plastic, mercury, and radiation. We need to stop overfishing, and poaching. We need to continue to restore the coral reefs. Stop offshore drilling. Stop Whaling and shark finning. Whale plumes play an important role in the oceans ecosystem by releasing fecal plumes near the surface which support plankton growth. This process is known as the "whale pump." Whales also move nutrients thousands of miles from their feeding grounds in the colder waters of the Arctic to the warmer waters where they travel to migrate to calve.</p> <p>The pH of the ocean waters have become more acidic due to humanity's CO2 flooding the atmosphere. The altered pH of the water makes for a bevy of problems. The sperm-whale defecation removes atmospheric carbon each year by enhancing such plankton growth.</p> <p>We need to use eco friendly products because the runoff goes into the</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	ocean and continue to build eco architecture for marine life.	
Aspinall-1	The proposal to implement sonar testing in the Salish Sea would be extremely detrimental to marine mammals, including harbour porpoises and orcas. The Southern Resident Orcas are already critically endangered, numbering only 76. Sound is vitally important to them. There are videos showing orcas in extreme distress and trying to flee the noise from sonar testing. The Navy itself has stated that sonar testing causes hearing loss in marine animals. This proposal threatens the survival of species who depend on their hearing. Our seas are in crisis and maintaining a healthy balance of it's apex predators is crucial. Over 50% of the oxygen we all breathe is generated by the sea. Please do not implement this destructive testing.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Assaly-1	We are already polluting the oceans with our plastics and killing marine animals. When will enough be enough? We do not own this planet, we SHARE it with every other living creature innocent creatures for sonar testing. Stop & care about the world around you, because everything falls apart without our functioning ecosystem.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Athair-1	SINCE THE INCREASE IN GROWLER RECENTLY HAS BEEN HAPPENING IT HAS BEEN SIGNIFICANTLY UNPLEASANT LISTENING TO THE NOISE NOT ONLY IN THE WILDERNESS AREAS HERE ON THE PENINSULA BUT ALSO IN PORT ANGELES IT SELF.IT DISTURBS ME ALSO THE AMOUNT OF FUEL CONSUMED IN ONE HOUR TIME IS 1100 GALLONS FOR EACH GROWLER ! HOW MUCH WASTE OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND NATURAL QUIET HABITATS AND WASTE OF FUEL WILL CONTINUE TO DIMINISH ALL THAT WE	<p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic MOA, it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <p>1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>DESIRE IN LIFE ON THIS PLANET???? PLEASE LIMIT AND DIMINISH THE NUMBER OF GROWLER ACTIVITY AND THE NUMBER OF GROWLERS ESPECIALLY IN WILDERNESS REGIONS FOR PEACE AND QUIET AND TRANQUILITY SO IMPROTANT TO ALL OF US....</p>	<p>2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year).</p> <p>3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to approximately one additional flight per day.</p> <p>4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy considered reducing the number of training and testing activities. However, as described in Section 2.4.1.2 (Reduced Training and Testing) in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, a reduction or cessation of training and testing would prevent the Navy from meeting its statutory requirements and adequately preparing naval forces for operations at sea ranging from disaster relief to armed conflict.</p>
Auclair-1	<p>I just saw some sonar testing recording from Ric OBarry site. I can't believe this is still going on! Not only patrolling in the water close to marine life (cetaceans in particular) causes distress because of engine sounds, now sonar testing?</p> <p>What will it take for you to understand that by killing life we are killing ourselves? No need to train for war. We are killing ourselves slowly but surely by destroying marine life balance.</p> <p>Think about it. Sure extermination of ALL OF US against possible conflict with other equally stupid humans.</p> <p>I'm not asking you to do something about it. Au contraire! DON T DO ANYTHING!! You did too much already.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Auguste-1	<p>Our NAVY is important to our country, but our Wildlife is vital to the world and it's environmental health in general. Since sonar testing is dangerous to marine mammals, especially to endangered species, it a no brainier to</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	STOP. Even the military bares the responsibility with the rest of the world to protect wildlife before it to late. STOP THE TESTING. STOP! 🙅	EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Aum-1	The decibel level of the proposed sonar is higher than the number of decibels it takes to kill some of the marine mammals and would therefore kill many of them. This could be a deadly blow for our already polluted oceans with many mammals such as the whales and also the Common Murres now dying by the hundreds. I hope we can all work together to make the ocean a healthy beautiful place for all. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Avila-1	Under the current NOAA issued Unusual Mortality Event for Gray Whales, any increase in Military Training could very well prove to be more damaging to whales. Our Sea Lions and Seals of all types are starving to death. All Marine Mammals are suffering right now because of lack of food. It is the one common denominator in all species listed for reason of death in necropsies. Necropsies are not testing for Sonar and Seismic damages. So Necropsies are not complete. You have NO Idea what your new weapons will do to marine mammals. You are just guessing. Your Marine Mammal Observers are limited in doing their job when a weapon travels 7 times the speed of sound. Our Southern Resident Orca live in this area where the Navy wants to continue to train for war. There are 75 left with one new baby. The Navy can NOT say their actions will not harm SRKW whales. Our fish populations are low in all areas according to NOAA fish surveys. The Navy admits there will be losses although small. How small? Its just a guess for anyone including the Navy. Virus, Domoic Acid, Infections, Starvation, and the over all condition of the Health of the Ocean Environment for the Pacific is in a fragile state. I am quite sure the Navy could find a area that less damage would occur to practice for war to Marine Mammals and the Environment they call home. I fully understand that need to practice. However I do NOT APPROVE of any	The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities. The Navy's use of new weapon systems such as high-energy lasers, kinetic energy weapons, and biodegradable polymer, while new to the NWTT Study Area, have been tested on other Navy ranges and evaluated in previous environmental documents. Their use in the NWTT Study Area has been thoroughly analyzed in this NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS for impacts specific to their use in this environment. In each case, as described throughout Chapter 3, impacts are expected to be minimal to undetectable. The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>additional new testing of military actions for this purposed Area. Especially the types of new weapons you the navy would like to test. You the Navy have no idea what the outcome will be. You suggest that public back up our statements with explanations, facts and references, for that I refer you to your request for permit in the Navys own words about the environmental impact for all species should you be granted this permit. You, the Navy clearly state the additional damages that will and could occur. This is not the time to be adding more damage to an Environmentally damaged area. Connect the dots with NOAA research. General Public does not have the time to show you, exactly where you have stated damages will and could occur from this action. You are the ones who provided the information. If the Navy needs help in locating their own information we are certainly screwed are we not? General Public is well aware of what is going on. Dont make it increasingly hard for public to comment by asking for files uploaded and page numbers with paragraphs to your own information. That is your job. You are the ones requesting Public Comment.. Listen to NOAA findings. Listen to the Scientific Research being provided as well as your own findings in your request for permit...and for Gods sake..Take the time to care as much about Americas Oceans and its life, as you do about protecting its citizens in case of war. Our Oceans and the Marine Mammals who call it home..Are also what makes up America that needs the Navy's protection. For once, think about the Americans who have NO HUMAN voice that live in the ocean. What would America be with out a healthy off shore environment? A baron waste land with no resources for American Citizens. Find a safer, less environmentally damaging area to train. I understand the Golf of Mexico has a Huge Dead Zone. Far larger than your purposed area currently. Go practice war in a dead zone, where you do not add to a already fragile death of a eco system. A place where you do not harm, an already Critically Endangered Species such as the Southern Resident Orca or any other Starving Marine Mammal..Use an area that is already dead. Im sure the Navy has the resources to operate anywhere in the world. Use the resources and change locations for training. Its to high of a price to pay in your current requested location. California, Hawaii, Oregon, Washington and Alaska have suffered enough with Navy War Games. Time to move to a less environmentally damaged area to continue your tests. Give our Coast and Our Marine life a chance to recover the damage that is already done.</p>	<p>unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service regarding the Navy's Proposed Action and potential impacts to endangered species, as required under the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Avnet-1	<p>I have just learned of an EIS put out by the U.S. Navy on March 29, which is very disturbing to me. The only EIS alternative that is acceptable is the No Action Alternative. The other options given are unacceptable to the environment and life on the Olympic Peninsula. Alternatives 1 and 2 would cause unforgiveable and unnecessary damage to Olympic National Park and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. Alternative 2 is the most extreme.</p> <p>The length of the EIS, the great area it affects, and the many people it affects requires a 90-day comment period. This, so the EIS can be examined properly and thoroughly. I ask you for another 14-day extension of the comment period. The noise from multiple jet flights over the western and northern parts of the Peninsula will chase residents and visitors away. This will affect the health and economy of the Peninsula and the state of Washington.</p> <p>The search pattern of jet Growler flights looking for emitters would roar above the ocean beaches; the Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges; Washington State Department of Natural Resources land; Quinault, Quileute and Hoh Reservations; and thousands of acres of private land, including the towns of Forks and Amanda Park. The Navy admits to 85–100 decibels of noise per pass. That is enough to cause hearing loss and contribute to other health problems. People in Forks have recorded 94 decibel flights under the current operations. While noise is known to affect people and no studies have been done on the iconic Olympic elk, it is not difficult to reason they would be similarly affected, being mammals of a similar weight.</p> <p>The military training in the Marine Sanctuary would do damage to the ocean beaches, the marine animals of the coast, the nesting areas of many of Washington's shorebirds, migrating whales, and the birds that use the Pacific Flyway. The Navy has denied flying over Olympic National Park. This is untrue. Not only is this untrue, it is impossible not to fly these missions over the Park. This degradation of the Olympic Peninsula's environment is unacceptable. For 112 years, Congress and presidents have set aside areas of the Peninsula to protect its valuable environment. Irreparable damage would be caused if the activities are done as stated in the Navy EIS/OEIS Mar 2019 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Northwest Training and Testing.</p> <p>Please stop this plan by the Navy. The training has been done elsewhere. It can be done elsewhere. Wild places are not empty places just waiting for</p>	<p>The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	an invasion by the military. Our national security must also include environmental security.	
Ayala J-1	I am a very concerned United States citizen. I appreciate the US Navy but it really saddens me to know about the harm done to marine life that is directly caused by Sonar. Please continue protecting the US while still protecting all marine life instead of harming them. This will help future generations to come and help preserve the health of our only home.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ayala S-1	In support of marine life, which we are all responsible for, I beg you to reconsider.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
B		
Babbe-1	The oceans are getting more ravaged each year, with garbage gyres growing annually (this year measured at the size of the 19th largest COUNTRY in the world, acidification and massive coral reef dye offs, our local lack of bull kelp and urchin infestation compromising sustenance abalone harvests, this year several humpbacks are getting stuck in the SF bay because they do not have the reserves to make the migration to northern waters; not to mention the fisheries-of-no-more all along the entire north coast. All ecosystems of the oceans outside explicitly protected and small reserves that are patrolled are ailing, while an accelerated number of species are rapidly going extinct. Meanwhile, "Active Sonar" is a sound blast at 200 decibels. Death by sound for a HUMAN is at 185 decibels. The destructive capacity for miles with that radius is a real and dire concern given the state of ocean health. Business as usual has left too much destruction in its wake, thus WHY these permits need reviewing every few years. It is a built in safe-guard to human life and the well-being of the oceans in which environmental, social, and economic well being are intimately intertwined. STOP ALL TESTING, EXERCISES, OFF ALL COASTS OF THE UNITED STATES. OUR OCEANS ARE DYING. OUR PLANET IS DYING. STOP NOW!!!	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Backe-1	Olympic National Park is one of the last quiet places in the US. At least it was until fighter jets started flying over it regularly. If jets must practice, please have them fly west over the Strait of Juan de Fuca to the ocean, then go west another fifty miles before they practice their maneuvers.	The Navy considered but did not develop mitigation for aircraft overflights, such as shifting transit routes, relocating aircrew training activities, or modifying flight altitudes, because such mitigation would not be practical to implement due to implications for safety and mission requirements. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) controls the National Airspace System

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	This would reduce much of the jet noise over the national park. There are SO FEW quiet places left; please let this national park be one of them.	and routes that overlap the NWT Study Area. The FAA designed the routes to efficiently manage air traffic in the region and to safely deconflict military traffic from commercial and general aviation aircraft, with consideration given to the presence of Canadian National Airspace and traffic to the north. The FAA is the responsible federal agency for determining transit routes and any changes to such routes must be approved by the FAA. The Navy is currently in discussions with the FAA exploring the possibility of shifting the FAA-established transit routes for military aircraft transiting to and from the Olympic MOA from Naval Air Station Whidbey Island to the north of the Olympic Peninsula. The purpose of these discussions is to consider the efficient and safe use of navigable airspace. While ultimately any shift in transit routes is the FAA's decision, it is possible that, if approved, such a shift will have the added benefit of reducing military aircraft noise over the Olympic National Park.
Baglien-1	It is not possible for the USN to mitigate the harm and actual damage that is done to the subject areas. Having been a hiker and backpacker in this area the noise and intimidation factor of Armed Forces flying over a National Park I will never be able to use the park again. There are alternatives to destroying the shorelines and forest lands of the area. Move this training exercise to the base at Attu Island. This is on the frontline and is in a much better location to defend our country from the Russians or the Chinese. This is what the training is about. Do it in a realistic setting where it is useful to the countries objectives. There are American flag Jones act compliant ships that could easily supple the base with all of the needs of the USN and dependents.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Baglyos-1	I am 100% opposed to under water sonar testing which is harmful to sea creatures of all types. Please do not allow this! Thank you,	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bailey-1	RE: Draft Northwest Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement Dear Naval Facilities Engineering Command Northwest, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Northwest Training and Testing (NWT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS). The Friends of the San Juans' letter speaks for all of us who are aggrieved about impacts on the Southern Resident orcas, which are at serious risk of	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. Please see the Navy's response to the Friends of the San Juans' letter.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>extinction. We strongly believe this iconic species is currently, and will continue to be, directly negatively impacted by the training and testing activities. We have been doing all we can here in the San Juans to find ways to protect our remaining Southern Resident Killer Whales (SRKW), including drafting our own initiative with stricter guidelines for how close vessels can be to resident orcas; this will be for the November ballot and will likely resoundingly pass.</p> <p>Sonar testing and explosions are one of the cruelest ways to extinct the orcas and other cetaceans. If you've ever had a burst eardrum and bleeding from the ears (as I have), I can assure you it's unimaginably painful. For species that depend on sonar and echolocation to navigate, communicate, and stay together in family groups, it grieves me to think of them having this fate - all unnecessary.</p> <p>We coastal peoples treasure the marine and avian life that comes here to live among us and was here long before us; they are part of our family and for a great many of us, one of the reasons we stay here. We are a tourist destination and national monument. People come from all over the world to experience our orcas and other wildlife and the natural beauty these lands and waters afford. Our ways of life are so counter to the Navy's idea of "taking" - lands, animals, resources. We strive to protect and honor the marine species of the Salish Sea. We are not a warlike people. We revere life and are horrified at the idea of "taking" it to further any agenda.</p> <p>I include the entirety of the Friends of the San Juans letter as an attachment and agree 100 percent with their recommendations and those of the Task Force.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of our input and concerns as you finalize the EIS.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	
Baily-1	<p>Not only are your proposed continuous flights over the Olympic National Park and it's environs unnecessary because you have warfare designated areas that do not impact the livelihood of these areas. They are not World Heritage sites with an economy that depends on the peace of the area. The impact you are having on one of the few quiet and serenely beautiful places on earth, with your incessant flights and plans for more are destroying our economy, destroying the environment and all that live within it. What a price to pay for the stubborn insistence that you have the right to claim dominance over this area of profound peace. Because the Growler's do dominate!!! Why, I ask, such a profound insensitivity for those you are charged to care for? You have alternatives!!! It is time you became</p>	<p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic MOA, it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	the friends that I thought our military was when I grew up during the second world war. I wanted to be a pilot. My father was a pilot during that war! Now it seems we must war with you to get you to see the harm you are doing and planning to do. Sit down, take a look at what is left of our precious world and help us keep safe from noise and disturbance in one of the few areas still capable of healing in the peace and quiet of an exquisite World Heritage site. The Joy you will bring when you end this heartless plan will bring hope and real support for your efforts that can be done where the impact is not so intense.. Thank you.	<p>averaged over a 365-day year).</p> <p>3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to approximately one additional flight per day.</p> <p>4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Bainbridge-1	<p>Our national parks are sanctuaries for wildlife and people. They should not be used for electronic warfare exercises. This is a desecration of what the Olympic National Park was preserved for.</p> <p>Olympic National Park is home to the endangered spotted owl and the endangered marbled murrelet. Its coastline is the biannual flyway for billions of migrating birds that depend on navigational signals disrupted by the jets. Growlers also collide with birds. 15 Reported "mishaps" include "large flock of birds hit after takeoff," "bird strike shut down engine," "bird ingested sometime after flight," and "encountered bird flock that FODed (foreign object damage) both engines."</p> <p>I live in Greenbank on Whidbey Island about 20 miles away from the OLF. Yet last night I listened to the Growlers rumbling until 11:00 pm. I did not move to Whidbey to live on an island controlled by the military. Please relocate your Growlers to a less populated, less idyllic place.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Balducci-1	<p>Please reconsider doing war games and flybys. There's a smarter way to practice for war. And I know this country loves War.</p> <p>I also believe that there are many intelligent people in this country that could think of a different way to practice protecting this country.</p> <p>I don't understand how ruining the residence of so many and harming humans and wildlife is acceptable at all.</p> <p>Isn't that why you're practicing for war in the first place? Maybe I've missed the meaning of the military. For some reason I thought your mission was to protect those very things and not destroy them in the name of protecting them.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Ball-1	I do not support the Navy engaging in any sort of testing that affects animals. Especially marine life in this case who do not have the opportunity to express to the navy their concerns or pain. Do not proceed with this.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ballweg-1	We need to protect our whales, not submit them to the dangers of sonar testing. When will human learn to respect and protect the natural world. Proceeding with these test will have more long-term damage to our environment. Don't proceed. From The SEATTLE Times "The Navy first acknowledged sonar's damaging effects in 2001, after 16 whales stranded — or beached — in the Bahamas in a day and a half's time the year prior. Six animals died; the others were pushed off or escorted to deep water, according to a report from NMFS and the Navy. Several received necropsies. Two animals — the freshest of the dead whales — had hemorrhaging and blood in their inner ears and around their brains consistent with "acoustic or impulse injuries" which likely triggered the strandings, according to the report. The use of midfrequency sonar by Navy vessels near an underwater canyon was likely to blame, the investigation concluded."	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Baltan-1	The Southern Resident Killer Whales live their lives by sound, it's how they hunt and communicate. They can't eat if they can't find their prey because navy sonar is blocking their echolocation. The sonar also is damaging to their senses. DO NOT USE SONAR IN THE SALISH SEA! The SRKW are already on the precipice of extinction, they already are having a difficult time finding enough fish to eat. Don't seal their fate by using sonar.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bancroft-1	I copied here my "substantive" comment, but you are limiting how substantive we can truly be. Attached is my letter.	The commenting feature on the project website, while not a NEPA requirement, was added by the Navy to further facilitate commenting by the public. While the 1 MB limitation restricts larger file uploads, it does allow the Navy to continue supporting this feature in a cost-effective manner. Over 1,800 comments were received on this project through website commenting and attachments, with very few affected by this limit. The Navy will review this file size limitation for future projects.
Bancroft-2	While I agree that we need to have a navy that is well trained in order to defend our nation, I vehemently disagree with using our coastal waters to test bombs and other devices that will have any negative impact whatsoever on our marine life—from sensitive coral and other seabed life, to miniscule fishes and other tiny sea creatures upon which other fish feed,	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>to the largest of our sea mammals.</p> <p>I searched through and read much of the 1500 plus pages of your Supplemental EIS. The prose is impenetrable in many places. After going to the Open House in Ft. Bragg and seeing how impossible the Navy made it to receive and give information, I am cynical enough to believe that the Navy hopes the public will be deterred by the report's scientific verbiage and your repeated requirement that we search somewhere else for answers to our questions. For example, take this passage on p. 147:</p> <p>"Since the release of the Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effect Analysis in 2012 (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2012b), recent and emerging science has necessitated an update to these criteria and thresholds for assessing potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles. A detailed description of the Phase III acoustic and explosive criteria and threshold development is included in the supporting technical report Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Impact to Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017b), and details are provided in each resource section."</p> <p>In effect, you are telling us to go elsewhere than your already dense EIS report to find out what the impact of acoustic interference and explosions will have on marine mammals and sea turtles. Why don't you state it simply in your report?</p> <p>Reading further, I found discussion of "animats," in this long, technical passage that also tells me to go elsewhere to be informed of the potential impacts.</p> <p>"The animats do not represent actual animals, but rather allow for a statistical analysis of the number of instances that marine mammals or sea turtles may be exposed to sound levels resulting in an effect. Therefore, the model estimates the number of instances in which an effect threshold was exceeded over the course of a year, but it does not estimate the number of individual marine mammals or sea turtles that may be impacted over a year (i.e., some marine mammals or sea turtles could be impacted several times, while others would not experience any impact). A detailed explanation of the Navy's Acoustic Effects Model is provided in the technical report Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2018)."</p> <p>In effect, I have learned nothing from your report on that topic. Aside from the unwieldiness of your method to assure public access to your study, my critique of your approach rests on a fundamental difference of</p>	<p>minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>opinion about protecting our nation, its people, and its coasts: Many citizens like myself treasure and wish to protect the ocean from the pollution and destruction resulting from navy testing. We are at a time of facing the destruction of the earth in another 50-100 years, in which climate change will drastically impinge on life of our grandchildren and great-grandchildren soon to come. While climate crisis deniers continue to scoff at this notion, the science and reality of climate change are ever more respected. The report that the Navy has provided relies on very technical science to make a case for why the Navy should be able to destroy swathes of ocean life with its polluting testing. If you believe in the veracity of scientific analysis, why not believe in the fundamental principle that we need to stop interfering with nature when possible, and instead become heroic warriors defending the sea?</p> <p>Of so many specifics that you would like the public to respond to regarding your methods, I pick one here, “sightability” of marine mammals present at a testing event. The report states that some are easier to detect than others.</p> <p>“The ability of Navy Lookouts to detect marine mammals or sea turtles in or approaching the mitigation zone is dependent on the animal’s presence at the surface and the characteristics of the animal that influence its sightability (such as group size or surface active behavior). The behaviors and characteristics of some species may make them easier to detect. For example, based on small boat surveys between 2000 and 2012 in the Hawaiian Islands, pantropical spotted dolphins and striped dolphins were frequently observed leaping out of the water, and Cuvier’s beaked whales (Baird, 2013) and Blainville’s beaked whales (HDR, 2012) were occasionally observed breaching. These behaviors are visible from a great distance and likely increase sighting distances and detections of these species.” (p. 148)</p> <p>It seems fairly obvious, even by the report’s admission, that the fact that humans on the surface cannot see the many creatures below the surface makes it inherently wrong to destroy that which you cannot see but has valuable life and purpose in the ocean.</p> <p>Then the report claims, “The Navy implements mitigation measures (described in Section 5.3.3, Explosive Stressors) during explosive activities, including delaying detonations when a marine mammal or sea turtle is observed in the mitigation zone.” What if you have already exploded your devices before the dolphin or turtle were spotted? It is absurd that you can justify saying, in effect, “Oh! Stop! I see a turtle there,” when there are surely hundreds of various species that would be affected but have gone</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>unseen.</p> <p>Even more unsettling are the repeated statements throughout the report such as this regarding short-finned pilot whales (p. 515): “Pursuant to the MMPA, the use of sonar and other transducers during training activities as described under Alternative 1 will result in the unintentional taking of short-finned pilot whales incidental to those activities.” The report repeats this assertion that there will be “unintentional taking” of various species under Alternative 1. Therefore, DO NOT follow Alternative 1. We do not want any unintentional taking of any sea creatures or destruction of sea life of any kind by the Navy.</p> <p>The report (Vol. 2, p. 29) acknowledges, “The quantity of explosives used during testing activities under Alternative 1 would generally increase (Table 3.0-7) compared to levels presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS.” And under such increase, the damage to marine life will increase (p. 29), as the report states: “the impacts to marine invertebrates would be the same as those described in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS. Both pelagic and benthic marine invertebrates could be impacted by explosive stressors. Explosions would likely kill or injure nearby marine invertebrates.” I do not want to see ANY vertebrates or invertebrates killed or injured in your naval testing. There is no justification.</p> <p>And certainly 50 miles out is not sufficient to protect the migratory route of whales, or the sea life that local fishermen and the coastal economy rely on.</p> <p>Another objectionable test is the use of high-energy lasers (discussed in Section 3.0.3.3.2.2). These, you state (p. 31), “are designed to disable surface targets, rendering them immobile. The primary concern is the potential for an invertebrate to be struck with the laser beam at or near the water’s surface, where extended exposure could result in injury or death.” I do NOT want any sea creatures affected, much less injured or killed, by your high-energy lasers.</p> <p>Further objectionable is the detritus that the testing program will leave behind, as you state (p. 38): “Military expended materials include non-explosive practice munitions, other military materials, high explosives that may result in fragments.” It’s already been proven that even miniscule plastic and other materials can strangle marine creatures and otherwise impact the ecology of their environment. With the tons of floating garbage already impacting sea life around the globe, the last thing we need is yet more garbage from the Navy.</p> <p>Alternative 1 and even 2 are sounding ever more noxious to ocean life.</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Here is another example (p. 40, Vol. 2):</p> <p>“Under Alternative 1, the total number of testing activities that include the use of seafloor devices would increase compared to ongoing activities (from 809 to 878). The majority of the activities involve the temporary placement of mine shapes in Inland Waters. Because of the nature of the activity, marine invertebrates on the seafloor may be impacted by seafloor devices by physically removing, crushing the individual, and temporarily increasing the turbidity (sediment suspended in the water) of waters nearby.”</p> <p>“Crushing the individual” does not sound at all “inconsequential.”</p> <p>Further potential damage includes “entanglement stressors that may impact marine invertebrates,” which “include (1) wires and cables, (2) decelerators/parachutes, and (3) biodegradable polymer” (p. 42, Vol. 2). NO entanglement stressors should be introduced to the marine environment.</p> <p>One last complaint about your process: I am familiar with the work of the Intertribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council, representing ten Native tribes along the coast and inland from the coast. Historically and traditionally they were stewards of the lands and seas, utilizing sea life in a way that was never wasteful, not killing only to kill (such as the thousands of buffalo shot by white tourists from rail cars in the late 19th century, left to rot). But rather in the Native tradition, the taking of life aims to sustain their own in respectful ways. If you have ever been to contemporary Indian ceremonies or feasts, you will see how that respect continues.</p> <p>I know that the Council attempted to meet with the Navy and speak about protecting the ocean and coasts from a traditional perspective; however, they were rebuffed. As a non-Native person, like all non-Native people in the United States, I have benefited from the takeover of these lands. But it is not too late for us to learn from traditional Indian values regarding respect for nature and a refusal to destroy wantonly anything that nature provides. What the Navy is proposing is such wanton destruction. We need to listen to the voices of the Native peoples who seek to restore our earth to a more ecological balance, for the good of all people and all life.</p> <p>In conclusion, I do not want to see any of these impacts on the ocean life. The Navy could make the world safer by taking such stressors and destructive practices out of the ocean and helping clean it up, if you really think about it.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, not only of my opinion but of the earth and of future generations that hope to thrive here.</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Bane-1	I'm against sonar testing	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.mil/specops/navsource/navmeps/monitoring.asp • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Bannavong-1	<p>PLEASE, stop this testing. The harm you do to the animals of the oceans far out weighs any good you believe you're doing for the sake of society. Keep in mind, when you start destroying the cycle of life, that cycle includes HUMANS. So not only are you putting at risk the beautiful creatures of the seas, you are also putting at risk our future generations!</p> <p>Please don't allow your paycheck to over rule any compassion you may have.</p> <p>Your children will thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.mil/specops/navsource/navmeps/monitoring.asp • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Barber Je-1	The testing should end. It causes noise pollution, which impacts quality of life both for people and nature. I do not appreciate the air traffic going by during the night.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
		<p>minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Barber Jo-1	<p>"The Navy predicts that there would be more than 500,000 instances of marine mammal behavioral impacts, harassment, and injuries over five years, including 275,000 instances of temporary hearing loss, and more than 600 instances of permanent hearing loss."</p> <p>This statement alone, which i believe vastly underestimates the problem, is reason enough to abandon this kind of testing. There should be a world wide ban. As species of large mammals are being decimated around the world it is vital we take every possible step to protect the wildlife that remains.</p> <p>and [expletive deleted] war and anyone one who supports it.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Bare-1	<p>Thank you so much, for protecting me. I know that your exercises are to prepare yourselves to protect this country. Thank you, keep up the good work.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Barger-1	<p>From meeting the Navy environmental science team, it is clear to me that they are sincere and truly desire the best outcomes from their research and from the public comments process. It is in this light that I submit these</p>	<p>The Navy will continue to consult with the Tribes. Through Government-to-Government consultations, the Navy will consider additional tribal and</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>comments.</p> <p>In general, I express my support for the issues raised by the Lake and Mendocino Counties tribes. Those who study the ocean from a whole system perspective have the best tools for assessing what changes need to be accounted for; Tribal Traditional knowledge originates from whole system perspectives and would support deeper understanding and less damaging outcomes. For this reason, tribal cultural knowledge should be included and respected in any assessment process. They should be respected on their own value. That respect would be supplemented by incorporating them into scientific research as previously conceived.</p> <p>I support the tribes concerns about sonar: use of sonar (loud noises) in the social environments of complex social beings is like someone else playing loud music in your living room (bedroom, bathroom, kitchen and so on). You may be able to reproduce as much so population level effects may not be detected. Your family's resilience to other stressors may be greatly altered but may not appear for decades.</p> <p>"Population level effects" fail to adequately indicate impacts that could be detected, measured and mitigated. As significant as the inquisition was in European history, population level effects are only detectable by comparing individual towns and show only an impact on population growth between towns of 0.11%.</p>	<p>traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.</p> <p>As stated in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the term "traditional resources" is used to encompass protected tribal resources.</p>
Barger-2	<p>I have one area of extreme concern about the environmental effects of the Navy's testing: there are no control plots. The Navy is, by its activity over such a range of environments, eliminating the possibility of control plots. When engaging in a damaging, disruptive or destructive behavior (loud noises, explosions) control plots should be held in reserve for future experiments. Otherwise no future testing can be done in unaffected areas. By using the whole range, the Navy is destroying possibilities for future "best available science." This violates both the spirit and the letter of the law. A repeated experiment on the whole system is not an experiment. Thank you for your time and attention and again thank you for your efforts to protect the environment.</p>	<p>The Navy's tests are not experiments of the type requiring control plots as suggested by the comment. The Navy's proposed testing is to evaluate how specific systems function in various natural environments.</p>
Barhum-1	<p>Sonar testing has caused mass strandings in the past. Take for example the Greek stranding of Cuvier's beaked whales on May 12 1996. Four of these whales were found bleeding from the eyes. It wasn't never confirmed that naval sonar testing causes THIS particular stranding, but you do the math. Another event we should remember is the mass stranding of different species in the Bahamas in the year 2000. The variety of species lost and the extended geographical area was of a greater magnitude.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>After this stranding, more laws were put into place. Despite this, the Navy was still found conducting sonar exercises in a narrow channel in close proximity to a pod of orcas, porpoises, and grey whales in Washington (San Juan Island) in 2003. Marine mammal experts found dead porpoises floating ashore. A dead harbor porpoise was found dead bleeding from its eye. The CT scans performed on these animals showed acoustic trauma and hemorrhaging around the brain.</p> <p>These are only a few events in the long list of strandings and marine mammal deaths that can be attributed to sonar testing. There are laws in place meant to protect the home and safety of these innocent animals. A small fine doesn't seem like a big deal to an entity with an enormous budget, but the people are aware. And we stand against this kind of cruel act.</p>	<p>the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, and the "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities" (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents). Please read the discussion of the 2003 event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p>
Barker-1	<p>The Navy has been tightly wound with the University of Washington, with over 200 grants given to UW by the Navy (https://www.grants.gov). Undoubtedly, this relationship, and the relationship with military contractors such as Boeing, has become vital to the economy of the area. This is not a reason to continue the harmful impact of Growler drills on Whidbey Island. Rather than being a good community member, the Navy is causing harm and destruction, and is protected by its comrades in the economy. That the Navy and the Department of Defense have huge pockets of money and that many in the area profit, is not a moral reason to continue damage to the Puget Sound, and to Whidbey. Nor is the damage done in wars that have continued for over 18 years an excuse. Stop the contamination of and violence to local and distant communities.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Barrett-1	<p>Please do not conduct your training in the critically endangered habitat of the Southern Resident Killer Whales of the Salish Sea. You already admit and KNOW your training is harmful to marine mammal hearing. These orca are fighting for their survival against low prey numbers, boat traffic and pollution from oil tankers and area cities. They cannot tolerate another threat. There are only 76 of them. One is a brand new calf. One is so thin you can see the outline of her skull. Your training operations could severely harm or kill both the very young and the very frail AND cause serious of permanent damage to healthy animals. Please conduct your training somewhere else. Or find a way to train via simulation. Anything else. But don't come into this fragile ecosystem with a CRITICALLY endangered</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	species. Please. Please consider the permanent damage your temporary presence can make. Thank you for your time.	will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Barron-1	If we were in the same situation as the marine animals, we would not stand for it. But unlike these animals, we are capable of voicing our opinions and taking a stand. We would detest the idea of a stranger invading our lands and homes with a deafening high pitched sound. Also, in-line these marine animals, our eyesight is far more developed. We use several different forms of communication, while whales and dolphins use mostly sounds and rely on hearing. The sound testing has the capability to completely incapacitate them. What gives us the right to not only invade their homes, but to leave them disabled? Please stop the testing.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Barth-1	Please stop these harmful sonar tests in critical marine mammal habitat	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bartlett-Smith-1	Without reading the document in detail, I'm told the Navy plans to dump toxic waste into our oceans. Our ecosystem is too fragile already, and additional stressors are unacceptable. I cannot believe that we don't have other options for disposal of waste, and treat our oceans as if they are our dumping ground. Please do not follow through with this plan, and find another, environmentally friendly way to dispose of waste.	The Navy does not propose any activities that constitute dumping toxic waste into the ocean. In the course of the Navy proposed activities (listed in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of the EIS/OEIS), which do include the use of sonar and similar sound sources as well as underwater detonations, some expended materials are left behind in the ocean. The potential impacts of these actions was thoroughly analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the EIS/OEIS.
Bass-1	This testing has proven harmful if not lethal to marine life please discontinue this SONAR testing in the wild and so it in a man made environment free of animals. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Batista-1	Sonar testing is not acceptable!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Battersby-1	<p>I have a business in Mendocino Village.</p> <p>The type of operations that are listed in this plan would devastate our tourism community as well as the pristine nature of our coastlines. We depend on our coastlines being preserved and respected for all to enjoy.</p> <p>Bombing, using torpedoes, Sonar and other war technologies, would not only disrupt the whale migration in this area, but also totally disrupt the nature of our tourism situation here on the coast.</p> <p>We cannot afford to have the Mendocino coastline be destroyed.</p> <p>There is a strong historic nature to the area, and people have enjoyed it for hundreds of years</p> <p>Please consider a moratorium on navy weaponry within miles of our coastlines.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Wildlife-dependent recreational activities, such as wildlife viewing, or whale watching, are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p>
Bauer-1	100% AGAINST sonar testing. You know it's negative. Don't do it!!!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bax-1	Sonar testing IS NOT OKAY especially when previous comments show that the navy recognised that it is damaging to ALL marine life. Please stop this practice NOW. It's 2019, you should know better!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Baxter-1	<p>Please do not go forward with this underwater sound pollution. It is unacceptable that Endangered Southern Resident Orcas young and old, all ready compromised by starvation would be knowingly subjected to underwater high frequency noise disruptions.</p> <p>They rely on underwater communication and the integrity of their keen senses to hunt, socialize and navigate. The planned testing is reprehensible ~ sadly to say it is inhuman is seems to miss the mark as this kind of senseless testing ignores a bigger far more precious reality than we humans seem to grasp all to frequently.</p> <p>Please rise above to and put a halt to the planed underwater noise assault on these sentient innocent beings just trying to exist and raise there newest family members 🙏</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Bean-1	<p>Pacific Coastal ecosystems are in rapid and explosive decline and grey whales are beaching themselves. Necropsies indicate they are starving. The burden of proof is on the Navy that their training activities have not already caused serious damage to a complex marine ecosystem upon which local communities depend for their survival.</p> <p>To state that no significant human impact would occur as a result of continuing use of sonic and explosive testing underwater in the presence of marine mammal migration routes is specious at best and misleading to the public.</p> <p>Furthermore, The parameters of the impact statement are too narrow to encompass the effects of human activities of this sort upon a system of this magnitude & coimplexity. We have not had the time nor till recently the technology to establish a pre=existing baselline, because the EIS protocol was not established until late into the 20th century, by which time industrial impacts & industrial fisheries had altered the baseline beyond any reasonable estimation of its actual pre-existing state of dynamic equilibrium.</p> <p>What is needed is a moratorium to allow the systems to heal themselves, and a period of observation. Human activity has clearly altered the ecosytem balance, and is at the point of threatening human survival, driven by short-sighted environmental policies and political agendas. True</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	natioinal security means protecting our environmental integrity and food web.	
Beasley-1	<p>For the record, my name is Dale Beasley, president of the Coalition of Coastal Fisheries (CCF) which represents fourteen commercial seafood harvesting and charterboat organizations that fish in the Pacific Ocean, Puget Sound, estuaries along the West Coast, and the Columbia River as well as major seafood processors, related supply and support companies, and coastal ports. I personally have been involved in fisheries for the past 50 years and have been a strong advocate promoting a multiple aim, to protect, preserve, and prevent the depletion of both fish and the people that depended on those fish for a living wage that supports fish dependent communities.</p> <p>The Navy is in the business of ensuring that CCF members and the public have FREEDOM of the SEAS that the Navy protects so that we can freely exercise those basis FREEDOMS of Navigation and Fishing.</p> <p>The Coalition has one very important comment, "THANK YOU, the fish dependent communities really appreciate all you do to protect and guarantee our FREEDOMS.</p> <p>CCF completely agrees with your assessment of any potential adverse impacts, they will be miniscule and localized, NO overall fish/mammal population impacts. Any RISK involved is far out weighed by the benefits of a FREE OCEAN.</p> <p>Your readiness to offer those protections for us is extremely important and we encourage you to do whatever is necessary to maintain top shelf readiness to protect our seas from our nation's potential enemies. Since the last EIS five years ago none of our fishing community has had any conflict for space in the ocean, the Navy has done a good job of avoiding our fisheries, that is also appreciated.</p> <p>Keep up the good work protecting our freedoms.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>
Becker H-1	<p>I feel as though you have to have the research that this is deadly and extremely harmful to the eco balance of the Salish Sea. We are already seeing the devastating repercussions of man-made decisions happening to our oceans. Please reconsider doing this for the health of the only home we have and the future of not only all the species that make the Salish Sea their home but also for the future of our species as a whole. Let us be on the right side of history.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Becker S-1	<p>I do NOT support military training and testing activities in the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area- northern coast of California to the Canada border, as proposed by the 2020-2025 environmental review.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Sonar hurts marine mammals; the region is designated to be of cultural importance, as per the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council.</p> <p>In December, the U.S. Navy discontinued training and testing activities within 12 nautical miles of Northern California's coastline from the Mendocino-Humboldt county line to the Oregon border following 3 ½ years of discussions with the ten Northern California Tribes that comprise the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council. These discussions were the result of a 2012 lawsuit over the National Marine Fisheries Service's failure to protect marine life and areas of cultural importance.</p> <p>Please cease and desist from military training/testing activities in this region.</p>	<p>(Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Beckham-1	<p>The United States Navy needs to cease and desist from engaging in this testing and training immediately. This is an urgent matter. The potentially grave harm that may be inflicted on the endangered Southern Resident Killer Whale population is unacceptable. Please, consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's EIS clearly indicates that the Southern Residents will be harmed by their testing and training activities, and that this is not acceptable. Our Southern Residents need quiet in order to "hear" their prey. • In 2003 during a training session, the J pod quit foraging and instead spent time and calories trying to leave the area instead of hunting and eating. • In pursuing these activities, the Navy violates the Endangered Species Act, which should be protecting the orcas. • The designation for the orcas' critical habitat is under review and the Navy should not be allowed to move forward until the designation is final. The Navy must respect the Southern Resident Orcas' Endangered Species status and take steps to mitigate further harm. The Navy must protect the critical habitat of the orcas and prohibit testing and training in these waters. The Navy must also ban sonar and explosives in these waters. The Navy MUST NOT engage in any activities that can harm marine life. <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.
Becton-1	As a community member and physician, I am extremely concerned about the dumping of stressors into our water. We are seeing unprecedented change already in this area, loss of sea life, drastic environmental change. This would only compound an already stressed ecosystem. We depend on this water. Environmental toxins risk the health and safety of our citizens in addition to the fish and water mammals who live in it. I urge you not to further poison this area in this time of crisis.	Please see Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for the analysis of impacts to sediments and water quality from the Navy's proposed activities. See the various resource sections elsewhere in Chapter 3 for an analysis of potential impacts to those species (3.4 Marine Mammals, 3.5 Sea Turtles, 3.6 Birds, 3.7 Marine Vegetation, 3.8 Marine Invertebrates, and 3.9 Fishes).
Belardinelli-1	I am 100% against the underwater sonar testing. This is debilitating to our marine mammals that rely on sound for survival. If there is any capacity for compassion for an already at risk species, this will be stopped. Thank you and I look forward to seeing the halt in this process.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bell-1	As a resident of Washington State fair request that you do not dump any pollution send the ocean off our shores or conduct any noise test that will damage or hurt the whales in the Dolphins	The Navy does not propose any activities that would "dump any pollution." In the course of the Navy proposed activities (listed in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of the EIS/OEIS), which do include the use of sonar and similar sound sources as well as underwater detonations, some expended materials are left behind in the ocean. The potential impacts of these actions was thoroughly analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the EIS/OEIS.
Bellamacina-1	I am writing to express opposition to the Navy's training and testing. Specifically, please address: 1) The adequacy of the assessment of Tribal cultural impacts as well as environmental impacts from the Navy's training and testing activities is especially important because these activities take place in the Pacific Ocean, which holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes and is critically important for the wellbeing of all people and lifeforms on this planet. 2) The Navy should work meaningfully with the Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities. 3) The Navy should prohibit use of sonar within the 50-mile mitigation area.	Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals.</p> <p>4) The “best available science” referenced in the draft SEIS should be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy’s NWTRC.</p> <p>5) The Navy’s monitoring program should be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.</p> <p>6) The Navy should expand its list of environmental “stressors” to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing.</p> <p>7) The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy’s 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.</p>	
Belliveau-1	<p>This is already an endangered species! Please dont make their existence harder than it already is....</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy’s ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy’s Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Bender-1	Stop testing under water. I am against this. You destroy marine life special Dolphins	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Benitez-1	Please stop getting in the way of the orcas and stop sounding out sounds to them 😞😞	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Bennett A-1	I strongly protest the Navy's Sonar testing in areas where the Southern Resident Orca Whales live. This kind of noise has been proven to be disruptive to their own communications, ultimately leading to decreased food intake and overall health.	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Bennett B-1	Please respect this sacred, remote and unique corner of our nation. Air training and exercises fill this space with terrible noise, robbing our citizens of this area of refuge. Please do not use the pacific peninsula for flight exercises.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Bennett G-1	Please refrain from testing in the Salish sea. The sea life is an important part of keeping our environment healthy and the whales which are heavily affected by this testing are key. Stop testing sonar in the Salish sea.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bennight-1	No sonar testing. We need to be working on peaceful solutions not war machines. We need to protect each other as an Earth as a people as an habit it to this Earth to the environment.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bentley-1	Further testing in the Salish Sea is unconscionable. We are destroying our marine life, which are critical to the health of our earth. No more testing!!	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Benz-1	I am against anything that will adversely or negatively affect or damage any sea life, including any training or testing by any agencies or government.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Berg-1	<p>Thanks to an ungrateful person writing a letter to the Peninsula Daily News, in the Peninsula Voices section, today, Sunday, June 9, 2019, giving us the contact addresses how to contact you and our devoted, brave military people who protect us all today.</p> <p>This woman, Katherine Kennedy goes on to tell how annoying you all are, never realizing it is she herself, you all are doing your best to protect, among the many others living on the Peninsula.</p> <p>I send my sincere thank you for your service to our people and country and I hope you remain in our area, doing your job with your flyovers and please know everytime I hear one of our Jets, Helicopters or any military plane flying over, I always ask God to bless them and their pilots and crew, keeping them all safe.</p> <p>Ms. Kennedy should write about the REAL problems of our Olympic Peninsula mountains. The drug syringes, etc. and the many people hiding in our forests, such as Illegal Aliens, drug traffickers and the like. For years, many of us feel unsafe enjoying the beauty of the back roads and surroundings in our local Olympic forests.</p> <p>Keep up the good work, we love and appreciate you all. God bless you.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>
Bergman-1	<p>I am concerned that Park values like peace and quiet are being usurped on a piecemeal basis and we do not have the entire picture as the Navy expands it's footprint on the Olympic Peninsula and the Salish Sea.</p> <p>If the noise pollution that is occurring in Coupeville and Port Townsend are any example, The Navy has misrepresented the scope of this project and Civic Values are being trampled on. The Navy has proven to be a very poor neighbor, unconcerned with the community values. This State is being run like a War Machine. It is time for the Navy to respect other values than some war they are attempting to drum up in the Pacific and Chinese Seas.</p> <p>The United States needs to quit trying to run the world. NO MORE JET NOISE IN SENSITIVE AREAS. THE NAVY HAS MADE AN ENEMY OF THOSE THEY ARE SWORN TO PROTECT by destroying our peace. Keep the Navy out of Park airspace. best regards, Bert Bergman</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Bernal-1	<p>Good morning</p> <p>By doing this testa you are destroying their hearing and that leads for them to find food even harder.</p> <p>They are in critical condition, millions of dollars spent to save them and you're doing this?</p> <p>Please stop those tests now,</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Bernardy-1	These trainings should be moved out of a highly populated area- like Moses Lake or an under populated area. The Navy has been arrogant and plowed through WA state with disregard for anything but their needs. They never followed the EIS process and they should be sued for it. We pay their salaries they should be held accountable.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Berntsen-1	Last Sunday's Seattle Times presented an article by Lynda V. Mapes describing "How our noise is hurting orcas' search for salmon". Surely the navy's use of sonar and explosives contributes to the dire stress experienced by our Puget Sound orcas, which are declining and in danger of extinction. I hope the navy ceases its sonar and explosive testing program in time to give the resident orcas a chance to survive.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Berolzheimer-1	I am opposed to the US Navy, or any other entity, using sonar or other sound that causes any behavior change, or injury to marine mammal and more specifically whales. According to The Marine Mammal Center: GRAY WHALES - 31 whales have been found dead along the West Coast so far in 2019, making this the 3rd largest gray whale mortality total on record. - The Marine Mammal Center has responded to 9 gray whales and identified that 4 were struck by ships and 4 were severely malnourished (one is unknown). - Researchers in Mexico found that 60% of the whales showing up this past winter were skinny and calf counts were down by about 1/3 from the previous year. Our oceans are already depleted, polluted, and unsafe for marine organisms. Humans doing no more harm is necessary to allow the ocean habitats to recover.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.
Berolzheimer-2	Any disturbance to marine mammals is unacceptable! Any additional trash – plastics, etc. should NOT be dumped into the ocean. We Americans need to be a model for stewardship of our oceans – OUR oceans.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Berry-1	<p>For the past 20+ years there have been numerous measures taken to ensure that the whale population has the opportunity to come back from the edge of extinction. Whales are an essential part of our part of our global ecosystem, as I am sure you are aware.</p> <p>One step was to limit the use of any "loud" noises that disrupt their ecolocation such as explosions near to any whale groups and definitely not in the path of any of their migrations. It is my understanding that you are proposing to change this. It would have a severe detrimental effect on the whales during their annual migration. Further that you propose to do this with NO show of urgent need to expand your activities into the path of their migration!</p> <p>Lately there have been some major set backs in overall whale recovery and there is some die back of the whale population. They are washing up dead on the California coast in record numbers. The crab season has been shortened by a month to ensure that there is sufficient food for the whales during their migration. Further, the sardine fishing season has been cancelled on the California coast for the same reason. While these steps do create significant hardship on the fishermen of the coast, these steps are being taken to ensure the long term overall health of our oceans and the whale population.</p> <p>I ask that you seriously reconsider your actions. There is no show of need to destroy parts of our world habitat. There is no show of urgency to invade areas of the ocean that area currently under threat from other sources. There are other options for you to consider and still meet your goals.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Betlach-1	<p>1. The adequacy of the assessment of Tribal cultural impacts as well as environmental impacts from the Navy's training and testing activities is especially important because these activities take place in the Pacific</p>	<p>Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Ocean, which holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes and is critically important for the wellbeing of all people and lifeforms on this planet.</p> <p>2. The Navy should work meaningfully with the Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities.</p> <p>3. The Navy should prohibit use of sonar within the 50-mile mitigation area. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals.</p> <p>4. The "best available science" referenced in the draft SEIS should be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy's NWTRC.</p> <p>5. The Navy's monitoring program should be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.</p> <p>6. The Navy should expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing.</p> <p>7. The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing</p>	
Beuzekamp-1	<p>De wereld.</p> <p>Met al jullie technieken zou je toch denken dat er gewerkt word aan vrede op aarde.</p> <p>Deze trainingen gaan over oorlog.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>En voor dat deze ooit uitbarst hebben jullie de zeeën der wereld uitgeroeid. Ik hoor in de infovideo over het beschermen van de oceaan.....als het leven in deze wateren sterft is er niets meer om te beschermen.</p> <p>We zijn hier niet alleen op aarde!</p> <p>En zijn zeker niet de baas.</p> <p>Ik ben TEGEN deze trainingen ga inplaats van oorlogje spelen de zeeën ontdoen van plastic afval.</p>	<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Bian-1	<p>I am 100% in opposition against sonar testing in the Salish Sea! There are orcas in the sea and their hearing will be impaired by the testing, please stop.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Bianchi-1	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas. "For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival," Calambokidis said</p> <p>Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations.</p> <p>Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times.</p> <p>The Navy uses sonar to track enemy submarines, torpedoes, mines and</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>other potential threats underwater. Sonar operators send pulses of sound through the ocean and then listen for echoes from objects hit by the sound waves.</p> <p>Scientists demonstrated the sound may disrupt the feeding patterns of marine mammals. The sound may also startle some species of whales, causing them to die.</p> <p>It is vital to understand that the ocean is their habitat and we are destroying it with plastic, chemicals, garbage and now this?! Please don't contribute to the destruction of this planet is the only one we have. Said this I'm utterly against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals.</p> <p>I trust the Navy will not allow this practice.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	
Bigelow-1	<p>Please see that reducing vessel noise by the Navy to increase Orca hunting efficiency will buy time for the endangered whales, while also building up chinook runs. Noise is a problem because lack of chinook is a problem.</p> <p>Please don't add to this problem of threatening such an important species as Orcas.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Billo-1	<p>The proposed area of training includes the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and areas in or adjacent to Olympic National Park. These two locations are prime examples of near pristine northwest coast ecosystems and temperate conifer forest, as well as being prime destinations for recreationalists seeking solitude from industrial noise pollution. Multiple daily flights over these areas with noise amplitudes of up to 100 decibels will greatly impact the user experience in these areas.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Navy is asking for permission for "incidental take" of "marine mammals...and threatened and endangered marine species." This is simply unacceptable, especially in a protected area. There is mountain scientific evidence to show that noise alone can alter the behavior, and ultimately survival, of many species, including the very species that the marine sanctuary and national park were set up to protect. Indeed the Olympic National Park (formerly Olympus National Monument) has been designated an environmentally sensitive area for 112 years.</p> <p>It is reckless and irresponsible to conduct this warfare training around</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	sensitive areas of the Olympic Peninsula when there are many other areas, such as southern Idaho, where the training was previously conducted, that are much more appropriate for this sort of training because conflicts with people and sensitive wildlife species will be fewer.	
Bingham-1	I don't like it when my neighbors mow their lawn at 7am. Sure, it's not up to me, but in my eyes (and rem) it is not okay. It's not even light out, what are you doing. That's how I feel about sailors testing echolocation in the ocean. Yup, that's how much I dislike 7am Saturday mowers. These animals communicate in one way and we are messing with it in multiple ways. I thrive because I get my rest on the wonderful weekend I don't get interrupted by a lawnmower.. do the orcas ever get that same luxury?	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Birdsall-1	Please do not perform sonar testing in the Salish Sea (or any other one) it's been proven to be harmful to our beautiful marine life animals and even cause death (which there is enough of already to both humans AND animals because of humans (weapons, testing, pollution, etc) sound pollution is just as detrimental to these innocent, sentient, nonhuman beings as plastic and other waste and it's time that we start caring for others (other than ourselves!!) Decompression sickness effects their feeding and mating rituals due to throwing off their echolocation, the ocean is THEIR home, they allow us to swim, surf, boat, etc. and they trust that they will be left alone and safe from harm, many species of marine life are curious and don't know that their lives are in danger (they ALL want we want and that's to be with their families freely, haven't we taken enough lives in the name of science? WHEN does it end?! Why do we feel that we are superior to other living, breathing, FEELING (both physical and emotional) beings? We ARE NOT! Please reconsider what you are doing! Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Birks-1	This is our opportunity!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Bishop J-1	Please keep training your young men and women. I got the chance to visit the aircraft carrier John Stennis and saw the deck where they land the	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	planes. What a good job they do. Have to practice to be the best and they are they best. The noise is freedom at it's best. I have lived in Jefferson county all my life (76 years) and I listen with pride. Contact me anytime and I will speak for your young people aabout the good job they are doing. Thank God for the Navy!!!	
Bishop M-1	<p>I am opposed to a plan by the US Navy to begin treetop high training missions over the area from the Hood Canal to the ocean over some of the most sensitive and significant areas in Washington State.</p> <p>The sound profile of the Growler is not only loud but includes a low-frequency vibration that travels farther and vibrates objects in its path. This aspect creates a deadly combination beyond annoyance that impacts human health.</p> <p>The 2011 World Health Organization report titled 'Burden of disease from environmental noise' documented health problems. The studies analysed environmental noise from planes, trains and vehicles, as well as other city sources, and then looked at links to health conditions such as cardiovascular disease, sleep disturbance, tinnitus, cognitive impairment in children, and annoyance. The WHO team used the information to calculate the disability-adjusted life-years or DALYs—basically the healthy years of life—lost to 'unwanted' human-induced dissonance. See https://www.science.org.au/curious/earth-environment/health-effects-environmental-noise-pollution</p>	<p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety).</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p>
Bishop R-1	<p>I strongly disagree with the navy's plans to increase aircraft activity and EMP projects in Olympic National Park. That land was set aside as wilderness for a reason, to protect all that lives there and to provide a wild place for people to enjoy. Low flying LOUD aircraft does not fall within the definition of wilderness.</p> <p>Please do not do this. Please do not ruin our remaining wilderness. Please do not take my solitude in the wilderness away from me. Please do not continue to harm the wildlife that lives in Olympic National Park.</p> <p>I say no.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Blackwell-1	Currently the ocean off the Mendocino and Sonoma Coast is in crisis due to the dessimation of the kelp forests and the over population of purple	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>urchin. This situation has put a significant strain on the fisheries and birds that rely on the kelp for a nursery and food source. While many organizations are working together to restore the kelp, it could take years or decades to return the fisherie to anything close to normal. This has caused great economic harm. Abalone season is closed indefinitely. Red urchins have been reduced by 80 to 90 percent. Crab season was cut short. Salmon season is threatened. Its unconscionable to add additional stressers to an environment that is already sufferring. The reality is that you don't know if your testing will aggravate the problem, because the knowledge base on bull kelp is too small to make that determination.</p>	<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Blaha-1	<p>The majority of these training exercises do not have to be conducted along our shoreline and could instead be conducted far from shore minimizing the impact on birds, fish, marine mammals, other wildlife and communities. There is no evaluation for other locations which could significantly reduce the harmful impacts of these exercises. Training around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas could be avoided if that was a priority for the Department of Defense.</p> <p>Also, many of these training exercises can be done via computer simulation. Saving money, not adding to noise pollution and green house gasses.</p> <p>The damage that sonar and explosives due to our whale population and other sea mammals is unforgiveable. The people of Washington want a clean, quiet, place to live, work and play. The Navy plans are not compatible with this.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered the use of simulation, and in fact already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 2.4.1.4 (Simulated Training and Testing Only) and Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy has also considered conducting training and testing in other locations, such as beyond the continental shelf; however, as stated in Section 2.4.1.1 (Alternate Training and Testing Locations), other locations fail to provide all the attributes necessary for effective training and testing.</p>
Blair J-1	<p>Please reconsider this ridiculous expansion of the headache inducing, nausea producing, sleep depriving Growlers. We have already seen a doubling of flights in 2019, with flights now going four days a week into the late night. Please, please find another way to train these pilots !</p>	<p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic MOA, it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year).</p> <p>3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to approximately one additional flight per day.</p> <p>4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Blair K-1	<p>The thing that I love the most about the place where I live is the calm, peaceful, happiness I get when emerging myself in the natural areas of Washington State. These areas should be protected and maintained by the government in which we have selected. And by that I mean left alone as much as possible. It is a shame that the military wants to destroy these beautiful and fragile ecosystems as well as endangered species such as the spotted owl, the peregrine falcon, the orca whales and many more. I do not support this. I hope my six year old son has a chance to enjoy these beautiful places with our future generations. Please consider changing your plans.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marin-species-monitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Blanc-1	<p>Hello, I m against underwater sonar testing because it hurts sea mammals. Thank you</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Blankenship L-1	When we moved to Camano Island 9 years ago, the sound of the jets from Whidbey Navel Air base was disruptive in a bearable fashion, and acceptable from a patriotic perspective. Today's increased flight frequencies for much noisier jets has severely impacted our normal conversation and sleep patterns. The evening and nighttime touch and goes are especially troublesome.	Growler noise on Camano Island is outside the scope of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area. With respect to the increase in flight volume, the Navy is not proposing a significant increase in Growler activity. A minor increase in training flights in the Olympic MOA is projected over the next several years; increasing by approximately 300 total flights per year by 2023; approximately 1 additional flight per day.
Blankenship P-1	We have lived on the west side of Camano Island for 9 years. The level of noise when we moved here was bearable. However, recent increases of fighter activity and the much louder noise from them disrupts any conversation (in and outside our home) and our ability to sleep. The evening and night time touch and go activity is particularly disruptive to healthy living. In addition, the excessive noise levels will also reduce our property value, the major part of our retirement investment.	Growler noise on Camano Island is outside the scope of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area. With respect to the increase in flight volume, the Navy is not proposing a significant increase in Growler activity. A minor increase in training flights in the Olympic MOA is projected over the next several years; increasing by approximately 300 total flights per year by 2023; approximately 1 additional flight per day.
Blankenship R-1	My family spends much time in the wilderness and national parks in the state of Washington. We observe many low flying over these protected lands causing disturbance the wildlife and to the visitors seeking solitude and serenity. I would request that military require all jets to fly at a moderate speed and high elevation through these areas limiting the disturbance. High speed low elevation training should occur anywhere else.	All flights conducted in the Olympic MOA occur at altitudes of 6,000 feet or higher, and at least 1,200 feet above ground level.
Blichfeldt-1	I am a 100% against underwater sonar testing, which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Blid-1	I am 100% against underwater sonar testing which has been PROVEN to cause harm to marine animals. There is no protective benefit to this practice whatsoever. It should be stopped immediately.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Blohm-1	Because so many sea creatures and marine mammals will be harmed by this I am completely against this testing. It will be hard enough for our Southern Resident Orcas to recover from their course on Extinction without this type of harmful and even fatal testing going on. We just can't take this chance with our Orcas and the whole Salish Sea ecosystem down to the smallest organism, they are all crucial to each other's survival.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Blume-1	We should not be sonar testing in the Salish sea when our southern resident orcas are going extinct. Find another place or another way to do this testing. The damage will be irreparable and we must eliminate all known interference with their survival.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bobbitt-1	Please stop the sonar testing. You're only harming the animals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bock-1	<p>The Southern Resident Orcas and all Salish Sea marine inhabitants are in harms way from the US Navy 's dangerous & harmful sonar practices. This is unacceptable. I am 100% against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas.</p> <p>"For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival," Calambokidis said. Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations. Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times. Please do not allow this! I vote NO!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Bogard-1	<p>Re: Opposition to Sonar and Explosive Testing Off the Coast of Mendocino County</p> <p>To Whom it May Concern,</p> <p>I am writing this letter in opposition to your proposed Sonar and Explosive Testing off the Coast of Mendocino. Thank you for your consideration and weighing in of public, agencies/organizations, city, county and State of CA comments and concerns with regard to the effects, both immediate and long term, that your proposed sonar/seismic testing will have on the flora, fauna, geology and water quality of this fragile marine ecosystem.</p> <p>It is imperative that this project take into account the scientific evidence in consideration of the entire marine ecosystem that will be affected. Species affected are not only the apex predators: cetaceans, pinnipeds, sharks, starfish, but algae(Bull Kelp) invertebrates, crustaceans, fish, marine mammals, pelagic and migrating birds, the sediment on the ocean floor, coral, and ocean water quality that make up and sustain the marine ecosystem and habitat of this coast.</p> <p>The "takes" of marine mammals, by death, physical harm or behavioral disturbance from foraging/navigating/breeding/nursing/stress has the potential to threaten the sustainability of a species to maintain overall health and can lead to extinction and/or decimation of that stock.</p>	<p>All of the issues raised in the comment are addressed in the NWT Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>i have concerns for the short and long term affects the proposed project will have on the geology of the ocean floor and reefs and the toxicity from contaminants of the testing occurring as a result of your project.</p> <p>With the current stress on the ocean habitat and fragile ecosystem caused by climate change, ocean warming, increased acidity numerous species are threatened and endangered. Just recently and since 2013, the starfish wasting disease has caused decline of this apex predator and the species have not recovered. The Bull Kelp has also significantly declined and plays an important role in sustaining populations of fish, abalone and many other species. With regard to cetacean species; Gray Whales, Orcas, Blue, Humpback, Fin, Bottlenose Dolphins, Harbor and Dalls Porpoises and others are all affected and will potentially be lethally harmed or their populations disturbed and altered in terms of sustainability. Currently, along the northwest coast and off Mendocino, there is an unusual Gray Whale mortality occurring due to starvation and vessel strikes. Orca species, in particular, Resident fish eating populations which migrate along the coast are facing extinction due to decreasing food sources and environmental stress on their populations. Pinniped species are also noted to have an uptick in disease and mortality due to decreasing food sources.</p> <p>Stellar Sea Lions that reside on the west coast and off the coast of Mendocino, Sonoma and Humbolt Counties are an “endangered” species and it has been noted that along the Alaskan/Washington coasts their population declined and has not recovered due to bombing(detonation of explosive devices) and starvation due to limited food sources. The Guadalupe Fur Seal, a “threatened” species that normally reside in Mexico and Southern California have currently been sited/rescued and are currently showing up dead in Mendocino County. Numerous pelagic bird species and their food sources will be affected and are very susceptible to pollution and toxicity from contaminants. While the causes of mortality are still under investigation, just recently there has been an unusual mortality event with hundreds of Common Murre washing up death on the beaches of Mendocino and all along the north coast.</p> <p>These factors and the scientific evidence all indicate that our marine ecosystem along the Mendocino and west coast are at risk and compromised in their ability to sustain a balanced and healthy environment for the flora and fauna and recover from the current environmental impacts. The future of this diverse, fragile and enriching ecosystem depends on our ability and the actions we take to protect it.</p> <p>Thank you for taking into consideration and review, the effects your project</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	will have on the entire marine ecosystem of the Mendocino and northwest coast. While your project is focused on an aspect of safety, it is imperative that the sustainability and longevity of our marine habitat be protected to promote the life and health of all species.	
Bolter-1	<p>I strongly urge you NOT to conduct testing and training, that will surely affect endangered orcas, humpbacks and other cetaceans. It has been well documented that the decibel level of these tests is well beyond the sounds orcas make, and that it can potentially lead to hearing loss and altered behavior. The southern resident killer whales are social animals and rely on communication with each other, in addition to echolocation to hunt, as do the transient orcas. Not only will the training and testing activity make it difficult or impossible for them to hear each other, it will make it much more difficult to locate their prey.</p> <p>We do not have enough long term science on the damage this testing could cause to accurately assess how bad the damage could be. We don't know whether it will cause temporary hearing loss, permanent hearing loss or worse. SRKW are on the brink as it is - they are starving to death and at their lowest numbers in decades. With dwindling salmon returns, they need all the help they can get in finding prey. At a time of extreme prey scarcity, inhibiting their hunting is absolutely the wrong thing to do. We all need to protect the biological diversity of this precious planet for our own survival as well as theirs. Once the orcas are gone, they're gone forever. The fate of a species that has coexisted peacefully for so much longer than humans is in our hands. Please don't let that be the stain on your hands. Extinction is an undoable tragedy. Thank you very much for considering this comment.</p>	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bond A-1	I am against testing and training in our coastal waters. Our oceans are sick and dying. We need to learn how to work together and communicate non-violently. We will not save the planet using combat or weapons. With 11yrs left before we irreversibly push the planet into environments unsuitable for humans and most other creatures, we need to all tirelessly work together to prevent toxic waste and byproducts from being created.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bond S-1	I live in the Puget Sound area and am very concerned about local sea life, most importantly the Orca population and the wild salmon. I feel that proposed testing would endanger both of these populations and the health of these sea creatures as well as that of other sea life inhabiting our local waters. I therefore request that you refrain from any testing that could contaminate our waterways or endanger any species in our waterways.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Borcich-1	<p>There is NO way the Navy can prove its “allowable take” is accurate. The harm you will do to the marine life in our waters is too great to calculate. Already the die offs and mysterious beached mammals are giving us loud warnings of the fire changes in our oceans. The toxins and garbage these tests will leave behind will further degrade the health of the Earth’s lungs. We need the ocean for our lives, for the diversity of underwater life. The tests are for the benefit of killing. Killing in future wars. Killing of human beings. Killing of children and mothers. And I’m preparing for all this killing you propose to kill uncounted marine animals and pollute the already fragile ecosystem we all depend on.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Just no. We vehemently oppose this horrible testing. Go away, Navy. We don’t want or need you here or anywhere.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Borcich-2	<p>How loud can we say it? Louder than your killingly loud tests. NO. Just no. Don’t come here with your lies and lame excuses for wrecking the entire eco system, the entire world. Lexie us and the whales alone. Just leave. NO.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy’s ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy’s Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research’s Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy’s project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Borcich-3	<p>US Court finds Navy sonar harming whales and dolphins was improperly approved and its sonar is used across more than 70 percent of the world's oceans</p> <p>By AlessandraPotenza@ale_potenza Jul 18, 2016, 7:13pm EDT</p> <p>The US Navy is now using a particular type of sonar in more than half of the world's oceans under an illegal permit That sonar harms marine mammals like whales, dolphins, seals, and walruses. On Friday, the Ninth US Circuit Court of Appeals in California found that a 2012 regulation that allowed the Navy to use a low-frequency active sonar for training and testing violates</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy’s ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the Marine Mammal Protection Act.</p> <p>The court found that the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), which gave the authorization, isn't doing enough to avoid harming or killing marine mammals under the law. The Marine Mammal Protection Act calls for the "least practicable adverse impact" on marine mammals and their habitats. The court also found that the federal agency failed to protect areas of the world that its own government experts had flagged as "biologically important" to protect marine life. Such areas include the Galapagos Islands off the coast of Ecuador, the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument off of Hawaii, and Challenger Bank off of Bermuda.</p> <p>The Navy had been authorized to use the high-intensity long-range sonar - called low-frequency active sonar, or LFA - for five years across more than 70 percent of the world's oceans, in areas of the Pacific, Atlantic, and Indian Oceans and the Mediterranean Sea. The NMFS has to set certain limits to activities, like military training, that could harm marine mammals. The goal is to reduce the impact on marine life to its lowest possible level.</p> <p>The Navy uses LFA to detect quiet foreign submarines. The sonar involves the use of 18 speakers lowered hundreds of feet below the surface. It produces low-frequency sound pulses of about 215 decibels (dB) in sequences that last about 60 seconds. That can interfere over hundreds of miles with some marine mammals like whales, dolphins, and walrus that rely on underwater sound for navigating, catching prey, and communicating. LFA sonar can harm the animals by interrupting mating, stopping communication, causing them to separate from calves, and inflicting stress. Sounds above 180 dB can disrupt the animals' hearing and cause physical injury. In 2005, 34 whales became stranded and died off in North Carolina because of nearby offshore Navy sonar training, according to Scientific American.</p> <p>To limit harm, the NMFS requires the Navy to shut down or delay sonar transmission if there are nearby marine mammals. It also forbids the Navy to produce pulses of 180dB or more within about 14 miles of any coastline, or within 0.6 miles of several "offshore biologically important areas." All these regulations exist to try to minimize the impact that the use of LFA sonar has on marine mammals, to try to comply with the law. But the court found that the measures aren't enough.</p> <p>"This systematic underprotection of marine mammals cannot be consistent with the requirement that mitigation measures result in the 'least practicable adverse impact' on marine mammals," the court said.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>One of the NMFS's arguments is that too little data on marine mammal distribution is available to ensure protection of certain habitats. But even when the federal agency consulted with leading marine mammal experts, their opinion was disregarded, according to Michael Jasny, the director of the Marine Mammal Protection Project at the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), one of the organizations that brought the case against the NMFS.</p> <p>"The NMFS should err on the side of overprotection rather than underprotection"</p> <p>"The court soundly rejected that approach," says Jasny. "In doing so, it has ruled in ways that could significantly alter the way that the agency does business under the law." When enough data is lacking, the NMFS should err on the side of overprotection rather than underprotection, Jasny says.</p> <p>This is the third time that the Navy's authorization to use its LFA sonar has been challenged in court. In 2002, when the Navy first sought authorization for its LFA sonar system, and in 2007, plaintiffs and the Navy reached a court-ordered settlement allowing use of LFA in significantly reduced areas of the world's oceans, according to the NRDC.</p> <p>"What the fisheries service did here was ... consistent with what until now has been an inadequate approach to mitigation that the scientific and conservation communities have frequently criticized the agency for," Jasny says.</p>	
Borden-1	<p>I have just learned of an EIS put out by the U.S. Navy on March 29, which is very disturbing to me. The only EIS alternative that is acceptable is the No Action Alternative. The other options given are unacceptable to the environment and life on the Olympic Peninsula. Alternatives 1 and 2 would cause unforgiveable and unnecessary damage to Olympic National Park and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. Alternative 2 is the most extreme.</p> <p>The length of the EIS, the great area it affects, and the many people it affects requires a 90-day comment period. This, so the EIS can be examined properly and thoroughly. Please ask the Navy for another 14-day extension of the comment period.</p> <p>The noise from multiple jet flights over the western and northern parts of the Peninsula will chase residents and visitors away. This will affect the health and economy of the Peninsula and the state of Washington. The search pattern of jet Growler flights looking for emitters would roar above the ocean beaches; the Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges; Washington State Department of Natural Resources land; Quinault,</p>	<p>The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations);</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Quileute and Hoh Reservations; and thousands of acres of private land, including the towns of Forks and Amanda Park.</p> <p>The Navy admits to 85–100 decibels of noise per pass. That is enough to cause hearing loss and contribute to other health problems. People in Forks have recorded 94 decibel flights under the current operations. While noise is known to affect people and no studies have been done on the iconic Olympic elk, it is not difficult to reason they would be similarly affected, being mammals of a similar weight.</p> <p>The military training in the Marine Sanctuary would do damage to the ocean beaches, the marine animals of the coast, the nesting areas of many of Washington's shorebirds, migrating whales, and the birds that use the Pacific Flyway. The Navy has denied flying over Olympic National Park. This is untrue. Not only is this untrue, it is impossible not to fly these missions over the Park.</p> <p>This degradation of the Olympic Peninsula's environment is unacceptable. For 112 years, Congress and presidents have set aside areas of the Peninsula to protect its valuable environment. Irreparable damage would be caused if the activities are done as stated in the Navy EIS/OEIS Mar 2019 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Northwest Training and Testing. Please stop this plan by the Navy. The training has been done elsewhere. It can be done elsewhere. Wild places are not empty places just waiting for an invasion by the military. Our national security must also include environmental security.</p>	<p>however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Bordin-1	<p>Dear NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager:</p> <p>I am providing my comments, short as they are, but very important in relation to the naval plans to continue training and testing activities at sea and in associated airspace with the study area beyond year 2020. The naval activities include the use of active sonar and explosives for the purpose to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready naval forces.</p> <p>My serious concerns are that the Southern Resident Killer Whales (Orcas) live in the areas of the Salish Sea that the Navy wants to continue with its "activities". As you may know these whales are "endangered" and their numbers are continuing to decline in population due to a number of known reasons, including, but not limited to: noise, water pollution, depleted food source (Chinook salmon), harassment by "boaters", vessel traffic (large and small ships), toxic contaminants, habitat loss and negative land use practices.</p> <p>Sonar and explosives in your training exercises and "activities" will be</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>disastrous to the Endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales, and, all the other marine life (fish, marine mammals, other species of whales, porpoises, et. al.) that live in these native ocean waters. The detrimental effects that are commonly known to whales and other marine creatures within a short distance to miles further from the use of sonar and explosives are: bleeding brains, hearing destruction and loss, confusion, severe shaking/trembling, stranding, and death. (A documentary that I watched a few years ago about divers who were underwater when sonar was used had become: shaken bodily, had confusion and disorientation, had headaches, and sickening stomachs, and the "noise and vibrations" they had experienced was definitely hazardous to their health.)</p> <p>There is no mitigation that serves to undo a distressed, confused/disoriented, shocked/vibrated, bleeding, stranded, and dead Orca whale, gray whale, or other whales, and, marine wildlife when Naval sonar and explosives are used to training and testing activities. Please do not further consider the use of sonar and explosives in your Naval training and testing activities, now and in the future.</p> <p>Please seriously consider my comments today. Living in the beautiful Pacific Northwest has been a blessing to me and my family. Both seeing and knowing that the Orca whales are living and rearing their young in the Salish Sea, lower numbers that they are currently, should be a wake-up call to each human being here in Washington State, and to the human populations in Alaska, Oregon, and California; the areas that the Southern Resident Killer Whales, and, Transient Killer Whales live, forage, and reside. We should be doing absolutely everything within our human powers to save the Southern Resident Killer Whales, and other marine species, including Chinook salmon in the Salish Sea, and other areas that they migrate to and are known to frequent. Sonar and Explosives are not helpful, but destructive.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, and timely consideration in this matter. You may wish to learn more about the Southern Resident Killer whales by directing your attention to Governor Jay Inslee's website under the Southern Resident Killer Whale Task Force. You will be able to follow all the recommendations and check out the accompanying studies, reports, and documents related to the fate of "Our" whales. Once again, Please Do Not Continue to Use Sonar and Explosives in your Navy Training and Testing Activities.</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Botta-1	This has got to stop. The Navy is NOT a good neighbor anymore. The noise is untenable on Whidbey and over Port Townsend and Forks area and in of all places our Olympic National Park and Forest, The dangers of sonar to our marine life in the sound is of serious consequence, Please put your efforts to making peace instead of war and then maybe we can be a great country again. Feelings about the navy are changing. You are NOT being a good neighbor.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.mil/specops/navypages/marine_species_monitoring.navy.mil • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Bouchard J-1	Please don't do these tests knowing the harm you are placing on the marine life. Why must we. as humans, torture & kill everything in the name of 'research'. Please, please STOP these exercises!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.mil/specops/navypages/marine_species_monitoring.navy.mil • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Bouchard P-1	I do not believe that the Navy has to do its practice sessions over the sensitive wildlife areas of the Olympic National Park and the habitat of the	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>endangered Orcas of Puget Sound. I acknowledge the need for training but I do not believe that this is the only place that you can do it. You are ruining the quality of life of people who have chosen to live here for the wild quiet place that it is.</p> <p>We have chosen to live away from the comfort and convenience of cities because we love the quiet and wild places. It is not right that the navy should choose the same places. The Navy has many other choices.</p> <p>The Navy has not adequately studied the environmental impacts. You have not taken into account the financial impact on tourism in Port Townsend and on Whidbey Island and on home values in those areas.</p> <p>I object very strongly and will continue to oppose this action.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Pamela Bouchard DVM</p>	<p>the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft and ships are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness. The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p>
Bouknight-1	<p>Please make this stop, or find a better, and less harmful substitution. These animals in the ocean do not deserve this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Bowden-1	<p>I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed sonar testing in the Puget Sound waters off the coast of Northern California to Alaska.</p> <p>As the Navy is well aware, marine animals rely on sound to communicate, locate food, avoid predators and navigate. By conducting sonar tests in these animals homes, you are exposing them to temporary to permanent</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	hearing loss, as well as forcing them to flee the noise, which moves them from their homes and feeding grounds. Conducting sonar testing in such a sensitive area shows that the US Navy has no regard for the planet and those creatures that reside in its waters. I hope that for the sake of the oceans inhabitants and for future generations of humans that you seriously consider the impact his has on the planet instead of just thinking about yourselves.	Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bowen-1	Stop the noise!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Bowers-1	Research has substantiated the disastrous effects on sea mammals and other marine inhabitants when they are confused and/or overwhelmed by competing underwater noises. These include the various forms of testing done by the U.S. Navy as well as the increasing noises created by pleasure craft and commercial heavy marine sea-going vessels. Additionally, numerous individuals marine inhabitants are being injured and killed by these large vessels making use of the crowded travel lanes in the Salish Sea. It is well past time for humans to assume more responsibility for this damage by modulating these effects through regulation and human concern for sharing the environment with these myriad sentient beings.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bowlin-1	The Navy has known for a long time that sonar affects whales. It destabilizes their ability to find food, so they starve. The amount of whales that have washed up on shore this year tells us, as citizens, that the Navy is doing more sonar games. If whales were to become extinct because of your actions it would have a huge impact on all other life.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Boyd-1	I think you need to stop this sonar testing and stop trying to torture the animals They don't deserve their habitat destroyed just because you think you can	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bradley-1	Stop this torture. Please think about how you would feel in their circumstances. Help the beautiful animals on this planet. Don't kill them	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Branson-1	I am concerned about the impact on the wildlife and the noise issue. I have a friend who moved to that area and she loves it and is a very outdoor person. This noise has become a very major issue and the endangerment to the animals is very upsetting. I am sure there must be a more suitable place. I ask that you please listen to the people and consider other options.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Bravo-1	Stop testing and support our Orcas Respect our oceans as you were to protect it not destroy it	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Breiby-1	Hi, I really hope that you stop this. It is very disturbing to the children, the wildlife and us adults. Please reconsider your actions and their affects on life. Thank you	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Bricker-1	The effects of sonar and high-volume acoustic impulses on cetaceans are well-documented. Why not test in large lakes or areas where endangered or eco-system-critical sea life are not at risk?	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bridges-1	Please don't do this	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Brill G-1	It is imperative that the Navy act responsibly and not dump/minimize accidental dumping of heavy metals and poisons into waterways or the broader ocean environment. Heavy metal and chemical pollution will work it's way up through the food chain and will ultimately have a deleterious effect of all animals, tiny or large. And that effect will ultimately impact the well being of humans as well.	The Navy does not propose any activities that would "dump heavy metals and poisons." In the course of the Navy proposed activities (listed in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of the EIS/OEIS), which do include the use of sonar and similar sound sources as well as underwater detonations, some expended materials are left behind in the ocean. The

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	All toxic waste must be minimized in scope and be sequestered in safe and arid land depositories.	potential impacts of these actions was thoroughly analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the EIS/OEIS.
Brill J-1	<p>To Whom it may Concern,</p> <p>I am outraged at the proposed plan by the US Navy to begin treetop high training missions over the area from the Hood Canal to the ocean over some of the most sensitive and significant areas in Washington State. This is some of the most distinctive wilderness in the state and it must be protected.</p> <p>The military already receives an obscene percentage of our resources, far more than any other social agency. This taking, taking, taking has got to stop.</p> <p>The training facilities in Idaho and Nevada are sufficient and the areas were designed for warfare training, the Olympic Peninsula was not. There is no reason the Navy can not continue electronic warfare training in Idaho and Nevada as they have done for decades.</p> <p>It will disturb visitors to, and the wildlife of, Olympic National Park which is the eighth most visited park in the National Park System; 3.4 million visitors to the Olympic National Park in 2017. It includes International Biosphere Reserve and a World Heritage Site.</p> <p>Noise causes and aggravates: High blood pressure, Heart dis ease, Hearing impairment, and Increases or creates mental health problems. The 2011 World Health Organization report titled 'Burden of disease from environmental noise' documented health problems. The studies analysed environmental noise from planes, trains and vehicles, as well as other city sources, and then looked at links to health conditions such as cardiovascular disease, sleep disturbance, tinnitus, cognitive impairment in children, and annoyance. The WHO team used the information to calculate the disability-adjusted life-years or DALYs—basically the healthy years of life—lost to 'unwanted' human-induced dissonance. See the Australian Academy of Science article: Health effects of environmental noise pollution</p> <p>The sound profile of the Growler is not only loud but includes a low-frequency vibration that travels farther and vibrates objects in its path. This aspect creates a deadly combination beyond annoyance that impacts human health.</p> <p>Impact to our economy:</p> <p>People spent \$279 million in communities near the park. That spending</p>	<p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety).</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>supported 3,556 jobs in the local area and had a cumulative benefit to the local economy of \$385 million.</p> <p>There must be some human beings there who still have compassion for our world. There is no reason to defend this country if you make it uninhabitable. Your exercises will do just that. Go to Idaho and stay out of the Olympic Peninsula.</p>	
Brisson-1	<p>The following article from "Scientific American" succinctly explains how sonar testing negatively affects marine life, while offering methods as to how the Navy can work to reduce the use of sonar testing to ensure the protection and safety of marine life.</p> <p>"Unfortunately for many whales, dolphins and other marine life, the use of underwater sonar can lead to injury and even death. These sound waves can travel for hundreds of miles under water, and can retain an intensity of 140 decibels as far as 300 miles from their source.</p> <p>These rolling walls of noise are no doubt too much for some marine wildlife. While little is known about any direct physiological effects of sonar waves on marine species, evidence shows that whales will swim hundreds of miles, rapidly change their depth (sometime leading to bleeding from the eyes and ears), and even beach themselves to get away from the sounds of sonar.</p> <p>In January 2005, 34 whales of three different species became stranded and died along North Carolina's Outer Banks during nearby offshore Navy sonar training. Other sad examples around the coast of the U.S. and elsewhere abound, notably in recent years with more sonar testing going on than ever before. According to the nonprofit Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), which has campaigned vigorously to ban use of the technology in waters rich in marine wildlife, recent cases of whale strandings likely represent a small fraction of sonar's toll, given that severely injured animals rarely make it to shore.</p> <p>In 2003, NRDC spearheaded a successful lawsuit against the Navy to restrict the use of low-frequency sonar off the coast of California. Two years later a coalition of green groups led by NRDC and including the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), the League for Coastal Protection, Cetacean Society International, and Ocean Futures Society upped the ante, asking the federal courts to also restrict testing of more intense, harmful and far ranging mid-frequency types of sonar off Southern California's coastline. In filing their brief, the groups cited Navy documents which estimated that such testing would kill some 170,000 marine mammals and cause</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, and the "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June 2017)" (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>permanent injury to more than 500 whales, not to mention temporary deafness for at least 8,000 others. Coalition lawyers argued that the Navy's testing was in violation of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act. Two lower courts upheld NRDC's claims, but the Supreme Court ruled that the Navy should be allowed to continue the use of some mid-frequency sonar testing for the sake of national security. "The decision places marine mammals at greater risk of serious and needless harm," says NRDC's Joel Reynolds.</p> <p>Environmental groups are still fighting the battle against the sonar, lobbying the government to curtail testing, at least during peacetime, or to at least ramp up testing gradually to give marine wildlife a better chance to flee affected areas. "The U.S. Navy could use a number of proven methods to avoid harming whales when testing mid-frequency sonar," reports IFAW's Fred O'Regan. "Protecting whales and preserving national security are not mutually exclusive." "</p>	
Bristow-1	<p>Thank you for your service.</p> <p>Idea:</p> <p>Crowd-source your passive comms-EW Training around the PNW and elsewhere. Fixed, car, and marine radio broadcast fall into in the 25-100 watt range. (HF operators are much higher wattage). There are many Navy/military enthusiasts which would support this. 1. Navy funded or subsidized equipment. 2. Wireless computer app. 3. Geo-fixed site at residence or business. 4. Centralized [internet] radio control via Coupeville EW site or other area (or even the individual squadrons during their sorties).</p> <p>You will likely have numerous volunteers, the broadcasts fall within both civilian restrictions and would be threat-representative. Minimize need to curry favor with state government folks with political agendas. After relatively low fixed costs for time and money, this will have much higher efficacy, wider geo-area and much cheaper operations than the current RV trucks. It is also in line with current technology and civilian trends for similar efforts. Plus, this would be very low profile for the Navy and volunteers.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Perhaps look at climb out and even higher transition altitudes and corridors as NASWI jets go feet dry into the Olympic Peninsula. (i.e. NAS North Island 20 years ago.)</p> <p>Aggressively look for additional REPI candidates near the Hoh area, with</p>	<p>Thank you for your EW training recommendations. They have been forwarded to appropriate range planners for consideration. Regarding routing of aircraft into the Olympic MOA, the Navy considered but did not develop mitigation for aircraft overflights, such as shifting transit routes, relocating aircrew training activities, or modifying flight altitudes, because such mitigation would not be practical to implement due to implications for safety and mission requirements. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) controls the National Airspace System and routes that overlap the NWTT Study Area. The FAA designed the routes to efficiently manage air traffic in the region and to safely deconflict military traffic from commercial and general aviation aircraft, with consideration given to the presence of Canadian National Airspace and traffic to the north. The FAA is the responsible federal agency for determining transit routes and any changes to such routes must be approved by the FAA. The Navy is currently in discussions with the FAA exploring the possibility of shifting the FAA-established transit routes for military aircraft transiting to and from the Olympic MOA from Naval Air Station Whidbey Island to the north of the Olympic Peninsula. The purpose of these discussions is to consider the efficient and safe use of navigable airspace. While ultimately any shift in transit routes is the FAA's decision, it is possible that, if approved, such a shift will have the added benefit of reducing military aircraft noise over the Olympic National Park.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>hopefully overlap into murrelet habitat. Note the San Juans are also key murrelet forage fish habitat esp. during El Niño events, perhaps increased REPI efforts can be made along Lopez, Blakely, and San Juan islands, since that is an approach area during some flight ops. --- The Navy is here for the long term and is a better neighbor than most formalized eco-groups. Use your third-party partners for your conservation efforts to build closer relationships with Oly Park area “people” in the manner of China Lake area (Which has numerous national parks, wilderness areas, a preserve and other parks.)</p> <p>Hire a PR firm via Fleet Forces to genuinely promote and expand awareness of your conservation efforts. During the last few years USN efforts have likely been THE most active and meaningful conservancy in the entire PNW. A few Kitsap Sun articles do not build awareness.</p> <p>Lastly, continue to look for ways to distinguish unique EIS comments. For example, in previous EIS comment periods, very few people generated a considerable number of comments (usually against the Navy). They used the stats from this to indicate higher faux anti-Navy sentiment than what was actually factual. Supporters consider their single comments to equal in weight, to those single people who purposefully make numerous comments as part of an organized campaign.</p> <p>There is nothing in your EIS which is outside PNW environmental concerns and other impacts. You balance these with the national defense mission very well. Thanks.</p>	
Broadhurst-1	<p>I strongly object to your using this fragile and mostly legally protected area as a training ground. The effects on wildlife here, alone, make this a plan that should be illegal and is illegal if you even come close enough to disrupt the environment of Olympic National Park.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Broeck-1	<p>As a US citizen, I am strongly opposed to the Navy's proposal to increase sonar and electromagnetic underwater testing. This testing severely threatens to injure marine mammals and disrupt their habitat. Not only are marine mammals a vital part of ocean ecosystems--the preservation of which deeply impacts of our nation's well being, and that of all peoples--they are living beings who deserve our respect and protection. As an elementary school teacher, I believe we owe it to future generations to do everything in our power to protect the living ecosystems of our planet, and I am deeply disappointed that this increase in testing is even a</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	consideration. I see this increase as a threat to the well being of ocean ecosystems, and therefore a threat to the security of our nation and world. There seems to be limited substantive information given in your report about the long term impacts of sonar and electromagnetic testing on marine habitat in general. I urge you to select the No Action Alternative plan until a more in depth understanding of the long term impacts is developed. In my opinion, the threat environmental degradation through military and economic activity poses to our national and world security is a far greater than that of "enemy" subs. Thank you for your consideration.	
Brohm-1	Why is this going on, everybody knows what's going on with our precious Orcas, we should all be working to protect them not kill them. Do not do this !!!! 😞	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Brohm-2	STOP, this is insane what's it going to take 😞😞😞	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Brooke-1	Your underwater sonar testing is harmful to mammals like dolphins and orcas. Please stop!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Brookler-1	We are at a critical point in climate change and ecosystem/biodiversity collapse and we cannot afford to release ANY more toxic compounds or additional harmful acoustics into our environment! Making smart long-term decisions for the sake of a livable planet is the most important thing we can do right now. Please do not to release ANY heavy metals, depleted uranium, toxic chemicals, or harmful acoustics into the Puget Sound (or any oceans) or its surrounding environment. For all of our children and their children... protect our oceans, our people, our planet. Please.	In the course of the Navy proposed activities (listed in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of the EIS/OEIS), some expended materials are left behind in the ocean. The potential impacts of these actions was thoroughly analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy does not propose the use of ordnance containing depleted uranium. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.
Brooks-1	I am 100% against sonar testing that endangers an already fragile and endangered(!!!) pod of orcas. Please refrain from all testing that endangers the whales and other marine life. Our oceans are already in peril, please don't add to the problems.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Broome-1	I went to the information night put on by the Navy. I cannot more strongly disagree with the proposed testing. While the Navy may be trying to put safety in place for marine mammals, ecology, and fish, this will not be enough. Our orcas are facing extinction due to starvation. Their tendency to avoid these disruptions, noise, blasts, will cause further starvation by avoiding their normal feeding habitats. They will be crossing these locations and you cannot account for every individual, resident or transient, and protect them and tell them "It's ok. You can go feed." We need all of them healthy. We need to be doing all we can to protect these animals, and the	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	delicate balance they keep as apex predators. WHALES and ORCAS ARE STARVING!!! Do NOT place additional obstacles in their way. This is THE WORST time to start this endeavor. There is historical significance to these underwater ecosystems, which will be destroyed, and all the flora and fauna are already being affected by human dams, boating, accidents, pollution, and fishing. We need to do everything in our power to help this community. For their lives, for ours. As a citizen with a scientific background, understanding in ecology, wildlife volunteer, and outdoor enthusiast, I cannot more strongly disapprove of the Naval testing. I guarantee if this goes forward, our southern resident orcas will not recover.	As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Broussard-1	I am aware of the occasional noise as you practice overhead and I SUPPORT THE TRAINING 100%. For all those who complain they need to get a life. Bottom line... I feel that the current method of sustained 15-20 minute periods of jet noise is inconsequential and appreciate that no night time exercise occurs. If the complainers don't realize that our dedicated armed forces need this training to stay current with skills, then they will never understand any common sense. Please continue to do what you do.... Thank you for your service!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Broutin-1	vos sonars sont une catastrophe pour les cétacés et les poissons, ce bruit perturbe leur moyen de se déplacer, de communiquer et sont responsables de échouages de masse	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Brouwer-1	Please stop it right now! If you are at least 1% human you know you have to stop this <i>[expletive deleted]</i> tests immediately! I suffer from hearing loss permanently and hear this crazy stuff 24/7, it's driving me nuts! It's barbaric to do this to living creatures.. so stop it or kill yourself!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Browe	I am writing you with concern about the planned expansion of US Navy war training exercises planned for the Mendocino Coast area. Our local commercial Dungeness Crab harvest was just suspended due to excessive impact on our Gray Whale migration along our coast from February - April when the Gray Whales are returning from birthing their young in Baja	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Mexico enroute along their 10,000 miles to the Arctic. Your planned sonar signals, explosions and training activities could have a detrimental effect on these marine mammals and their young travelling through our coastal waters through this month. I implore you to consider other areas for your war training exercises.</p> <p>I appreciate your meetings planned in Fort Bragg and Eureka in early May to apprise our coastal communities of your training plans. You neglected to give the times of those meetings. You can be sure that the meeting halls will be packed with other concerned individuals eager to hear the extent of your training exercises. Perhaps you should consider adding another meeting in the Crescent City area to receive our coastal resident's input from this extensive coastal geographical area.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p>	<p>to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>All notification methods (newspaper advertisements, website, emails, etc.) included the time of the meetings as part of the announcement.</p>
Brown J-1	<p>Do it for the newest member of the critically endangered southern resident orcas! Just two more days left to make your voice heard against the proposed sonar testing by the US Navy in the Salish Sea.</p> <p>Go to bit.ly/2EYTO6S and let them know you are against the sonar testing!</p> <p>Photo: John Forde/Tofino Whale Center</p> <p>#dolphinproject #nofishnoblackfish #savethesrkw</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Brown K-1	<p>Can we please consider the impact that sonar has on marine wildlife. The damage that it is doing is well documented and acknowledged by the armed forces. In a time when we are fighting to save our marine life from so many threats this is one that we could instantly remove and help to reduce the great stresses currently placed on the marine mammals that we love so dearly.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Browning-1	Please have respect for our beautiful Pacific Northwest. What good is the strife for freedom if where we live is inhabitable because the Navy's need to play war games in our backyard. The F-18's have made it all but impossible to spend time outside in the this beautiful place. There has to be a place where the Navy can move there installations to better serve our great nation. Please do not renew the Navy's permits.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Browning-2	You have no respect for our community or the sea life that surrounds us. We live in a beautiful and historic place that should be preserved not used as a training grown at your discretion. You (The Navy) have already disrupted life, as we know it, by invading our community with jet noise. Now you want to use our water ways for battle training, shame on you. Why here, did every one else kick you out. Our eco system is very fragile and needs to be protected for future generations. I've been told to move if I don't like what the Navy is doing. I always thought the arm forces were here to protect our freedoms not take them away. Count me out for any support for the Navy in any and all endeavors.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/• The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org• The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr• The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology• The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Browning-3	Something I forgot in me initial comment. We spent a lot of time and a meager amount of money to landscape our property so as to enjoy it outside. We love siting around our fire pit and enjoying the quiet and nature around us. We have yet to spend an evening during the week enjoying our creation since the new, louder and more frequent F-18 flight schedule started. You have taken away the one thing at home that we love. It literally does not feel like home anymore. It was actually quieter living in the city. Now that I'm retired, I do not have the finances (or energy) to replicate this again even if I wanted to move. I know a lot of people that are or have moved because of your presents. Im STUCK with you and Im not happy about it. You, as a representative of are the armed forces, should be ashamed for the disruption in or community and financial hardships for	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	those that chose to leave their homes. Michael	
Bruce-1	Commission an independent study of the effects of sonar on marine mammals then abide by the recommendations of the study.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy's analysis in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS is in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.</p>
Bruels-1	<p>1.5 CJCSI 3500.01H emphasizes training as we fight. The Navy's Title 10 responsibilities require deploying forces that "are trained and ready for employment as joint capable forces." In DoDD 3222.04, EW policy states "Incorporate EW capabilities, tactics, techniques, and procedures into joint exercises and training regimes to the maximum extent possible. As the only Service with an airborne EW capability, the Navy should conduct airborne EW training, both for the Navy and Joint training and exercise. In past years, Whidbey squadrons conducted some training at Mountain Home AFB, working with the AF. They have also supported AF fighter squadrons, providing realistic conditions for them to hone their tactics. Now the intent seems to be to consolidate EW training primarily over the Olympic EW range, thus shrinking the instances of joint training and exercise — at a time when the EW (and cyber) threat to US Forces is growing. The rationale is to reduce cost and improve morale due to reduced travel. The \$5 million savings is a very small percent of the budget, and at the cost of diminished joint training opportunities, money poorly saved.</p> <p>2.2.3, 2.4.1.1 While conducting integrated EW training across naval platforms, both the consolidation of VAQ squadrons at Whidbey and the bulk of Growler EW training in the Olympic MOAs, the amount of joint training and exercise is actually declining. Since we fight jointly, it would seem that we would want to increase joint EW test, training, and exercise. Previous use of the MOAs at Mountain Home AFB provided some opportunities for joint engagement in addition to the annually scheduled exercises. Also, the consolidation ignores other training areas that don't</p>	<p>The training proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS is Basic Phase training, as described in Section 1.4.2.1 (Basic Phase) in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS. This training develops fundamental skills and is required before more advanced joint training can occur. For this Basic Phase training, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Nevada are not reasonable. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	negatively impact highly populated or wilderness areas to the same extent as those in the Northwest Training area (e.g., Mountain Home, Fallon). Based on the stated desire for “reduction of costs, and reduction of fossil fuel consumption,” it would seem that considering Mountain Home AFB (that the Navy has already used for training) would be a reasonable alternative to be considered.	
Bruels-2	<p>3.0.3, 3.0.3.1, 3.0.3.1.3, Appendix J, 3.4.1.7.4 Aircraft noise is identified as an acoustic stressor and then seemingly dismissed. The depiction of sound pressure levels (both in-water and airborne) were calculated using models to assess the impact on the Olympic MOAs. These data are then further expanded in Appendix J under a variety of aircraft scenarios, altitudes, etc. Recent real world studies (Impact of military flights on Olympic Peninsula Landscapes, Initial Summary of Findings, June 4, 2019; Lauren Kuehne, University of Washington’s College of the Environment) have added significant new data based on collection at multiple locations across (and beyond) the MOAs that appears to present a less dimmer view of the noise impacts. The Supplemental should not be approved before there is reconciliation between the Navy’s model-driven data and recent real world studies/measurements.</p> <p>3.4.1.7.4 Table 3.0-4 listed aircraft-produced in-water stressors, but there was no further discussion of impacts, or any analysis similar to Appendix J for in-water noise effects. Instead, in this section there is an extensive discussion on noise impacts on marine mammals — largely focused on the noise caused by shipping. There is no further discussion of aircraft noise on marine mammals. There is precedent for including such analyses as part of EAs/EISs (e.g., http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/permits/egtrr_ea-draft.pdf). Other studies have shown aircraft noise can result in an acoustic signature at depth. A new study will soon be starting that will measure this acoustic signature at a variety of depths associated with Growler takeoffs and landings at Whidbey Island NAS. This data, when combined with previous study results on the effects of vessel noise on killer whales should provide some useful insights. The Navy should include results of this impending study (and extrapolations thereof), as “best available science” in determining future sortie rates for the Growlers over the Olympic MOAs.</p> <p>3.12.3.2 Recent real world noise data diverges from the Navy’s model-driven data. The noise impacts on tourists extend beyond the borders of the Olympic MOAs. Data received by the NPCA’s Growler Tracker app, used by visitors to the Olympic National Park and environs tend to correlate quite closely to the data Kuehne’s study. The impacts within Olympic NP</p>	The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was released to the public before the Kuehne report was made available. The Navy has considered this report in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS (see Section 3.12 and Appendix J). The Navy will continue to use the best available science in its analyses of impacts.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	are exceptional because of what visitors expectations are for a world-class wilderness and one of the three quietest places in the country. Many visitors come for the quiet; several servicemen suffering PTSD have come to the park for the quiet and have been negatively impacted by the growing number of Growler flights. The Supplemental should not be approved until noise data is reconciled. The Navy should also work with the NPS and community leaders to optimize training to minimize the impacts on tourism.	
Bruha-1	The use of sonar tests is extremely harmful to marine wildlife, specially cetaceans. This cruel practice needs to be halted immediately for the sake of protecting the species that depend on their ability to use echolocation to hunt and sonar to communicate.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Brumer-1	We are at a critical point in climate change and ecosystem/biodiversity collapse and we cannot afford to release ANY more toxic compounds or additional harmful acoustics into our environment! Making smart long-term decisions for the sake of a livable planet is the most important thing we can do right now. Please not to release ANY heavy metals, depleted uranium, toxic chemicals, or harmful acoustics into the Puget Sound or any oceans.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Brummitt-1	Please do not continue underwater sonar testing! It is destructive to the local marine life, especially whales and dolphins. By negatively impacting the wildlife, you will also negatively impact all business that rely on these animals for eco tourism (such as whale watching). Of course, that is to say	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	nothing of the importance of biodiversity and the respect we need to have for who we share spaces with. Listen to the locals, your neighbors, and they will tell you NO.	EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Brunel-1	I am 100% against navy sonar testing. It is representating a big danger for marine wild life. It can lead to injury and death for many whales, dolphins and other marine life. "In January 2005, 34 whales of three different species became stranded and died along North Carolina's Outer Banks during nearby offshore Navy sonar training. Other sad examples around the coast of the U.S. and elsewhere abound, notably in recent years with more sonar testing going on than ever before." To protect wild life should be a priority. We co-exist together.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWTTC Final EIS/OEIS, and the "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June 2017)" (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents).
Bruns-1	Regarding the training flights out to and over Olympic National Park: National Parks were set aside for a purpose. They are there for the citizens (and visitors) to have the opportunity to enjoy our heritage, the undisturbed "wild" places that are left on earth. They are obviously very much disturbed by the noise of the jets. Living in Port Townsend, I am subject to the invasive, peace-disturbing, inescapable roar of the jets. I long to be able to go somewhere that still resembles what God created. I no longer have any idea where that would be (that I could get to). Many plan for months, travel at expense to reach a supposedly protected area, in order to experience the wonders and beauty of nature. The Navy has STOLEN this from them. Take your practice flights to designated MILITARY area, not to a designated national forest or national park that don't belong to you for that purpose.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTC Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Bryant-1	Please stop using sonar in the Salish sea, the Pacific Northwest in general, and please start to be mindful of the animals we share this planet with	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	when running your drills or practices. My dad recently retired after 30 years in the Navy, and I've always been so proud of that. However, as I get older and understand how little thought we as people give to the animals we share this planet with, I am ashamed to be human. The oceans do not belong to us to use as we "need" to deal with petty human crap. Do better.	and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bryson-1	I am completely against underwater sonar testing. It has been proven very harmful to vast forms of marine life. The creatures of our oceans deserve better than to die out and fade further toward extinction because of human negligence.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Bryzhatenko-1	Underwater sonar testing is very harmful for marine animals who utilize sound to find food and communicate with each other. It is unacceptable to run such testing, affecting these animals lives and chances of survival, especially knowing that they are in danger of going extinct, like Southern Residents Orcas.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Buck-1	Please see attached pdf document for comment.	No file was attached to the website comment.
Budner-1	I strongly object to the navy increasing its aircraft operations at the whidbey island naval base. The current aircraft operations already negatively impact the community enough with the noise, and specter of violence. This is the opposite of what a healthy community needs.	Growler noise on Whidbey Island is outside the scope of the NWTT EIS/OEIS. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Bullard-1	As a new homeowner in Port Townsend, I strongly oppose growler flights in the Olympic Peninsula! As a retired medical professional, Nurse Practitioner, I feel that the noise is extremely unhealthy for all of us living here. I understand the need for well trained pilots, but I strongly encourage to seek a different venue for this.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	This is very important! I appreciate your attention in this matter,	minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Bunker J-1	<p>The Navy war games and testing that include massive explosives and sonar is nothing new. What is new is the ramped up devastating "active sonar" the navy will be including in these war games and new EIS. AND there is a reason they need to RENEW their permits regularly regardless: Things change. Values change. Priorities change. Our oceans are ailing...</p> <p>"Active Sonar" is a sound blast at 200 decibels. Death by sound for a HUMAN is at 185 decibels. The destructive capacity for miles with that radius is a real and dire concern given the state of ocean health. The oceans are getting more ravaged each year, with garbage gyres growing annually, acidification and massive coral reef dye offs, our local lack of bull kelp and urchin infestation compromising sustenance abalone harvests, this year several humpbacks are getting stuck in the SF bay because they do not have the reserves to make the migration to northern waters; not to mention the fisheries-of-no-more all along the entire north coast. Just within the last 3 weeks, hundreds of Common Murres have washed up all along the Mendocino beaches. All ecosystems of the oceans—outside explicitly protected and very small reserves that are patrolled—are ailing, while an accelerated number of species are rapidly going extinct.</p> <p>Meanwhile, "Active Sonar" is a sound blast at 200 decibels. Death by sound for a HUMAN is at 185 decibels. The destructive capacity for miles with that radius is a real and dire concern given the state of ocean health. Business as usual has left too much destruction in its wake—thus WHY these permits need reviewing every few years. It is a built in safe-guard to human life and the well-being of the oceans in which environmental, social, and economic well being are intimately intertwined. Unless they hear from you these destructive permits will be issued.</p> <p>Please do not allow renewal of EIS for permits for navy training including ACTIVE SONAR activities off our coast!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Since sound in the air and sound underwater are measured on two separate scales (Sound Pressure Level is expressed in dB re 1 μPa for underwater sound and dB re 20 μPa for airborne sound), it is incorrect to compare the dB sound level of sonar in water to the dB sound level of noises through the air.</p>
Bunker R-1	<p>As being one of the services who saves our country who our country respects I just can't understand how you could put your issues above these animals who are endangered. I understand that you need to do sonar training but you do not mean to do it near aquatic wildlife unless you're intentionally doing it to see how it affects them and if you're doing that you are evil truly evil. I have two brothers one served in the Marines the other the air Force and I will never ever tell anybody to join the Navy ever. What you're doing is unethical wrong and you guys know it because you guys</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>have been doing it and all we need is for our animals are aquatic marine life are land mammals all of them to go extinct because of corporations like you cuz that's what you are as a corporation. You should get off your high horse and do what's right and leave these animals alone leave these orcas alone leave any other aquatic animal land animal alone because that's what they need to be is left alone especially from evil corporations like you because that is what I'm now deciding is that you're an evil corporation and nothing nothing else so I will be advocating as much as I can telling people do not join the Navy ever cuz I don't care what you guys have done now if you're willing to do something like this.</p>	<p>EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Burdette-1	<p>The Navy's EIS clearly indicates that the Southern Residents will be harmed by their testing and training activities, and this is not acceptable. Our Southern Residents need quiet in order to "hear" their prey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please be reminded that in 2003 during a training session, the J pod quit foraging and instead spent time and calories trying to leave the area instead of hunting and eating. • In pursuing these activities, the Navy violates the Endangered Species Act, which should be protecting the orcas. • The designation for the orcas' critical habitat is under review and the Navy should not be allowed to move forward until the designation is final. Please respect the Southern Resident Orcas' Endangered Species status and take steps to mitigate further harm. Please protect the critical habitat of the orcas and prohibit testing and training in these waters. Please ban sonar and explosives in these waters. I am concerned that the Navy should not engage in any activities that can harm marine life, especially the endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales. 	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Burdick-1	<p>I have lived almost all my life on the Olympic Peninsula, and consider it to be one of the most beautiful places in this country. Although much has changed since I was young - logging and increased tourist activity - I consider the Navy's use of this wilderness for their "training" program with Growlers to be totally inappropriate to this last remnant of what used to be a vast wilderness, home to a diverse range of plants and animals whose value to the health of our planet is still unknown.</p> <p>You ask for specific information. You must know that studies of impacts of Growlers on the animals in the affected area are only in their beginning stages. Definitive information - and that on only a small number of those impacts - will not be received until long after approval of this EIS. Effects of Growlers on marine mammals like whales are not yet studied, but it doesn't take a study to understand that their ability to communicate with each other is affected by these flights. They are already under threat in many ways; the Growlers add another stressor.</p> <p>Although we live a considerable distance from the "target" area of the Growlers, we hear them often. Our sympathies are with the people (and animals) who experience this assault on their lives over and over again. The Navy insists that we should accept this increase in Growler flights as part of their slogan, "the Sound of Freedom." I believe it is an arrogant and thoughtless act that will have irreversible negative consequences.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Burns-01	<p>I recommend that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the Navy clarify whether and how it incorporated uncertainty in its density estimates for its animat modeling specific to NWTT and if uncertainty was not incorporated, re-estimate the numbers of marine mammal takes based on the uncertainty inherent in the density estimates provided in Department of the Navy (2019) or the underlying references (Jefferson et al. 2017, Smultea et al. 2017, NMFS SARs, etc.). 	<p>The Navy did incorporate animal abundance and group size uncertainty when seeding the animats in the Navy's Acoustic Effects Model as was done with other Navy Phase III Training and Testing impact analyses. As discussed in Section 4.2 of Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017) marine mammals and sea turtles are distributed into simulation areas, and multiple iterations are run for each species to account for statistical uncertainty in the density estimates. Each iteration varies according to the standard error associated with the density estimate.</p>
Burns-02	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. the Navy (1) revise the various densities for (a) northern fur seals based on the abundance estimate from 2015 that includes data from Bogoslof Island, (b) Steller sea lions, California sea lions, Guadalupe fur seals, and elephant seals based on growth rates up to at least 2020, and (c) harbor seals in the Strait of Juan de Fuca and the San Juan Islands based on 46 rather than 37 percent of the animals being in the water at a given time based on Huber et al. (2001) and (2) re-estimate the numbers of takes accordingly in the final SEIS and its LOA application. 	<p>(a) We used the estimate provided by Bob DeLong/NMFS and did not integrate the 2015 data mentioned due to a volcanic eruption. The difference between the two abundance estimates and the resulting change in density is approximately a 3 percent increase.</p> <p>(b) The density estimates were historic numbers not future predictions based on when we performed the effort.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>(c) There were also specific haulout factors for other areas within the Study Area that gave lower estimates throughout the Inland Waters. Bob DeLong and Steve Jeffries concurred with the 37 percent.</p> <p>(2) No re-estimation required.</p>
Burns-03	3. the Navy provide the method(s) by which species specific densities were calculated for Western Behm Canal and cite the primary literature from which those data originated in Department of the Navy (2019) for the final SEIS, as well as all technical reports that underpin its density databases for future Phase III and IV DSEISs and DEISs.	<p>There were two primary sources of density data used to establish cetacean density estimates for Behm Canal:</p> <p>(1) U.S. Department of the Navy 2010 (Marine mammal occurrence/density report prepared in support of Navy activities at the Southeast Alaska Acoustic Measurement Facility), and</p> <p>(2) Density estimates derived by the National Marine Mammal Laboratory, Alaska Fisheries Science Center based on systematic surveys conducted in Southeast Alaska (e.g., Dahlheim et al. 2015).</p> <p>These sources were cited as appropriate in the species-specific sections of Department of the Navy (2019); methods by which species-specific density estimates were calculated are described in these reports.</p> <p>Multiple sources were used to establish pinniped density estimates for Behm Canal. All are cited as appropriate and methods described within the species-specific sections of Department of the Navy (2019).</p> <p><i>Department of the Navy. 2019. U.S. Navy Marine Species Density Database Phase III for the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area: Technical report. Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. 258 pages.</i></p>
Burns-04	4. The Navy refrain from using cut-off distances in conjunction with the Bayesian BRFs and re-estimate the numbers of marine mammal takes based solely on the Bayesian BRFs.	<p>The consideration of proximity (cut-off distances) was part of the criteria developed in consultation with NMFS and was applied within the Navy's acoustic effects model. Cut-off distances were used to better reflect the take potential for military readiness activities as defined in the MMPA.</p> <p>As stated in Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers), the derivation of the behavioral response functions and associated cut-off distances is provided in the technical report titled Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III).</p> <p>Briefly, much of the data used to derive the behavioral response functions was from nearby, scaled sources, thereby potentially confounding results since it is difficult to tell whether the focal marine mammal is reacting to the sound level or the proximity of the source and/or vessel amongst other potentially confounding contextual factors that are unlike actual Navy events</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		for which the BRF's are being derived. To account for these non-applicable contextual factors, all available data on marine mammal reactions to actual Navy activities and sound sources (or other large scale activities such as seismic surveys when information on proximity to sonar sources is not available for a given species group, i.e. harbor porpoises) were reviewed to find the farthest distance to which significant behavioral reactions were observed. These distances were rounded up to the nearest 5 or 10 km interval, and for moderate to large scale activities using multiple or louder sonar sources, these distances were greatly increased --- doubled in most cases. The Navy's BRF's applied within these distances is currently the best know method for providing the public and regulators with a more realistic (but still conservative where some uncertainties exist) estimate of impact and potential take under military readiness for the proposed actions within this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Burns-05	5. the Navy estimate and ultimately request authorization for behavior takes of marine mammals during all explosive activities, including those that involve single detonations.	As stated in Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives), the derivation of the explosive injury criteria is provided in the technical report titled Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III). This report was provided as supporting documentation to the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. There is no evidence to support that animals have significant behavioral responses to temporally and spatially isolated explosions that may rise to the level of 'harassment' under the MMPA for military readiness activities. The Navy has been monitoring detonations since the 1990s and has not observed these types of reactions. TTS and all other higher order impacts are assessed for all training and testing events that involve the use of explosives or explosive ordnance. All Navy's monitoring projects, reports and publications are available on the marine species monitoring webpage (https://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/).
Burns-06	6. the Navy in its final SEIS (1) explain why the constants and exponents for onset mortality and onset slight lung injury thresholds for Phase III have been amended, (2) ensure that the modified equations are correct, and (3) specify any additional assumptions that were made.	As stated in Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives) of the NWTT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the derivation of the explosive injury equations is provided in the technical report titled Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III).
Burns-07	7. the Navy use onset mortality, onset slight lung injury, and onset GI tract injury thresholds to estimate both the numbers of marine mammal takes and the respective ranges to effect.	The Navy used the range to 1 percent risk of mortality and injury (referred to as "onset" in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS) to inform the development of mitigation ranges for explosions. In all cases, the proposed mitigation ranges for explosives extend beyond the range to 1 percent risk of non-auditory injury, even for a small animal (representative mass = 5 kg). In the Draft

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has clarified that the “onset” non-auditory injury and mortality criteria are actually 1 percent risk criteria.</p> <p>Over-predicting impacts would occur with the use of 1 percent non-auditory injury risk criteria in the quantitative analysis. The Navy, in coordination with NMFS, has determined that the 50 percent incidence of occurrence is a reasonable representation of a potential effect. Rather, ranges to effect based on 1 percent risk criteria were examined to ensure that explosive mitigation zones would encompass the range to any potential mortality or non-auditory injury, affording actual protection against these effects.</p> <p>Although the commenter implies that the Navy did not use extensive lung hemorrhage as indicative of mortality, that statement is incorrect. Extensive lung hemorrhage is assumed to result in mortality, and the explosive mortality criteria are based on extensive lung injury data [See the technical report titled Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III)].</p>
Burns-08	8. the Navy use passive and active acoustic monitoring, whenever practicable, to supplement visual monitoring during the implementation of its mitigation measures for all activities that could cause injury or mortality beyond those explosive activities for which passive acoustic monitoring already was proposed—at the very least, sonobuoys that are expended and active sources and hydrophones that are used during an activity should be monitored for the presence of marine mammals.	<p>As discussed in Section 5.5.3 (Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Devices), there are significant manpower and logistical constraints that make constructing and maintaining additional passive acoustic monitoring systems or platforms for each training and testing activity impractical. The Navy’s existing passive acoustic monitoring devices (e.g., sonobuoys) are designed, maintained, and allocated to specific training units or testing programs for specific mission-essential purposes. Reallocating these assets to different training unit or testing programs for the purpose of monitoring for marine mammals would prevent the Navy from using its equipment for its intended mission-essential purpose. Diverting platforms that have integrated passive acoustic monitoring capabilities would impact their ability to meet their Title 10 requirements and reduce the service life of those systems. Furthermore, adding a passive acoustic monitoring capability to additional explosive activities (either by adding a passive acoustic monitoring device to a platform already participating in the activity, or by adding an additional platform to the activity) for mitigation is not practical. For example, all platforms participating in an explosive bombing exercise (e.g. firing aircraft, safety aircraft) must focus on situational awareness of the activity area and continuous coordination between multiple training components for safety and mission success. Therefore, it is impractical for participating platforms to divert their attention to non-mission essential tasks, such as deploying sonobuoys and monitoring for acoustic detections during the event (e.g., setting up a computer station). The Navy does not have available manpower or resources</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>to allocate additional aircraft for the purpose of deploying, monitoring, and retrieving passive acoustic monitoring equipment during a bombing exercise.</p> <p>As stated in Section 5.5.3 (Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Devices) of the Navy's 2019 Draft SEIS/OEIS, to develop an estimated position for an individual marine mammal, the animal's vocalizations must be detected on at least three hydrophones. As stated in Section 5.2.1 (At-Sea Procedural Mitigation Development), "Based on the number and type of passive acoustic devices that are typically used, passive acoustic detections do not provide range or bearing to a detected animal in order to determine its location or confirm its presence in a mitigation zone." The commenter took this sentence out of context to imply that the Navy indicated passive acoustic detections do not provide range or bearing to marine mammals in general. The Navy re-emphasizes that the passive acoustic monitoring devices typically used during its training and testing activities do not provide range or bearing to marine mammals, based on the number (e.g., one or two) and type of assets used.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 5.6.3 (Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring), although the Navy is continuing to improve its capabilities to use range instrumentation to aid in the passive acoustic detection of marine mammals, at this time it would not be effective or practical for the Navy to monitor instrumented ranges for real-time mitigation or to construct additional instrumented ranges as a tool to aid in the implementation of mitigation.</p>
Burns-09	9. Navy conduct additional pre-activity overflights, barring any safety issues (e.g., low fuel), before conducting any activities involving detonations.	As described in Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors) of the Navy's 2019 Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed a new mitigation for the Proposed Action requiring additional platforms already participating in explosive activities to support observations of the mitigation zone before, during, and after the activity while performing their regular duties. There are typically multiple platforms in the vicinity of activities that use explosives (e.g., safety aircraft). When available, having additional personnel support observations of the mitigation zone will help increase the likelihood of detecting biological resources.
Burns-10	10. the Navy conduct post-activity monitoring for activities involving medium- and large-caliber projectiles, missiles, rockets, and bombs.	As described in Section 5.3.3 (Explosive Stressors) of the Navy's 2019 Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed a new mitigation measure for the Proposed Action requiring the Lookout to observe the mitigation zone after completion of explosive activities. In accordance with the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS consultation requirements, the Navy currently conducts post-activity observations for some, but not all explosive activities. When developing mitigation for the 2019 Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy determined

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		that it could expand the requirement to other explosive activities for enhanced consistency and to help determine if any resources were injured during explosive events, when practical. If additional platforms are supporting an explosive activity (e.g., providing range clearance), those assets will assist in the post-event visual observation of the area where detonations occurred. The Navy will continue to follow the incident reporting procedures outlined in Section 5.1.2.2.3 (Incident Reports) if an incident is detected at any time during the event, including during the post-activity observations.
Burns-11	11. Navy (1) specify the total numbers of model-estimated Level A harassment (PTS) and mortality takes rather than reduce the estimated numbers of takes based on the Navy's post-model analyses and (2) include the model-estimated Level A harassment and mortality takes in its LOA application to inform NMFS's negligible impact determination analyses.	<p>As stated in Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.2.1.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Sonar and Other Transducers) and in Section 3.4.2.2.2.1 (Methods for Analyzing Impacts from Explosives), the consideration of marine mammal avoidance and mitigation effectiveness is integral to the Navy's overall analysis of impacts from sonar and explosive sources. Details of this analysis are provided in the technical report titled Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing.</p> <p>As discussed in the 2017 technical report titled Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing, animals in the Navy's acoustic effects model do not move horizontally or 'react' to sound in any way. The current best available science based on a growing body of behavioral response research shows that animals do in fact avoid the immediate area around sound sources to a distance of a few hundred meters or more depending upon the species. Avoidance to this distance greatly reduces the likelihood of impacts to hearing such as temporary and permanent threshold shift (TTS and PTS, respectively). Specifically, the ranges to PTS for most marine mammal groups are within a few tens of meters and the ranges for the most sensitive group, the HF cetaceans, average about 200 m, to a maximum of 270 m in limited cases; however HF cetaceans such as harbor porpoises, have been observed reacting to anthropogenic sound at greater distances than other species and are likely to avoid their zones to hearing impacts (TTS and PTS) as well.</p> <p>As discussed in the 2017 technical report titled Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing, the Navy's acoustic effects model does not consider procedural mitigations (i.e., power-down or shut-down of sonars, or pausing explosive activities when animals are detected in specific zones adjacent to the source) which necessitates consideration of these factors in the Navy's overall acoustic analysis. Credit taken for mitigation effectiveness</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		is extremely conservative. Not considering animal avoidance and mitigation effectiveness would lead to a great overestimate of injurious impacts. The NMFS has concurred with the analytical approach used.
Burton E-1	I love the Navy and all military however there needs to be a new process for testing that will not injure, harm or disrupt our beautiful sea creatures. We all live together on this amazing planet and truly need to help not hurt each other. There are so many intelligent scientists that work for our military who can perhaps come up with a solution that will NOT cause detrimental damage to other lives. All lives matter even our spectacular sea creatures. They do not have a voice so I hope in some way this does help them. Thank you for reading my opinion. God bless Emily	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Burton J-1	While testing is important, we as a people can't look past the dangers this poses to our environment. This is the only planet we have, so we have to protect it and keep it safe!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Bushatz-1	Whitby Island is already suffering enough from Naval activities. Please preserve the beauty and quit of the Olympic National Park and Olympic National Forest, Please move these important Growler activities to another location, preferably an existing training range.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Butler-1	I strongly disagree with underwater sonar testing. This testing has been shown to cause significant harm to marine life which rely heavily on their hearing for survival. Among the animal life at risk are the SRKW which are endangered.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Butow-1	<p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the Navy's Proposal to use the Olympic Peninsula designated as an International Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Site, as a training ground. What jumps out at me is how ironic it is that a place deemed a Sanctuary, meaning a place of safety and quietude, will now be decimated through constant noise, driving both human and wildlife inhabitants crazy!</p> <p>I am a 61 year old Washingtonian who raised a family here and took them on yearly expeditions to the Olympic Peninsula specifically to enjoy the quiet and nature at it's finest. This coming summer, I will be hosting foreign friends and our destination of choice is none other than the Olympic Peninsula. How can it be that the Navy whose very purpose is to protect the safety of the citizenry, is now proposing to trash a national refuge with overwhelming noise and pollution?</p> <p>The residents of Forks and surrounding areas have suffered enough. Although I am glad that logging of Old Growth has ceased, I empathize with the job loss and damage to families that this caused. Forks and surrounding residents have tried desperately to find alternative sources of revenue and tourism to the area is a main draw.</p> <p>I can assure you that if given a choice, tourists will avoid traveling, to and spending money in a place, that sounds like a war zone. Not to mention the impacts the Navy's actions will have on the myriad of wildlife that are supposedly protected in this refuge.</p> <p>As a Social Worker, I can tell you first hand about how noise affects people with Dementia, Depression, Anxiety, Sensory Integration Disorders and those on the Autism Spectrum. Loud noises startle victims of trauma, provoke those with stress-induced disorders and ignite those with short fuses. I don't think the Navy would want to be responsible for harming and traumatizing the very people it is here to protect.</p> <p>In sum, the only reasonable response is to extend the comment period and to adopt the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety).</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p>
C		
Caballero-1	<p>Sonar testing in the Salish Sea and Puget Sound is 100% unacceptable. Please please stop this as it is terribly damaging to an endangered group of orcas among many animals it is harming.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cabot-1	In December, the U.S. Navy discontinued training and testing activities within 12 nautical miles of Northern California's coastline from the Mendocino-Humboldt county line to the Oregon border following 3 ½ years of discussions with the ten Northern California Tribes that comprise the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council. These discussions were the result of a 2012 lawsuit over the National Marine Fisheries Service's failure to protect marine life and areas of cultural importance. Please finalize the decision to suspend training activities off of our coast. Protect the wildlife and respect the tribe. Thank you.	The Navy does not conduct training or testing within 12 nautical miles of the Northern California coastline.
Cain-1	Please STOP the harmful practice of sonar testing! As a Pacific Northwest Native, I am not only extremely concerned with the protection of Orcas (restoring their habitat and food source i.e. clean seas and bolstering the salmon population) but concerned with their vitality as well. And damage to their hearing caused by sonar testing is instrumental in propelling their endangerment. Please STOP contributing to their extinction by stopping Naval Sonar Testing. Thank you for hearing the public's Opinion and honoring this heartfelt plea.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cairns-1	I'm in utter shock that this has even been considered. We would never tolerate this on land why are we allowing them to mame our sea creatures. We have one ocean one lifetime. Is nothing sacred, does nothing matter. This is disheartening and a real shame if this is allowed to happen. The Orcas are already being starved because of our mismanagement of our oceans don't allow this to deafen them and thus not be able to communicate or fish basically killing the entire population. Just disgusting.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Calafiore-1	Dear sirs, there are so many device you can use alternatively. Please consider to not use this sonar, please think that the earth is suffer and we All need to save her.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Campbell C-1	I appreciate the need for testing, but not at the expense of the marine mammals that rely on their own sonar to navigate. This impacts their ability to live, find food, maintain contact, etc. We all know testing can be skewed to benefit whoever is doing the testing. We also know grey whales and orcas are having a hard time surviving. This is their environment. With the funding and ingenuity of the armed forces, I know you can find another way without further impacting Puget Sound, the Salish Sea. Please do so.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Campbell H-1	Pleas Do Not proceed with your plan to harm our coastlines,oceans and marine animals. Our environment is already under attack with the policies of the thug in chief. Have the consequences of these practices been adequately analyzed?	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Candiano-1	I have just learned of an EIS put out by the U.S. Navy on March 29, which is very disturbing to me. Please ask the Navy for another 14-day extension of the comment period so we can get the word out. Please stop this plan by the Navy. The training has been done elsewhere. It can be done elsewhere. Wild places are not empty places just waiting for an invasion by the military. Our national security must also include environmental security. The noise from multiple jet flights over the western and northern parts of	<p>The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the Peninsula will chase residents and visitors away. This will affect the health and economy of the Peninsula and the state of Washington. The search pattern of jet Growler flights looking for emitters would roar above the ocean beaches; the Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges; Washington State Department of Natural Resources land; Quinalt, Quileute and Hoh Reservations; and thousands of acres of private land, including the towns of Forks and Amanda Park.</p> <p>The Navy admits to 85–100 decibels of noise per pass. That is enough to cause hearing loss and contribute to other health problems. People in Forks have recorded 94 decibel flights under the current operations. While noise is known to affect people and no studies have been done on the iconic Olympic elk, it is not difficult to reason they would be similarly affected, being mammals of a similar weight.</p> <p>The military training in the Marine Sanctuary would do damage to the ocean beaches, the marine animals of the coast, the nesting areas of many of Washington's shorebirds, migrating whales, and the birds that use the Pacific Flyway. This degradation of the Olympic Peninsula's environment is unacceptable.</p> <p>For 112 years, Congress and presidents have set aside areas of the Peninsula to protect its valuable environment. Irreparable damage would be caused if the activities are done as stated in the Navy EIS/OEIS Mar 2019 Draft.</p>	<p>discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Cannon-1	I think this is awful, we need these fish, whales and dolphins to thrive in these waters or they will be gone forever! Please think about our future here on the West coast, it is so important!	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cant-1	<p>Leave the orca's habitat for good.</p> <p>They do not have other home besides the ocean.</p>	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Capellazzi-1	This is 100% intolerable! We need to protect and save the orcas!	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Capen-1	I am extremely concerned about the planned expansion of the Naval activities in this region. I am concerned not only about the significant impact on large aquatic mammals as outlined (e.g. thousands of incidence of disorientation and temporary deafness), but also the impacts on other species that are not as well studied or visible. The assumptions made by the Navy are questionable (see attached) and further study and mitigation, as well as more robust protections, are needed. Thank you.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Caputo-1	The inhabitants of our oceans are in enough distress without adding sonar testing to the list. We know this testing leads to hearing loss and worse for animals who rely on their voices and hearing to hunt for food and to communicate with their pods and family units. We wouldn't allow these sounds in our neighborhoods because they are so deafening; why should we allow them anywhere?	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Carbone-1	I respect and support our military. The purpose of our military is to protect and serve. Protection of all animals on earth should be included. This is torture and inhumane. We are better than this. We live in a great nation and we should be doing better. These animals deserve better. They're beautiful and majestic and important to our ecosystem and way of life. It's sad enough to know they are stolen from their homes for entertainment purposes and sold off to amusement parks, but to be torturing them in their home is terrible. I really hope the navy takes this message seriously. We are better and they deserve better. Let's be better.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Carlisle-1	I am 100% against sonar testing due to the harm it causes to creatures in our oceans.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Carlson N-01	Please see attached letter for my comments. Thank you. Norris Carlson	See responses below.
Carlson N-02	<p>1. Navy impacts on Southern Resident orcas were in fact recognized as an issue by the Orca Task Force in Washington state.</p> <p>The EIS inaccurately claims that “Navy actions were not the sources for any of the identified threats” in the report by the Southern Resident Orca Task Force (Office of the Washington Governor, 2018) (page 3.4-46).</p> <p>In fact, concerns about the Navy’s use of sonar equipment impacting the Southern Residents was raised in the very first Orca Task Force meeting (5/1/2018 meeting minutes). Recommendation 25 in the final report was “Coordinate with the Navy in 2019 to discuss reduction of noise and disturbance affecting Southern Resident orcas from military exercises and Navy aircraft.” It further continued: “The governor should meet with the U.S. Navy’s Commanding Officer for the region that includes Washington state to address the acoustic and physical impacts to Southern Resident orcas from Naval exercises in waters and air of Washington state. The governor should request the Navy participate on the Vessels working group in Year Two and identify actions to reduce the Navy’s impacts to Southern Resident orcas” (emphases added) (Office of the Washington Governor, 2018).</p> <p>In addition, potential impacts from Naval activities are recognized as a threat to Southern Resident orca survival and recovery in both the U.S. and Canada Southern Resident orca recovery plans.</p>	<p>The Task Force Final Report did not identify Navy sonar among the major threats. The major threats identified in the report are a lack of prey, disturbance from noise and vessel traffic, and toxic contaminants in the waters they inhabit. The Navy, as acknowledged by the Governor’s Task Force in 2018, was not previously requested to participate in the Task Force, and the Navy was not made aware of conversations held during meetings in 2018. The Navy has since been invited to take part and, as a result, a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Task Force’s working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor’s Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.</p>
Carlson N-03	<p>2. Given the small size of the endangered Southern Resident orca population today, and the fact that they travel in groups, harm to a single individual orca can easily mean a population-level effect.</p> <p>Each individual orca in the current population matters if the population is to avoid extinction. There has been a net loss of 12 individual Southern Resident orcas since 2011. The population has continued to decline since the 2015 NWTTS EIS. In 2016, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) declared that Southern Resident orcas are one of the marine species most at risk of extinction nationwide. The final EIS will need to be updated with</p>	<p>There are several sources of abundance numbers for marine mammal species. For consistency, the Navy uses abundance numbers of Southern Resident killer whales (as well as other marine mammal species) provided by NMFS in the most recent Stock Assessment Report. The Navy tracks this species closely and will continue to use the most recent available data.</p> <p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the latest number of Southern Resident orcas alive today, which is currently fewer than the 77 stated in the draft.</p> <p>The Draft EIS states that “the use of sonar and other transducers during training activities as described under Alternative 1 will result in the unintentional taking of killer whales incidental to those activities” (page 3.4-190). The EIS Fact Sheet Booklet states that 99.84% of all estimated takes of marine mammals would be Level B harassment, disrupting natural behavior patterns such as feeding, surfacing, nursing, breeding, sheltering or migration to those point where those patterns are abandoned or significantly alter. These—and especially feeding, breeding, and nursing—are all critical activities for the Southern Resident orcas now, given that they have produced only two surviving calves in the last three years, two orcas are visibly emaciated, and nutritional stress is recognized as a primary threat to the population. Up to 69% of all detectable pregnancies between 2008 and 2014 were unsuccessful, and low availability of Chinook salmon appeared to be a significant cause of late pregnancy failure (Wasser et al. 2017); Level B harassment by Navy activities that interferes with both feeding and breeding or displaces orcas from preferred foraging areas is of significant concern and will further contribute to the Southern Resident orcas’ low reproductive success.</p> <p>Table 3.4-40 in the EIS estimates two behavioral impacts to Southern Resident orcas per year from sonar and other transducers. It is unclear whether that means just two individual orcas will likely be affected; if so, we question whether that is realistic given that pods of orcas travel together. We are particularly concerned about new and increased impacts to Southern Resident orcas from mine explosives, which can cause injury or death, and the use of mid-frequency sonar, which can impact other marine mammals out to 16 km offshore. wildlife within 2,000 square miles – well outside the reasonable area that marine mammal observers are able to survey to record marine mammal sightings and initiate mitigation measures. In fact, military exercises have been documented to impact orcas right here in the Salish Sea.</p> <p>In a population with strong family ties, the loss of one orca also directly affects the others’ chance of survival. When a female resident orca dies, it increases the mortality risk of her male offspring under age 30 by 3.1 times, and the mortality risk of her male offspring over age 30 by 8.3 times (Foster et al. 2012). In late 2018 and early 2019, for example, it was reported that male Southern Resident orca K25 was observed to be doing poorly after the death of his mother, K13.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>3. There are documented cases in this region of U.S. and Canadian naval activities, including active sonar training and explosive testing, causing direct harm to the Southern Resident orcas.</p> <p>In 2003, an active sonar training exercise conducted by the U.S. Navy in the eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca and Haro Strait caused one of the Southern Resident killer whale families (J pod) to stop foraging and exhibit abnormal behaviors and movement, change direction multiple times, and group together in shallow water where they are at increased risk of stranding. In a video recording of the incident, sonar can clearly be heard above the water. More recent incidents involving testing of sonar and explosives by the Canadian Navy in Southern Resident orca habitat are examples of the potential impact of the activities proposed in this EIS. A juvenile Southern Resident female was stranded in 2012 with evidence of trauma consistent with an explosion or high-pressure impact, a week after the Canadian Navy had been conducting sonar exercises in the region. An exact cause of death was not determined, but experts in underwater noise who continue to review her case believe that the most likely cause of death was an underwater military explosion. In 2017, explosives detonated by the Canadian Navy near a group of Southern Residents (L pod) caused the whales to group together suddenly and flee the area. These examples show that just one incident of training and testing activities impacting Southern Residents can cause significant harm, death, or displacement from preferred habitat.</p>	
Carlson N-04	<p>4. Other agencies and operators are taking new, meaningful steps to reduce noise and disturbance affecting Southern Resident orcas. The Navy must also increase its protections, or it will become responsible for a larger share of the cumulative impact and potentially negate some of the benefits of the other actions being taken.</p> <p>In 2019, Washington state has taken big steps to reduce impacts on Southern Resident orcas from other vessel types, recognizing that noise and disturbance have significant adverse consequences for this endangered population. In May 2019, Governor Inslee signed into law a bill that increases the distance that vessels must stay away from the Southern Residents and enacts a 7-knot speed limit within a half nautical mile of these orcas. The legislature also allocated funding for a new hybrid ferry and funding to convert some ferries to hybrid-electric power. Washington State Ferries is also doing a baseline noise inventory and developing solutions to address noise and frequencies of concern. Meanwhile, in 2019, voluntary ship slowdowns will continue and expand for the third year</p>	<p>The Navy is fully aware of the plight of the Southern Resident killer whales. In 2019 a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Governor's Southern Resident Killer Whale Task Force working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales.</p> <p>The Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals in areas that are particularly important for biological life processes, such as feeding and migration.</p> <p>Procedural mitigation measures already in place and proposed to continue include ceasing activities that could be harmful to marine mammals when marine mammals are detected within defined mitigation zones.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	through the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority-led Enhancing Cetacean Habitat and Observation (ECHO) Program – a Canadian program that directly benefits Southern Resident orcas in the inland waters. The Navy should increase its own mitigation efforts so that there is still a significant net benefit to the Southern Residents in terms of reduced noise and disturbance when all these other entities are increasing their protective measures.	The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.
Carlson N-05	5. The designation for Southern Resident orca critical habitat is likely to change later this year. The Navy should not make final decisions about training and testing in the potential new critical habitat areas off the coasts of Washington, Oregon and California until this designation has been made. NMFS has committed to proposing a rule with an expanded designation of critical habitat off Washington, Oregon and California by early October 2019 – an area encompassed by the NWTT range. Advancing this EIS now for activities in an area that is on the cusp of being designated as critical habitat is irresponsible. The Navy should wait until NMFS makes its final designation for expanded critical habitat before pursuing activities that would adversely affect the area. Changes in the Navy's mitigation measures are likely to be necessary so that the proposed action does not "result in destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat."	The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Carlson N-06	6. Recent variations in Southern Resident orca presence in the Salish Sea are complex and should not be an excuse for exercising less caution in the inland waters. The EIS states that "foraging during the spring in Salish Sea by Southern Resident killer whales has declined in recent years as they shift their range and forage for Chinook salmon or other prey species elsewhere in response to reduced prey availability in that historically used inland waters foraging area" (p. 3.4-26). Even spending time elsewhere, Southern Resident orcas are not getting enough food and are showing signs of malnutrition. The inland waters foraging area is still critically important if they are going to survive and thrive. In recognition of this fact, state and federal governments are actively working to restore salmon populations in the inland waters. It is difficult to predict orca presence on a long-term or even annual basis, and the Navy should not assume that the shift outside of the Salish Sea in the spring and summer is a permanent change. The Southern Resident orcas are still sighted in the Salish Sea frequently. In fact, Olson et al. 2018 noted that K and L pods have been increasing the duration of their stay in the inland waters by staying in the Salish Sea through the fall and into the early winter. The Navy should consult with	The statements quoted from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS are part of an establishment of the environmental baseline the Navy then uses to estimate potential impacts resulting from the Navy's activities. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The commenter incorrectly asserts that the Navy suggests that protective measures in the Salish Sea are less important; however, the Navy has not suggested that and does not consider that to be true. The mitigation measures developed for both NWTT Inland Waters and the NWTT Offshore Area for the Proposed Action represent an increase over the mitigation developed for the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>orca biologists to gather other recent information, in addition to reviewing recent published literature on Southern Resident orca presence in the Salish Sea.</p> <p>The EIS implies that changes in the Southern Residents' presence in the Salish Sea mean that protections there are less important than they used to be. In fact, it should be reason for an extra layer of caution. Reducing noise and disturbance in the heavily-trafficked inland waters could enable the Southern Residents to forage there more effectively and therefore spend more time there as they have historically. Recent information on foraging locations should not be interpreted as a reason to decrease or discontinue mitigation efforts to avoid impacts to Southern Residents in the Salish Sea. Additionally, the Navy should consider that when the Southern Resident orcas are not in inland waters, they are likely to be in their offshore area, which is subject to additional training and testing activities that do not occur in the Salish Sea. The Navy should consider additional mitigation and monitoring in the orcas' offshore habitat given the potential increased use of this area and the unique activities—such as active sonar—that take place in this portion of the NWTT range.</p>	
Carlson N-07	<p>7. The EIS should include two additional studies related to impacts on Southern Resident orcas: Wieland et al. 2010 and Emmons et al. 2019. Wieland, M., A. Jones, and S. C. P. Renn. 2010. Changing durations of Southern Resident killer whale 23 (<i>Orcinus orca</i>) discrete calls between two periods spanning 28 years. <i>Mar. Mam. Sci.</i> 26(1):195–201. This study found that the Southern Residents make a behavioral adjustment as a result of vessel noise, as measured through an increase in mean durations of discrete calls. "Because they are adjusting their vocal behavior, we must consider the very real possibility that engine noise is hindering their ability to communicate, and may well impact their efficiency at using acoustics to forage and navigate, as well" (Wieland et al. 2010). These findings should be incorporated into 3.4.2.1.1.4 on masking (page 3.4.103, which talks about other species but not killer whales) and into the odontocete discussion on page 3.4-120.</p> <p>Emmons, C.K., M.B. Hanson, and M.O. Lammers. 2019. Monitoring the occurrence of Southern Resident killer whales, other marine mammals, and anthropogenic sound in the Pacific Northwest. Prepared for: U.S. Navy, U.S. Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, HI. Prepared by: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Northwest Fisheries Science Center under MIPR N00070-17-MP-4C419. 25 February 2019. 23p.</p> <p>This report states that there were 148 mid-frequency active sonar events</p>	<p>Wieland et al., 2010 was incorporated in Section 3.4.1.7.4 of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS as recommended by the commenter.</p> <p>The Navy-funded research presented in Emmons et al. 2019 was considered in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, but the report was not cited because it was still in the process of being edited by the authors and had not been finalized. The report has since been finalized and is cited in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy does not frequently conduct training or testing activities in the location of the Cape Flattery Offshore hydrophone since that area is highly utilized by commercial vessel traffic, making it an undesirable location for the Navy to conduct activities, especially sonar training or testing.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>detected between 2011 and 2017, with the peak overlapping with occurrence of the three killer whale communities (including Southern Residents). This is concerning because, as the EIS states, exposure to mid-frequency sonar has been directly linked to separation of a killer whale calf from its group (page 3.4-102); the separation and loss of a single calf would be a serious blow to the small population, given that there are so few calves and the southern residents have had limited reproductive success in recent years. Exposure to mid-frequency sonar has also been directly linked to mass strandings of cetaceans (page 3.4-127). In addition, the EIS states that newer high-duty or continuous active sonars have more potential to mask vocalizations, particularly for mid-frequency cetaceans like killer whales, and “longer-term consequences could include potential decrease in recruitment” (p. 3.4-102). The Southern Resident orcas cannot afford any further decrease in their already very low recruitment rates. The findings from Emmons et al. 2019 regarding seasonal use of different offshore areas by Southern Resident orcas and other whales should also be used to minimize adverse impacts by shifting sonar and explosives testing and training by season and by location.</p>	
Carlson N-08	<p>8. New whale report alert systems should be used for real-time monitoring and early warnings to build on the limited capacity of lookouts. The Navy should explore the use of newly available apps and technology that provide real-time information on whale presence in the Salish Sea and along the coast. Using this technology could expand the ability of the Navy’s marine mammal observers to be aware of and respond to the presence of Southern Resident orcas. For example, the Whale Report Alert System (WRAS), developed by the British Columbia Cetacean Sightings Network, alerts mariners to the presence of whales so that mitigation measures may be enacted to reduce the risk of disturbance and collision. Orca Network, Whale Scout, and other organizations in Washington also contribute to a Whale Sighting Network with close to real-time reporting in the Salish Sea.</p>	<p>The Navy developed new mitigation for Navy biologists to initiate communication with the appropriate marine mammal detection networks in NWTT Inland Waters prior to conducting explosive mine neutralization activities involving the use of Navy divers, Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training, Civilian Port Defense – Homeland Security Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Exercises, and Small Boat Attack Exercises. This mitigation will help the Navy plan activities in a way that minimizes the potential for exposure of Southern Resident killer whales, as described in Section K.3.3 (Mitigation Areas for Marine Species in NWTT Inland Waters). The Navy will also continue to assess the practicality of other available monitoring techniques as technologies advance.</p>
Carlson N-09	<p>9. Additional information is needed on the anticipated timing of the proposed activities. The EIS should detail the times of year during which the proposed activities will take place. The Southern Resident orcas have exhibited seasonality in their movements, and information from tagging studies, coastal surveys, and passive acoustic monitoring allows some degree of prediction for when and where they may be traveling and foraging. Any overlap in their seasonal movements and the Navy’s testing and training activities will</p>	<p>As stated in Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities), because of the nature of training and testing requirements for forces that must be ready to deploy at all times, activities could occur throughout the year. The duration of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS is for the foreseeable future, while the Marine Mammal Protection Act permits would be in place for seven years.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	increase impacts on these species. Information about timing should be made public in the EIS and the Navy should seek to adjust the timing of their activities to minimize such overlap.	
Carlson N-10	10. The intended duration of the EIS is not clear. This EIS is unclear as to the duration of the planned activities. A change in the 2019 Naval Defense Authorization Act extended the Navy's authorization for marine mammal take and harassment under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) from five to seven years. It is not stated in this EIS whether the proposed activities were analyzed for impacts over a five-year time period or for the extended seven-year time period.	The duration of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS is for the foreseeable future. The analysis would remain valid unless the Navy makes substantial changes in the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns, or there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts. The Marine Mammal Protection Act permits would be in place for seven years.
Carlson N-11	11. Increasing the Navy's testing and training activities at this time is counter to what the endangered Southern Resident orcas need right now to have a chance at recovery. Without bold and immediate actions, the Southern Residents are likely to go extinct within our lifetimes. Everything we can do now to protect the Southern Resident orcas is critical. In a time when we should be taking action to address and decrease threats facing the population, including reducing noise and disturbance, the Navy's proposed activities increase the risks from ocean noise, vessel strike and disturbance, potential direct harm and injury to Southern Resident orcas, and displacement from preferred habitat. The Navy must consider the current crisis facing the endangered Southern Resident orcas and make new adjustments in its testing and training activities. Despite being listed under the Endangered Species Act for nearly 14 years, this unique population is not recovering and is continuing to decline. It is obvious that status quo actions, including the Navy's training and testing activities, are not serving the Southern Resident orcas. Given their highly endangered status and continuing decline, the Navy should be considering how to reduce impacts and increase protections for Southern Resident orcas.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Carlson P-1	My name is Peter Carlson, and I am a farmer, small businessman, property owner, and community member here on Orcas Island in beautiful San Juan County, Washington State. I am writing to express my concern over the US Navy's plans to increase the scale of operations in our region both of the existing Navy Growler practice flights from the Naval Air Station on Whidbey Island, WA and the proposed build-up of an anti-submarine training program as described in the document. What the analysis is not taking into account is this region's reliance on the economic benefits of our beautiful natural environment, where the vast	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include aircraft flights in the vicinity of Orcas Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	majority of commerce in this county is generate from tourists who are coming to enjoy our outdoor activities and sightseeing. These activities include whale and bird watching, camping, fishing, hiking, boating, and outdoor sports, all of which will all suffer from the proposed increase in the Navy's environmentally destructive plans. Your own analysis outlines a number of adverse side effects from these activities. Your plans jeopardize my livelihood and the livelihood of our entire community, which for the last century has struggled to find and establish a delicate balance with our ecosystem here that takes into account both the needs of people and our natural flora and fauna in this beautiful region. Your document makes little to no mention as to the effects of these proposed Navy activities on our tourist based economy.	
Carlson R-1	Please accept this letter as public comment concerning potential environmental impacts associated with conducting proposed ongoing and future training and testing activities within the NWTT Study Area. I strongly oppose the Navy using active sonar and explosives at sea. The potential harm to the ocean and marine life outweighs any benefits of the testing. Recent reports about ocean acidification, species extinction, climate upset, and other environmental imbalances are alarming and indicate that natural resource conservation and preservation must take priority over consumption, development, and pollution. In today's local paper, the Associated Press reported that "an unusual number of gray whales are washing up dead on West Coast beaches NOAA Fisheries ... declared the die-off an 'unusual mortality event.'" The use of active sonar and explosives at sea for Navy military exercise is an extravagant example of consumption and pollution and poses potentially significant harm to marine life and the ocean ecosystem. The oceans, marine life, the environment, in general, have been imperiled because of human activity. The federal government, generally speaking, lacks credibility when making claims about the need for U.S. military action of any kind and, furthermore, because of U.S. military actions, Americans at home- and abroad are substantially less safe than ever. In short: the Navy testing program is not justified.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Carman-1	i moved to the olympic peninsula 11 yrs ago for peace and quiet. i live on 20 acres very very close to the olympic nat'l park. all day, what i hear now, are growlers flying in the same stupid circle over and over and over and over and over and over again. today, i'm getting very shaken as it's incredibly disturbing. there is a big huge ocean just west of here that the	Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	growlers could fly in the same circles over and over and over and not disturb so many residents. i know, the gov't employees, officials, and politicians do not at all care. i also know that we can all count on all levels of gov't to be consistent at one thing; that is to significantly decrease our quality of life in as many aspects as possible. sooooooooooooo many jets flying over head very frequently now. the nat'l park is suppose to be a quiet place. it no longer is. it has LOUD jet noise all day most every day. i moved here first then the gov't decided to ruin my life. there's not just an ocean right next door to practice your flying in circles, there's a big open desert just east of here. move your training there. we despise you.	<p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Carpenter G-1	Our country has so much sparsely populated open space there is no good reason to practice over a national park. The gunnery range in Arizona is an example of a usable site. the full length of the Rocky Mountains provides similar terrain with thousands of miles of open space. If you want to practice for a desert or seacoast environment is Las Vegas or Miami likely sites? All these available places are within minutes of travel for the Growler. Why pick very special places that are designated as unique to ruin. Is it attention seeking or punishment for voting Democratic ?	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Arizona, Las Vegas, or Miami are not reasonable. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Carpenter S-1	First I want to say that I appreciate the Navy and the protection it provides to our country. However, I find it ironic that the things we value most are	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	being threatened by the same group that protects us. The Olympic National Park holds many special features that cannot be found in other areas, one of which is the noted quiet and lack of traffic and airplane noise. It is becoming more difficult to find such rare treasures and I feel strongly that this one should be saved from noise pollution. Surely there are other areas that can serve as training locations that would be less offensive to those of us who value tranquility and natural beauty.	<p>the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Carpio-1	Cruelty is cruelty. I am against it.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Carr R-1	Please STOP the sonar testing in the ocean! We are not only losing hundreds of cetaceans a day but thousands around the globe from sonar testing. What have we become to not consider these magnificent beings that are being killed as just nothing but a fish 🐟 Please stop so our oceans and the families that call it home are safe. Thank you	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Carr W-1	<p>The Olympic Peninsula in general, and specifically the Olympic National Park is a popular destination for many individuals and groups intending to enjoy the quiet and peacefulness of this special area, recognized as a World Heritage Site. The noise intrusion really does not belong, and everything that can be done to reduce or eliminate the planned exercises and resulting levels of noise, should be done.</p> <p>There should be close monitoring of noise levels, carried out or verified by independent third parties, with results made public. After all, the Olympic National Park is a public institution, owned and funded by the American citizenry and their tax dollars!! We do not deserve to have the privilege of</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	visiting one of the quietest national parks undermined. There are other alternatives for these exercises and they must be considered. And when considering the impacts of these exercises, the Draft SEIS MUST consider not only the Military Operations Area noted, but ALL areas of the Olympic Peninsula which are impacted by the flight patterns employed, including transit flights to and from NAS Whidbey Island.	Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness. In Appendix J, the Navy considered the noise impacts resulting from aircraft transiting into the Olympic MOA.
Carty-1	This must not happen.All marine life is at risk.It has been proven that these test cause whales and other sea life to beach.It must stop	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Carvalho C-1	I am completely against navy sonar testing due to its known harms to marine mammals in proximity.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Carver-1	The Navy's underwater sonar practices are dangerous and harmful to Southern Resident Orcas. According to studies, "for mammals that use sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival". I am against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cascario-1	The upcoming sonar testing has not been properly supported with sufficient evidence. Particularly; there has not been a showing that the testing will not negatively impact whales. The current proposal is arbitrary and capricious for lack of scientific support.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Casellas-1	This sonar testing in the Salish sea is yet another step in the continued degradation of this critical habitat. Species, such as the orcas- specifically the southern resident killer whales- need increased protection and sonar is scientifically proven to interrupt their behavior. Other common species (harbor porpoise, transient killer whales, humpbacks, etc.) are just as effected by the testing. A stop must be put to this effort for not only the future of the species in the Salish sea, but the millions of people who depend on the sea for their livelihoods and recreation. There must be a stop to the navy sonar testing.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Casey-1	Sonar testing in the Salish Sea is utterly unacceptable!!! Un-American. Horrible. Protect our orcas. Please.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Casscles-1	God bless our navy flyers and keep them safe. I have lived and been in the mountains of New York state as well as other parts of our great country and the sound of freedom has never bothered me, keep up the good work. Our best wishes to all of you who keep our country free. Ron and Sandy Casscles	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Cassee-1	I strongly urge the Navy and the national Marine fisheries service to not move forward with this latest proposal for testing that will threaten the health and well-being of the Pacific North West Marine environment. There are already a multitude of stressors having significant negative impact on our marine environment. Declining populations of orca, and whales beaching themselves are just two immediate examples. There is no question that these animals require our protection. There is also no question that underwater sonar testing negatively affects marine creatures. That makes it an excusable. Period.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Time to use our ingenuity and resources to find a gentler alternative. Anything else is inexcusable.	
Castillo-1	Due to the known harm underwater sonar testing inflicts on marine animals, I am 100% against it. The SRKW are already starving with the lack of food supply, please do not cause more harm to them.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Catroll-1	Please stop northwest training and testing. Is it really necessary to harm endangered animals? The sound causes irreversible damage, stress, deafness to death to any animal that uses sonar. Instead of destroying not only their home and their only means of communication and navigation stop testing and find a way to preserve them and oceans. Whales and dolphins and other marine life have a hard enough time surviving man. Please don't add more tragedy to the mix.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cavallin-1	This is not right. Why are we willing to harm these animals? Is it worth it? Would you like it be done to you?	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Ceazan-1	I am opposed to a plan by the U.S. Navy to begin treetop high training missions over the area from the Hood Canal to the ocean over some of the most sensitive and significant areas of Washington State. Idaho and Nevada training areas are designed for warfare training the Olympic Peninsula is not. It will disturb visitors to and the wildlife of, Olympic National Park. It includes International Biosphere Reserve and a World heritage Site.	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTS Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Nevada are not reasonable. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Celani-1	We need to preserve and respect the home of other species. Humans do not own everything. Humans have to stop being entitled to do whatever they want and think there are no consequences. We were put on this earth to share it with other species and not destroy it. Have respect for living life no matter what shape or form. We will one day realize this when there is nothing left! It will be too late!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Celik-1	I am 100% AGAINST underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals !!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Chadd-1	<p>A resident of Port Angeles, WA, I am involved with advocacy and education on behalf of our Southern Resident Orcas. The J, K and L pods of the Salish Sea are on the decline; only 76 remain.</p> <p>Aircraft noise and sonic booms have been implicated as a cause of lowered reproduction in a variety of animals. Both high and low frequency noise have negative impacts on whales' ability to navigate and identify food. The carbon dioxide in jet exhaust acidifies the water, damaging the web of marine life that sustain salmon, the orca's primary food source.</p> <p>Additionally, chemical compounds from the Navy's fire retardant, already in Whidbey's aquifer, enter Puget Sound as surface runoff. These effects, taken together, will further stress the pods and may make the difference between survival and extinction. The potential risk of further harm to these critically endangered orcas is reason enough to deny the expansion of naval training operations in our area.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Chambers-1	<p>All I can say is that I cannot support what the Navy intends to do.. As intelligent as they are, this is a gross lack of the fact that the Navy did not adequately analyze the huge impacts on biological resources..</p> <p>Please think about how serious this would be on the life in the waters you will affect.</p> <p>Please</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Chamblin-1	Sonar testing is deleterious to cetaceans.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Chandler D-1	The Southern Resident Orcas deserve to live in a healthy, undisturbed environment. They are wild symbols of the Northwest and bring tourist revenue to the area that exceeds 65 million dollars per year. Please do not add to the list of things that are terrorizing these beautiful and important creatures.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Chandler R-1	I have ptsd and use a service dog. The noise severely stresses me and interferes with my service dogs duties. I have also observed and noted stress and behavior changes to the wildlife.	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude.</p> <p>2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year).</p> <p>3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day.</p> <p>4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.</p>
Chandler R-2	This is an area that should be 100% in its natural state. That means no noise from you. It harms wildlife and people with ptsd.	See response above.
Chantler-1	Why is this happening? There is plenty of evidence that plainly shows cetaceans suffer and die due to sonar testing. STOP IT NOW!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Charbonneau -1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's EIS clearly indicates that the Southern Residents will be harmed by their testing and training activities, and that this is not acceptable. Our Southern Residents need quiet in order to "hear" their prey. • in 2003 during a training session, the J pod quit foraging and instead spent time and calories trying to leave the area instead of hunting and eating. • In pursuing these activities, the Navy violates the Endangered Species Act, which should be protecting the orcas. • The designation for the orcas' critical habitat is under review and the Navy should not be allowed to move forward until the designation is final. 	The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Please stop trying to get around compliance of environmental issues and be respectful for once.	<p>The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p>
Charest-1	The Navy has known for a long time that sonar affects whales. It screws up their ability to even find food, so they starve. The amount of whales that have washed up on shore already this year tells us, as citizens, that the Navy is doing more sonar games. If whales were to become extinct because of your actions it would have a huge impact on all other life in the oceans (it already does) Science has proof that the ocean would lack oxygen and die. So why are you still playing your war games and killing the ocean? I am stunned by the Navy's lack of responsibility for LIFE. This needs to change, pretending you are protecting us while killing the oceans just doesn't work. We, nor our planetary home, can't live without water.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cheston-1	<p>Please stop acting like the mega-corporation you have become and be a 1,000% better steward of our planet.</p> <p>You share this earth with all of us. Why are you knowingly destroying it, piece by piece. Water, air-space, national park, all of it. It is totally egregious, horrific.</p> <p>I had to move from Coupeville to Greenbank because of the untenable jet noise.</p> <p>Thanks. I used to be proud of our Navy. Now I hate it. You have become a money-making machine. It is not about war, it's about money.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Chickman-1	<p>Regarding the Naval proposal for Northwest Training and Testing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I strongly request that you select the NO ACTION Alternative for Growler jet testing on the Olympic Peninsula. The cumulative negative impacts are unacceptable. 2. Please extend the comment period to be for 90 days. <p>I have many concerns that the proposed naval Growler testing over Olympic National Park, residential areas, and inside the Washington coastal waters of the Pacific Ocean will adversely affect our lands, waters, wildlife, and personal lives in the norwestern corner of Washington State. Please stay where you have done your training for decades. Please stop considering conducting naval warfare games and use of Olympic National Park, our national marine sanctuaries, national forests, and private/personal lands. We who live here on the peninsula do not want to live under training jets all day long...we do not want the use of sonar to impair our ocean animals...we do not want tourist business to be impacted...we do not want to harm the endangered bird species (such as the Marbled Murrelet) who are already living under pressure of habitat loss.</p> <p>Please select the NO ACTION Alternative of the EIS.</p> <p>Thank you for allowing me to comment.</p>	<p>The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p> <p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year. When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Chil-1	<p>Sonar testing underwater needs to stop. You do this several times a year, creating chaos in the water and damaging the animals which live in the area. They were there first. Are there other ways to test your systems without blasting it in the water?</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Choraliev-1	<p>Please stop the underwater sonar testing, it's killing the marine mammals or harm them to kill themselves.</p> <p>A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas.</p> <p>"For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival," Calambokidis said.</p> <p>Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations.</p> <p>Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Christensen L-1	<p>I am apposed to the navy expansion. Our environment can't take this ! Very concerned about the impact on our marine life.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Christensen R-1	<p>This is the most egregious, ignorant, condemnable, evil action, along with all others that violate the sanctity of life, given to us by our Creator. This is heinous, torturous murder that were you committing it directly against humans, it would be worthy of the death penalty.</p> <p>These beings are no less God's children and creations than we are. They predate us, in some cases by millions of years.</p> <p>This complete and utter disregard for life is nothing less than genocidal.</p> <p>And, in effect, you are committing these atrocities against humanity, as</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>well.</p> <p>Not only does the science back this up, but so does sacred Scripture. The earth and all in it are His. Period.</p> <p>You commit these atrocities against our Creator, in every way and degree you commit them against these living beings.</p> <p>Our human, bullish arrogance is the ultimate atrocity, acting without conscience, in immoral denial of your culpability and accountability.</p> <p>Every hand is bloody.</p> <p>Every hand that takes part in this is as bloody as Pontius Pilate.</p> <p>There is no "passive" participation here. None.</p> <p>Every. Man and woman is guilty.</p> <p>There is one Judge you will not escape. The same we all must face.</p> <p>You will answer for this, perhaps not in this life, but assuredly in the next.</p>	
Christenson-1	<p>I am against the sonar testing! This is disruptive to the sea life and their way of life and communications! Man has to find other ways to do what they want done and not at the expense of our sealife!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Christophi-1	<p>The proposal to implement sonar testing in the Salish Sea would be extremely detrimental to marine mammals, including harbour porpoises and orcas. The Southern Resident Orcas are already critically endangered, numbering only 76. Sound is vitally important to them. There are videos showing orcas in extreme distress and trying to flee the noise from sonar testing. The Navy itself has stated that sonar testing causes hearing loss in marine animals. This proposal threatens the survival of a species who depend on their hearing; thus making this testing totally irresponsible. Our seas are in crisis. Maintaining a healthy balance of apex predators is crucial. Over 50% of the oxygen we all breathe is generated by the sea. Please do not implement this destructive testing.</p> <p>Thank you for your time on this matter</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Chute-1	<p>Your Northwest Training and Testing will do irreparable harm to many marine mammals some of them in the endangered category. Please find an alternative to This planned testing.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Cincilla-1	<p>According to experts, this testing you are proposing could be catastrophic to our marine life. Causing generational damage, and perhaps even killing off entire species.</p> <p>The technology you're testing is impressive, but the testing of it in our near waters is not a reasonable choice.</p> <p>I object to your planned testing. It's too dangerous to these creatures.</p> <p>Quoted from The Seattle Times, 24/28 May 2019 https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/navy-plans-testing-of-futuristic-technology-sonar-harm-to-mammals-in-pacific-northwest/?amp=1&__twitter_impression=true</p> <p>"Many marine animals rely on sound to communicate, locate food, avoid predators and navigate. Exposure to sound could change their behavior," said John Calambokidis, a research biologist and founder of Cascadia Research Collective.</p> <p>Intense or repeated exposure to certain frequencies of sonar could also affect animals' ability to hear sounds in those ranges, he said.</p> <p>"For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival," Calambokidis said.</p> <p>Over seven years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters could experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations.</p> <p>Sonar would cause those porpoises permanent hearing loss 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" — anything from a distraction to prolonged</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	fleeing from sound — 101,377 times, according to the estimate. "It may be something that distracts the animal from normal activities, such as feeding or reproduction," Mosher said. Many of these animals could be exposed to sonar multiple times. A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters. Dozens of other creatures in the Salish Sea would be affected in lesser numbers, including endangered southern resident killer whales, which the Navy predicts would exhibit behavioral responses about 15 times over seven years. The documents say endangered humpback whales in waters off California, Oregon and Washington would suffer temporary hearing loss 277 times and alter their behavior 221 times because of sonar."	
Claire S-1	So sad we are still acting this way, knowing all the harm we are doing. Will we evolve one day ?	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Clark C-1	Don't	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Clark G-1	I attended the U.S. Navy's "Open House Public Meeting" last May 2, 2019 in Eureka, California. Please include my comments and questions below as part of the EIS/OEIS public testimony regarding the Navy's sonar and bomb testing off the California, Oregon and Washington coasts. 1) According to the EIS/OEIS, the surface visual and subsurface audio identification methods used ensure that few impacted species are present prior to testing, however, the EIS/OEIS fails to consider or mention that fewer impacted species are detectable due to plummeting populations that cannot afford more losses. On May 6, 2019, the United Nation's Intergovernmental Science Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystems Services estimated that one million species are threatened with extinction within the next generation. A) Why does this EIS/OEIS omit and fail to consider well-known science documenting the rapid collapse of land and sea biodiversity, commonly	The Navy considered the best available science regarding the current state of the environment, found in the Affected Environment section within each Chapter 3 resource section.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>referred to as "the sixth largest extinction event" in life's history on earth?</p> <p>B) Why does this EIS/OEIS fail to provide the parameters and explanations for the specific number of impacted specie losses it considers acceptable?</p> <p>2) The stated purpose of navy testing is "national security", yet, nowhere in the EIS/OEIS is the diminishing quantity and quality of our ocean food-source either mentioned or considered as part of our nation's national security except for native tribes. According to scientific reports, our ocean's large fish species have declined by 90% over the past 40 years.</p> <p>A) Why is the rapid collapse our nation's ocean food security not being considered in this EIR as part of our national security?</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and response to my testimony.</p>	
Clark R-1	<p>I am opposed to a plan by the US Navy to begin treetop high training missions over the area from the Hood Canal to the ocean over some of the most sensitive and significant areas in Washington State. Idaho and Nevada training areas were designed for warfare training, the Olympic Peninsula was not.</p> <p>There is no reason the Navy can not continue electronic warfare training in Idaho and Nevada as they have done for decades.</p> <p>It will disturb visitors to, and the wildlife of, Olympic National Park which is the eighth most visited park in the National Park System; 3.4 million visitors to the Olympic National Park in 2017.</p> <p>It includes International Biosphere Reserve and a World Heritage Site.</p> <p>Noise causes and aggravates</p> <p>High blood pressure</p> <p>Heart disease</p> <p>Hearing impairment</p> <p>Increases or creates mental health problems</p> <p>The 2011 World Health Organization report titled 'Burden of disease from environmental noise' documented health problems. The studies analysed environmental noise from planes, trains and vehicles, as well as other city sources, and then looked at links to health conditions such as cardiovascular disease, sleep disturbance, tinnitus, cognitive impairment in children, and annoyance. The WHO team used the information to calculate the disability-adjusted life-years or DALYs—basically the healthy years of life—lost to 'unwanted' human-induced dissonance. See the Australian Academy of Science article: Health effects of environmental noise pollution</p> <p>The sound profile of the Growler is not only loud but includes a low-frequency vibration that travels farther and vibrates objects in its path. This aspect creates a deadly combination beyond annoyance that impacts</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). The potential impacts to the economy are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>human health.</p> <p>Impact to our economy: People spent \$279 million in communities near the park. That spending supported 3,556 jobs in the local area and had a cumulative benefit to the local economy of \$385 million.</p> <p>In this EIS the Navy is asking NOAA for a continuation of their 2015 NOAA permit which states" reauthorization of incidental takes of marine mammals under the MMPA and incidental takes of threatened and endangered marine species'</p>	
Cleary-1	<p>Growler training flights should be shifted elsewhere. The majority of these training exercises do not have to be conducted along our shoreline and could instead be conducted far from shore minimizing the impact on birds, fish, marine mammals, other wildlife and communities. There is no evaluation for other locations which could significantly reduce the harmful impacts of these exercises. Training around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas could be avoided if that was a priority for the Department of Defense.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Clemens-1	<p>Please stop doing sonar tests, it's harmful and cruel to the sea life.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Clifford-1	<p>Cetaceans are important to marine ecosystems. They are intelligent sentient beings and should be able to live their lives without harm from the Navy.</p> <p>Hundreds of whales and dolphins are washed up dead each year on the west coast of Britain especially in the outer Hebrides. The cause of this mass death is most certainly sonar being used by the US Navy. This has got to stop, the wildlife of our planet is necessary to our own survival and we cannot afford to keep killing everything and expect no adverse effects to our own life support systems which are inextricably entwined with that of other living creatures on Earth. We live on Earth and are depended to upon it for our air water and nourishment. By continued wanton destruction of</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	our habits and environments we are making it impossible for Earth to look after us.	
Cline-1	<p>We in this household are against underwater sonar testing in Washington State, especially near the Salish Sea. The Salish Sea is home to countless marine mammals who depend on hearing for their basic survival. If their hearing becomes damaged due to underwater noise pollution such as sonar testing, they cannot hunt, communicate, nor navigate. The Salish Sea is also home to the critically endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales, who have lived there for generations and have become a cultural icon to those in Washington State. The Southern Residents depend on a prey species known as Chinook salmon, who are also critically endangered. The orcas are already having a difficult time finding food due to a decrease in their prey, and adding unnecessary noise pollution and damaging their hearing is further damning them to extinction. Don't let your actions be remembered as those who drove this iconic, intelligent, and wildly beloved species to extinction.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Clos-Versailles-1	<p>- The Navy's EIS clearly indicates that the Southern Residents will be harmed by their testing and training activities, and that this is not acceptable. Our Southern Residents need quiet in order to "hear" their prey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2003 during a training session, the J pod quit foraging and instead spent time and calories trying to leave the area instead of hunting and eating. • In pursuing these activities, the Navy violates the Endangered Species Act, which should be protecting the orcas. • The designation for the orcas' critical habitat is under review and the Navy should not be allowed to move forward until the designation is final. Please respect the Southern Resident Orcas' Endangered Species status and take steps to mitigate further harm. They need to protect the critical habitat of the orcas and prohibit testing and training in these waters. Please ask them to ban sonar and explosives in these waters. Stress that the Navy should not engage in any activities that can harm marine life. 	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i> . Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Close-1	And I'm representing myself in this. I've done a review of the difference between five years from now and now. And it seems like there were some minor mitigations and changes. And it seems what I'm understanding is that NMFS, the National Marine Fisheries Service, might only be requiring the Navy to reauthorize every seven years. And it seems that the Navy could voluntarily ask to shed daylight on this every five years instead of going with the seven-year recommendation because a lot of knowledge about mitigation impacts, migration and other factors can occur over the five years. And five years is definitely a long enough amount of time to -- if you are issued a permit, that it allows to take to seek the reauthorization, that it should come up at least every five years if not more often. So I'd ask the Navy to voluntarily agree to EIS public scrutiny and reauthorization from NMFS at least as often as is currently being done which is every five years. And that's about it. The other comments I'll try to send in. Thanks.	NMFS agreed that a 7-year permit was appropriate for the Navy's proposed activities. The Navy and NMFS hold an annual adaptive management meeting over the timeframe of the permit to discuss any changes that may need to be made to provisions of the permit, including changes based on new science or effective implementation of mitigation. In the event that there are any significant changes that would affect the analysis supporting the permit, the Navy would inform NMFS and work collaboratively with NMFS scientists to provide an updated analysis based on those changes. If necessary, the Navy would reinstate consultation under MMPA or ESA (depending on the species involved) to address those changes under the permitting process. In addition, pursuant to 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) section 1502.9(c)(1), the Navy would be required to prepare a supplement to its EIS if there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts.
Cloyd-1	The oceans and the associated waterways can no longer be considered a convenient dumping ground for pollution. Please stop using them as such. Thank you.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Coburn-1	This is totally unacceptable. We have highly vulnerable animals that need protection. There has to be a better way to do things. We have all science and technology necessary to make the necessary changes to prevent any further damage to our wildlife. This planet is home to billions of people and animals. You do not take precedence over them. Surely you can see that you have a responsibility to protect, not only people, but the earth and all of its inhabitants, as we are connected in a complex web of biodiversity. This must end. Shame.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Coffey-1	Please stop the endless poisoning of our planet. This further contributes to the demise of our planet and our species. Reconsider. For the sake of your children and their children, reconsider.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Coffield-1	Please stop this terribly damaging sonar testing. You know full well the damage and death it causes ocean inhabitants. Every time you blast this sonar around whales die and who knows how many other aquatic creatures. It is murderous, insane, and unnecessary. You've done countless tests and killed thousands already. Enough. Go protect the border. Do something useful.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Coleman-1	Please end sonar testing in the Pacific Northwest and everywhere else! This is cruel this testing can kill them or literally make them go insane. Please stop seeing wildlife as something you don't care about. Humans are animals too will hold you accountable if you continue to abuse marine life in this disgusting manner.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Coleman-2	Please, please stop underwater sonar testing! Humans aren't the only species that have a right to live on this planet. Sonar testing is evil and can inflict extreme harm onto marine animals, such as orcas. Have a heart and stop this NOW!!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Colton-1	When you perform military exercises in our National Forests, you shame the sacrifice of the service members who gave their lives that this country should be free. Shame shame shame on you for turning our military against our citizens, and for destroying everyone's ability to enjoy the beauty that is the Pacific Northwest of the United States of America.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Colton-2	There should be no military drills, exercises, or presence of any kind in our National Parks and our National Forests. None. Period. War games are the opposite of the purpose of our Parks.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Colton-3	The idea that "average sound pressure levels" are a meaningful or functional way to evaluate the effect of a long series of high-intensity events separated by majority periods of quiet is obvious and shameful nonsense. It is insulting to the intelligence of the citizens that you would even propose something so ridiculous. Show us that you actually understand the science: use on-site sound	DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses ¹ . The following text ² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	monitoring, look at the peak sound pressure levels, their duration, and frequency, and then have a factual discussion about the damage these aircraft are doing to the citizens near the flight path. You have zero credibility until you do.	<p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Coltrain-1	Please do not conduct this testing in the Puget Sound and surrounding areas. The damage to marine mammals would be irreparable. Surely there are other ways to conduct these tests without danger to already-endangered marine mammals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Combee-1	I am 100% against sonar testing as it has been proven harmful to the hearing of (at least!) marine mammals, which use that sense to hunt and find food. There are already hardships for the animals in that area, the testing will only stand to cause further demise for the residential species.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Conley-1	My substantive comment is simple - these marine mammals are known to be critically endangered and sonar testing is known to physically harm these same animals so the two statements together offer a simple conclusion. The Navy must not engage in practices that push an endangered species closer to extinction. That is common sense. Defending America means to me keeping safe everything that represents our amazing country - and our wildlife must be included in that. Any time there is footage of "America the great " - it includes vistas from our national parks and our wildlife. Protection is your duty - but to me as a proud American - America is more than the sun total of its people. It's the land and the sea and the people privileged enough to be here. So apply simple logic, compassion and TRUE patriotism for our country in its entirety and the answer becomes simple - protect these animals - do not knowingly harm them. The Navy has many brilliant minds - task them with alternate solutions. Innovation is definitely an American trait.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Conquest-1	I am a resident of Sequim, living on the Miller Peninsula with a clear view of Whidbey Island. I am 100 % in favor of your current and upcoming training mission that are or will happen. I am excited that our military has an area that accommodates the training that is so vital to completing the missions of protecting our nation. I am excited to hear the sounds of freedom and feel secure seeing the aircraft and ships that keep us safe. I feel the EIS is complete and impacts well documented.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Conrad-1	Oh PLEASE, PLEASE don't do this. Those that call the OCEANS home are having a hard enough time trying to survive. With alk the garbage and other pollutants we humans are slowly killing them. PLEASE don't add more stress and anxiety to them. They need to survive	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Conroy-1	I am opposed to allowing the Navy to practice war games — the damage these practices do to our mariane wildlife is untenable and unjustifiable. There is a lot of research to backup my statement. It is wrong fr one branch of government to be allowed to destroy our national natural heritage. It is simply immoral.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Contreras-1	Please respect the wishes of the Tribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council. Please do not repeat the history of the United States disregarding the ecological knowledge and cultural significance of indigenous peoples. The impacts on marine life have not been adequately analyzed.	<p>The Navy will continue to consult with the Tribes. Through Government-to-Government consultations, the Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.</p> <p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Conway J-1	I am completely OPPOSED to this training and testing. Our oceans are an incredible delicate ecosystem and this has a direct negative impact on vulnerable populations, especially southern resident orcas. If this testing takes place it will cause irreparable harm in the are and further degrade an already suffering ecosystem.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Conway K-1	<p>Please consider the extremely negative effects of sonar testing on all Marine Mammals, particularly those who rely on echo location capability in order to seek food and communicate with their closely bonded family members.</p> <p>It is most crucial that no disruptive, damaging sound waves occur where the highly endangered Southern Resident Orca population must be protected in the Salish Sea.</p> <p>Pollutants and lack of their main food supply of salmon, along with boat strikes are having negative impact on these resident Orcas, resulting in starvation and loss of both adults and calves.</p> <p>With their overall numbers drastically dropping, there must be no further strain on their threatened existence as we rather work to try and improve conditions they currently endure.</p> <p>Thank you for considering the welfare of Marine inhabitants, vital to the health of our oceans, when making the decision to not conduct sonar testing in or near the Salish Sea.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Conway M-1	Please do not go through with this sonar testing. It will be detrimental to the whales and dolphins that live in the Salish Sea, causing problems such as hearing loss. Whales and dolphins need their hearing; they communicate through vocalizations and use their natural sonar to locate prey. They obviously cannot do any of this if their hearing is damaged. Because of this, it may harm or even destroy that ecosystem. I am against it.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cool-1	PLEASE stop this harmful practice! Our Marine life are the basis of our food chain, & our lives. PLEASE protect our Marine life, without them, we die.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cooter-1	My family and I are 100% against the Navy's use of underwater sonar testing. It has been proven to damage the sea life that are exposed to these frequencies. Especially the living creatures that use frequencies for communication. These animals are extremely smart. Some are able to show empathy and have saved humans from danger. At some point we have to start taking care of the earth and the creatures that are needed for the overall good of the world. Not just your world or my world, but OUR world that we are destroying at a dangerous pace. Please, reconsider this action. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cornelius-1	It's true that the new sonar and Sperm whales can emit the same frequencies. The difference is: Whales focus their lethal hunting beam to a few feet wide while lethal Naval sonar is 360°. My grandfather was a market hunter, he could shoot 150 geese on the ground w/ ten 10 gauge shotgun shells costing 15¢ each, selling the geese for 25¢ each. That was declared illegal in 1918 because of hipster-like fad marketing and indiscriminate by-kill of a limited resource. There's a parallel between the navy proposal and the migratory bird act: The people doing the killing share a conceit that disconnects them from the result of the slaughter. They do it because someone tells them it's ok and they don't consider the results. It's not OK. Don't do it. Each pulse can maim or kill hundreds if not thousands of fish, birds and mammals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cornelius-2	The navy is planing exercises off the N. California coast which will disrupt marine life there, specifically Gray whale migration. Mendocino and Humbolt counties costal economies really do depend on tourism. Much of the tourist appeal is for whale watching and boat tours. We actually need those whales. Previous Navy exercises have led to other cetacean mass strandings of various species showing broken eardrums. The ocean is big, please don't	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	conduct war games near migrations, and perhaps turn down the sonar for close quarter practice everywhere.	
Corsick-1	<p>The public attending the meeting need and want microphones.</p> <p>No Action option</p> <p>No Action option</p> <p>No Action option</p> <p>We stand with tribal concerns</p> <p>Absolutely no sonar, no explosives, no chemical contamination</p> <p>Mendocino County Supervisors are for the No Action option.</p> <p>We stand with the county supes.</p> <p>I am source energy becoming aware of itself in every moment. We are all connected to each other This is time to protect and support the oceans & the earth.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Costa V-1	I am 100% against the use of sonar anywhere near the southern resident killer whale population or areas where marine mammals may be harmed by it.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Costello-1	Please do not allow the United States Navy, or anyone else from the public or private sector, to dump anything into the waters off of the Pacific Coast. Surely, there are better ways to manage this besides to pollute our waters and kill our ocean life that's already in peril.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cote-1	Hello, I would like to respectfully comment on the situation regarding environmental concerns over noise generated by the Growlers: I live in close proximity to Whidbey Island and have been experiencing loud booming noise much more often and for much longer duration than in the	When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic MOA, it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>past from the Growlers. It is quite unfortunate that we live in such a peaceful environment that is now burdened with excessive noise pollution from the added number of jets. We hear the noise, even inside our house through our triple paned windows morning, day, evening and night. It is very disruptive to our living environment, not to mention those times that we would like to take hikes in our Olympic National Park nearby and expect absolute solitude and peace. Please reconsider the noise pollution being generated by these jets. It is very disturbing to the many people living here in this beautiful environment. We are transplants - we used to live in a very noisy California fast paced environment and were so lucky and blessed to have found this part of the world to relocate. There just aren't many places like this anymore to seek the kind of peace we once had. It is deeply disturbing to realize we don't have it anymore.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to approximately one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved. <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Courtney-1	<p>HOW WILL THE NAVY MAKE ACCURATE COUNTS FOR "TAKE" AND still remain WITHIN THE ALLOWED "INCIDENTAL TAKE" NUMBERS? Recently I Saw and HEARD an absolutely alarming video of orca whales trying to escape the overwhelming, deafening sounds of underwater sonar from a Navy training ship. I had to cover my ears it was so loud! There was a pod of whales that came together breaching and diving over & over, going one direction, then going back - staying in the tight little pod- no where to get away from the horrible sound! These sounds are so great as to cause deafness in whales and other creatures. This is the way they communicate. If they can't find their way, or their offspring, or the rest of the pod they will die. A deaf whale is a dead whale! Please let me know how you will have any idea of the numbers of "TAKE" from a scenario that I just described?? How will the Navy guarantee that ALL forms of Marine Life will not be harmed by the Navy Northwest Training & Testing? Right now scientists are calling it a Wildlife Emergency! This includes our</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service regarding the Navy's Proposed Action and potential impacts to marine mammals and endangered species, as required under the Endangered Species Act.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	oceans, and here at home on our West Coast. This is a big issue for our coastal community - including tourism and fishermen's livelihood. Many species living here have already been compromised by warming seas and overfishing - not to mention the record numbers of curious deaths of whales and recently of the common murre found dead on our beaches. I do not see how your operations will do anything but add to the already fragile situation in our ocean and in our coastal community. Please respond to my question.	
Cowgill-1	I would rather see tax dollars working to save the environment rather than destroying it. As we've lost abalone season this year, we can hardly find sea stars or sea cucumbers and the otters have left this part of the coast, we aren't in a position to play war games with our oceans. Please turn around and use the money and equipment and tremendous man power to clean the gyres, to reduce plastics, for bioremediation, soil remineralization and perhaps a planetary inventory of our precarious hold onto life. Remember we are earthlings and we depend on the health and life of our host.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Coyne-1	I am opposed to expansion of these flights for the following reasons. The majority of these training exercises do not have to be conducted along our shoreline and could instead be conducted far from shore minimizing the impact on birds, fish, marine mammals, other wildlife and communities. There is no evaluation for other locations which could significantly reduce the harmful impacts of these exercises. Training around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas could be avoided if that was a priority for the Department of Defense. I monitored decibels at am home when the jets fly over and it always exceeds the measuring limit of 130 decibels.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Cr-1	Please stop sonar blasts which are DESTROYING the lives of vital marine life within our oceans. This is HEARTLESS and needs to end.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Craddick-1	The impact of sonar on whales is not conclusive & submarine exercises being linked to several high-profile mass strandings. The US Navy has admitted concerns over sonar's effects on marine mammals. Submarines' sonar has been implicated in whale strandings. But military-sponsored tests now suggest that low levels of sonar, which do not cause direct damage to whales, could still cause harm by triggering behavioural changes.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cramer-1	Other National parks are protected from this abuse. Please stop ruining our silence.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.
Crasto-1	I just plain and simple don't agree with the sonar practices that endanger our animals. The ocean is their home and even though we can use it we need to respect their lives and be careful to not destroy their lives and habitat. We need to protect them.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Crilly-1	What you are doing is wrong and you know it. How are they meant to communicate with each other if they are deaf. This is beyond cruel and disgusting. Please end this. Educate yourself on these incredible, social and amazing animals and stop destroying them.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Cristol-1	<p>First, I thank the Navy for all it does to keep our country and my family safe. I served in the Army and have a deep appreciation for the military and its complexity. But with an entire ocean to the west of Whidbey Island, and many far less inhabited areas than southwest Snohomish County in potential flight paths, I have to stand against this proposal. The noise will degrade property values and quality of life in Edmonds. It will even impinge on many home-based businesses in professional services that rely on speakerphone conference calls, presentations over the Internet, Skype and other teleconference communications, and even recording -- all of which require relatively noise-free environments.</p> <p>We do not want to be penalized with the use of our own taxpayer money for this disruption and annoyance, and respectfully insist that you do the right thing and find lower-impact ways of using the vast skies for testing away from southwest Snohomish.</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include aircraft flights in the vicinity of Whidbey Island, Edmonds, or Snohomish County. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>
Croci-1	<p>Sonar testing is affecting marine life especially cetaceans. It is changing their behavior and their eating habits.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Crome-1	<p>please dont do this</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Cronin-1	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to submit public comment NWTT Draft EIS. I am strongly opposed to increasing growler flights over Olympic National</p>	<p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic MOA, it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Park. Olympic National Park is a National treasure due in part to it being one of the quietest places in the country. My family and I make multiple trips annually into the park and I was born and raised on the Olympic Peninsula. I do not want to see any increased noise level associated with growlers or other aircraft over the park.</p> <p>I am also very concerned about the impact to Southern Resident orcas which are on the brink of extinction. The draft EIS as I read it identifies that the Navy's proposed actions put the Orcas further at risk. Please shift any Navy activity that negatively impact or has the potential to negatively impact Southern Resident orcas to other waters.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration I am not affiliated with any organization.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to approximately one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved. <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Crook-1	<p>Please do not do your testing while we are trying to protect the lives of our j pod orca. They are so stressed now. We must protect them. I was fishing in straits and could not believe the loud and obnoxious sounds. I can only imagine amplification under water. Thanks for hearing me.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Croonquist-1	I fully support the US Navy testing and training programs as outlined. While Alternative 1 is the preferred option, I am comfortable going to Alternative 2 if necessary to meet the needs for training efforts that will keep US Navy personnel trained up to the highest level necessary to meet our national security needs. I enjoy hearing the "sound of freedom" and seeing US Navy vessels and aircraft in Puget Sound, the Strait of Juan de Fuca and along the Washington coast.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Cropper-1	Please stop underwater sonar testing in Puget Sound, the Salish Sea and all other areas within the Southern Resident Killer Whales hunting and living waters.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Crosby-1	Please research the effect on grey whales of your activities in the Pacific Northwest and incorporate it into your plans. It is devastating to these mammals. I know others have forwarded to you these study results. Thank you for your serious consideration.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Crosier-1	I am 100 percent against sonar testing!!! oUR sOUTHERN rESIDENT oRCA AND ALL MARINE MAMMALS HAVE A RIGHT TO AN OCEAN WHERE THEY CAN FEED HUNT LIVE AND THRIVE WITHOUT MORE HUMAN	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	ENCROACHMENT. Sonar is known to severely panic and stun dolphins and whales even killing them HOW DARE YOU!!!!!! You do not have the right to cause harm or death without, discretion!!!! Our orca and dolphins as well as other marine life matter We should protect them for future generations! Our southern resident orca need all the help they can get to find salmon and survive for another generation The orca don't need another interference to their ability ti feed successfully. SHAME ON YOU FOR BEING SO CALLOUS TO OTHER SPECIES WE SHARE OUR WORLD WITH. NO SONAR SAVE OUR WHALES!!!!!!	Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cross-1	I am very much against all testing and training which has any negative environmental impacts on the oceans or the living beings in the oceans. I oppose all training and testing activities at sea and in associated airspace within the Study Area at any time.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Crowell-1	<p>No new jets. No new flights.</p> <p>I have lived in the La Conner area for 20 years. For 14 of those years I commuted to Redmond five days a week. I had to leave my house by 5:30 each morning to make my commute, so I went to bed by 9:00 pm. The invasive and torturous noise of the practice flights disrupted my sleep for years and contributed to stress and poor health.</p> <p>I'm no longer commuting, but the flights are still horrendous disruptions in an otherwise idyllic rural life. I cannot believe the arrogance of the Navy to ignore the obvious issues here with your stubborn insistence on expanding these life-disrupting practices.</p> <p>The intensity, frequency, duration, and altitude of the Growlers is a threat to public health.</p> <p>It's bad enough that the Navy has been knowingly killing sea mammals for</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>years due to its sonar practice, but these Growlers will affect every living thing subjected to the deafening noise.</p> <p>Allowing unskilled pilots to practice over residential areas is another concern. The blatant disrespect of these pilots (I'm thinking of the penis drawn in the sky) is not amusing and not appreciated. They are wearing headphones. Those of us on the ground who have no control over what we're being subjected to are not.</p> <p>I have written to my my representatives numerous times to oppose this expansion. It's clear people don't want it, that it will damage resources, lower property values and destroy the peace and quiet in our beautiful area. This is expansion is damaging to our area and is unnecessary.</p> <p>No new jets. No new flights. Stop this madness now.</p>	
Crowley-1	<p>We continue to oppose the Northwest training and testing activities at sea. We are more opposed to the continuation of these activities than ever before because of the issues of climate change and species extinction. Our oceans and the species that depend upon them are more stressed than ever. Our local fishing industry is all but collapsed. Crab season has been shortened after several dismal years due to stress on migrating whales. It is time for the Navy to reconsider this testing based upon current, alarming science.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.mil/specops/navfac/1mr • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/1mr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Crudland-1	<p>Please don't do sonar tests that can confuse our marine life. They are suffering enough through lack of food, disease, noise and plastics. Please don't do this, I beg of you.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Cruz-1	I am against the sonar testing! #dolphinproject #nofishnoblackfish	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cueff-1	Is there not an other way to test you equipment in a lab without impacting natural environment.	The Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, see the discussion in Section 2.4.1.4 (Simulated Training and Testing Only) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that discusses the need for live training specifically for aircrews.
Cummings-1	<p>I have just learned of an EIS put out by the U.S. Navy on March 29, which I view as problematic. The only EIS alternative that is acceptable is the No Action Alternative. The other options given are unacceptable to the environment and life on the Olympic Peninsula. Alternatives 1 and 2 would cause unforgiveable and unnecessary damage to Olympic National Park and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. Alternative 2 is the most extreme.</p> <p>The length of the EIS, the great area it affects, and the many people it affects requires a 90-day comment period. This, so the EIS can be examined properly and thoroughly. Please ask the Navy for another 14-day extension of the comment period.</p> <p>The noise from multiple jet flights over the western and northern parts of the Peninsula will chase residents and visitors away. This will affect the health and economy of the Peninsula and the state of Washington. The search pattern of jet Growler flights looking for emitters would roar above the ocean beaches; the Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges; Washington State Department of Natural Resources land; Quinault, Quileute and Hoh Reservations; and thousands of acres of private land, including the towns of Forks and Amanda Park.</p> <p>The Navy admits to 85–100 decibels of noise per pass. That is enough to cause hearing loss and contribute to other health problems. People in Forks have recorded 94 decibel flights under the current operations. While noise is known to affect people and no studies have been done on the iconic Olympic elk, it is not difficult to reason they would be similarly affected,</p>	<p>The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p> <p>The Navy’s proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA’s designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA’s designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>being mammals of a similar weight.</p> <p>The military training in the Marine Sanctuary would do damage to the ocean beaches, the marine animals of the coast, the nesting areas of many of Washington's shorebirds, migrating whales, and the birds that use the Pacific Flyway. The Navy has denied flying over Olympic National Park. This is untrue. Not only is this untrue, it is impossible not to fly these missions over the Park.</p> <p>This degradation of the Olympic Peninsula's environment is unacceptable. For 112 years, Congress and presidents have set aside areas of the Peninsula to protect its valuable environment. Irreparable damage would be caused if the activities are done as stated in the Navy EIS/OEIS Mar 2019 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Northwest Training and Testing.</p> <p>Please stop this plan by the Navy. The training has been done elsewhere. It can be done elsewhere. Wild places are not empty places that can be used in such a way without consequences. Our national security must also include environmental security if we are to protect our quality of life.</p>	
Cunningham Be-1	<p>In a time when we, as humans, have been shown exactly how detrimental certain actions are to the health and wellbeing of animals and the planet there is no excuse to continue behaving in this way. We need to be responsible about our behaviour and the impact we have on the planet and strive to help animals who have no choice but to live with the consequences of our actions. I fully oppose the Navy's planned actions as it will have a significantly negative impact on an immeasurable number of animals. Please re-consider this course of action and use the Navy's incredible resources to do better and play your part in sustainable techniques moving forward.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Cunningham Br-1	<p>On-site monitoring of aircraft overflights, rather than modeling, is needed to truly evaluate impacts on people and wildlife in Olympic National Park. In the EIS/OEIS the evaluation of impacts from sound is based on modeling rather than on actual monitoring of how aircraft noise affects wildlife and the experience of park visitors. Speculation and unsupportable extrapolation is no substitute for actual monitoring, data collection and analysis. Potential serious impacts to Olympic National Park, a World Heritage site and International Biosphere Reserve famed for its natural quiet, should be based on science, not speculation.</p> <p>The aircraft sound information in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS unrealistically minimizes the jet noise levels and frequency of overflights park visitors are already experiencing. I live in western Skagit County and am all too familiar</p>	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>with the noise generated by the EA-18G Growler. While the Supplemental EIS/OEIS claims that overflights of the Olympic Peninsula will typically be at least 2,000 feet above ground level, the document admits that these flights could be as low as 1,500 feet. To then suggest that Growler noise at that elevation will be roughly equivalent to a human whisper reveals how little actual monitoring of noise has been conducted by the Navy. This statement has put the credibility of the entire document into question and makes it a subject of ridicule by those who live with the Growler noise every day. The Navy clearly needs to do monitoring, not just modeling, to realistically evaluate the noise impacts of the present, and expanded, overflights of the Olympic Peninsula.</p> <p>The Supplemental EIS/OEIS fails to include a reasonable range of alternatives.</p> <p>The scale and complexity of the activities which the EIS/OEIS examines are massive, yet only 3 alternatives are examined: a continuation of the present testing and training with some additions (e.g. more Growler flights), a continuation with a greater increase in activity, and the required no action alternative, which would mean a cessation of training and testing in the study area. There is no alternative that looks at avoiding overflights of Olympic National Park, for example, and restricting water-based activities to areas outside the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. That these changes would be inconvenient or more expensive for the Navy are not sufficient reasons for not including such an alternative.</p> <p>Environmental Impact Statements are to examine a range of reasonable alternatives, which in this case would certainly include more than the three presented. At the very least, the Navy should design a solid, scientifically-based plan for eliminating or severely limiting negative impacts of aircraft overflights to Olympic National Park visitors and wildlife.</p> <p>In light of the inadequacies of the EIS/OEIS and its failure to address issues of significance I urge you to select the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Cunningham I-1	<p>I am against these exercises. We must protect the Orcas at this time, as even small disruptions to their existence may be the difference between survival and extinction. Please, do not move forward.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Cunningham T-1	<p>To Whom it May Concern,</p> <p>I am writing to strongly oppose any expanded Naval operations over the Olympic Peninsula, or any increase in sonar activities in the Salish Sea. We live in a time of environmental crisis. The marine life of the Salish Sea, from the largest whales to our areas beloved salmon, are under extreme pressure. Between the effects of human development, military sonar testing and the now unfolding effects of climate change, we see marine life under assault. The heartbreaking vigil of Tahlequah (the whale who carried her dead calf for weeks and weeks all over the Salish Sea) was a call to action. We must take our responsibility as stewards of our environment seriously - all of us, private citizens as well as all the branches of the military. As a parent of two young boys it is very important to me to work to pass on both a love for our land and seas as well as the knowledge and commitment to work to protect the natural wonder and beauty of this incredible area.</p> <p>In the study below, you will read that when marine life is exposed to the high decibel levels of naval sonar, it leads to changes in diving patterns that can cause whales and other marine creatures to dive too deep, too fast in order to quickly escape the punishing decibel levels of sonar. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/pdf/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533 Just as humans are negatively affected by the high-decibel noise of the Growler Jets, so to are marine creatures affected by sonar.</p> <p>The Olympic National Park is one of the great treasures of America, and is one of the quietest places on earth. Our National Parks and National Historical Reserves such as Ebey's Landing are the wrong locations for high-decibel military training. These places were created and set aside for preservation and for enjoyment by all. The US Military has vast holdings of unoccupied land that should be used for training, not our national parks and reserves.</p> <p>Noise pollution is just as devastating as other kinds of pollution. Recent articles in the New Yorker and New York Times (see links below) lay out very clearly the damages caused to humans, marine life and environmental health by noise pollution.</p> <p>As America's population shifts more and more to urban areas, the refuge provided by the sound of silence in our National Parks (and in particular by the incredible silence of the Olympic National Park and Forest) becomes</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>more and more vital as a way for people to connect with our pre-history. I understand that military training is a necessary part of keeping our military in top shape. However, a report from the Congressional Research Service shows that the "Department of Defense (excluding the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) administers 11.4 million acres in the United States (as of September 30, 2014), consisting of military bases, training ranges, and more." (https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42346.pdf)</p> <p>Please use some of the 11.4 million acres administered by the Department of Defense. Encroaching upon public treasured public lands is not the solution.</p> <p>https://www.nytimes.com/2019/01/22/science/oceans-whales-noise-offshore-drilling.html</p> <p>https://www.nytimes.com/2018/09/23/us/silence-escapes-noise-pollution-travel.html</p> <p>https://www.nytimes.com/2018/12/31/well/live/hearing-loss-threatens-mind-life-and-limb.html?searchResultPosition=17</p> <p>https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2019/05/13/is-noise-pollution-the-next-big-public-health-crisis</p>	
Custer C-1	<p>There should be no new jets and no new flights at the Whidbey Island Naval Station. The current level of flying is already extremely noxious to those who have to listen to it day in and day out. I have lived on the north end of Camano Island for many years. In the past, flights over our house were noisy but very intermittent. Days might go past where there were no planes. Planes flying over every day all day and well into the evening past midnight are making our wonderful home a place I don't want to be. This is a beautiful area. Many of the people moved here for the beauty but also the rural feel and the quiet. Noise is a pollutant just like polluted water and polluted air. The Dept. of Defense should not be allowed to ruin this area for their convenience. Perhaps it wouldn't be the best place to relocate if the Navy was paying the true costs of what it is doing to this region.</p> <p>The Navy needs to mitigate for the damage it has already done. No other federal agency would be allowed to have such a negative impact and not mitigate. All homeowners who are in the flight paths should have the option of selling their homes to the Navy or having them insulated for noise reduction. The increase in noise and the frequency of flights the Navy is proposing is going to make many places on Whidbey Island, Lopez Island, Camano Island places where people no longer want to live. You had no public meetings on Camano Island about this increase and you monitored</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include aircraft flights in the vicinity of Whidbey Island or Camano Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>two places on the Island but neither place was at the north end where we seem to be getting most of the noise.</p> <p>The Navy should not be able to use the excuse that they are not authorized to mitigate. If you are not authorized then get authorized. Any of your congressional friends can make this happen. People should not have to fight their government to get them to do the right thing. No other federal agency would be allowed to do what the Navy is proposing and not mitigate!!</p> <p>The EIS did not do a good job of addressing the impacts to wildlife in the area. It did not address the scientific information gathered that confirms the proposed increased flights and testing would harm the already endangered resident areas which make Puget Sound their home. The Navy should not be allowed to ignore the damage that these new actions will do because of national security when other options are available.</p> <p>If national security is an issue it would seem like locating all of these planes in an earthquake zone would also be a cause for concern for national security.</p> <p>Not only must we put up with increased noise during the day. There will increased flying at night. I thought the EIS did a very poor job of modeling how often people would be awakened by planes. There is no consideration given to people who are awakened and then can't get back to sleep. When these planes are flying over at night you can't get to asleep let alone be awakened.</p> <p>The assumption was also made that people here don't open windows because we live in a cool climate and that is incorrect. We start opening our windows in May and have them open until September. We open them especially at night to help cool down our house after it has been warm during the day. Having windows open makes the noise even worse.</p> <p>The noise pollution in the National park and the many state parks should not be allowed.</p> <p>It may make sense to the Navy to have your Growler planes at one location, but no single area of the country should be forced to bear the brunt of the training flights for all of the Growlers. They have been at separate bases and they should continue to be at separate bases. If you have to have all of these planes together you need to spend the money and find a place where the training flights do not have the negative impacts to the environment and the people that is happening here.</p> <p>Anyone who thinks that increasing these flights is a good idea should come and spend some time living in our homes and see what these noisy flights</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	do to them. There should be no new planes and no new flights and the Navy should mitigate for the problems you have already caused!	
Custer M-1	Our resident orcas will clearly be hurt by sonar testing, and they can not afford such a blow. Please do not proceed with sonar testing.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Czapik-1	This needs to end now. This is harming the ocean life	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marin-species-monitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
D		
Da Costa-1	Help to Orcas 🙏🙏🙏	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Dady-1	<p>I can't believe we have to have a conversation about how this sonar testing is unacceptable.</p> <p>This isn't just a PNW problem, but is ESPECIALLY concerning given the small waterways of the Haro Strait/Pudget Sound areas. It is proven and admitted that this causes SEVERE issues, even death, in marine mammals. In direct comment to the PNW testing area, the Southern Resident Killer Whale population is already so fragile, this testing, if unfortunately continued at all, should definitely NOT be done in this area.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Daily-1	<p>Please stop all of this! Its killing our oceans and everything that lives in the ocean! Stop now!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Dalby-1	I am strongly against this proposal.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Dalrymple-1	Please protect marine mammals (especially the Southern Resident orcas) by prohibiting sonar and loud noises in Puget Sound (especially by the Navy). There are newly born and elderly orcas that are quite vulnerable to loud noises.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Daly-1	I respectfully and with appreciation for your mission request that the Navy find a less sensitive area to conduct training exercises. There are few areas as pristine as this. We live in such an overdeveloped world, please help us protect the few places we still have.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft and ships are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Dame-1	The program to increase training can be relocated simply and economically. It is only a matter of a few years before manned flight for tactical maneuvers will be outdated. The trajectory of the increase will destabilize the region.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft and ships are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Daniels J-1	I am 100% against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Daniels K-1	This is not the time to start being MORE abusive to these iconic and valuable marine mammals. They need our HELP, not more of our complete disregard for the environment they EVOLVED TO THRIVE IN before we got here and messed everything up! We need to breach the dams, stop whale watching, slow down the boats, stop polluting their waters and their food, and we definitely need to stop ignoring their pleas for help. IF YOU WEREN'T TRAUMATIZED BY THE IMAGE OF TAHLEQUAH PUSHING HER DEAD CALF THROUGH SALISH SEA WATER FOR 17 DAYS SEARED INTO YOUR NIGHTMARES, YOU ARE PART OF THE PROBLEM. There is no reason, no excuse, no justification possible for not doing something to HELP them and if what you have planned doesn't HELP THEM, then you need to get out of the way of the people who are. I would also appreciate it if you would quit it with all the loud planes flying over all the time, its disturbing! If it bothers us, it surely bothers these whales. Stop with the constant flyovers, quit it with the loud booming and destructive and pollutive activities. If you really have America and her interests at heart, you have ALL of America, including the innocent creatures that we SHARE this space with. DO THE RIGHT THING. Be their champion. Be on the right side of history for once.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
D'anjou K-1	My name is Maeva Kelly and i give you my voice today for my opposition about the Us navy sonar test in the salish sea. This is unacceptable and endanger the precious marine life. This is so important to protect them. I say no to Us navy sonar for 1000%.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
D'anjou M-1	I introduce myself Maeva Kelly and sends you my comment by my opposition 1000% for underwater sonar tests. It has been proven that they can do a lot of harm to marine animals, including our 76 southern resident orcas who are currently so fragile. This is unacceptable, we refuse sonar tests underwater!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Danner-1	Please be part of the solution, not the problem. The resident orca of SJI need protection, no irresponsible testing by the US Navy. Please be aware of your actions and realize this population is on the brink of extinction.	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Dardecker-1	With the threats to the marine environment and worldwide increase in mass strandings of marine mammals this practice is unacceptable.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Darlington-1	It has come to my awareness that the Navy is doing Sonar testing in the pudget sound often right next to orcas whales who are are being tortured by these sounds and trying to escape, this is cruel and unnecessary. Please be sensitive to the living things that call these waters their homes and respect their habitat.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Darrow-1	<p>August 19th, 2018: While setting up our tents near Blue Glacier in Olympic National Park, Growler jets flew low overhead, shattering the natural quiet that had so far been an outstanding feature of our rare weekend of backpacking.</p> <p>April 28th: A friend reports that military jets were doing low laps around Mt. Rainier while he was climbing the peak.</p> <p>May 25th: My friends 3 year old daughter burst into tears when Growler jets flew low over their home in Port Townsend, screaming "Make that noise stop, Grandma!"</p> <p>May 30th: While visiting a friend near Fort Worden at 3:40 in the afternoon, we had to pause our conversation until Growler Jets passed over, because we could not hear each other over the sound of the jets.</p> <p>June 7th: We were enjoying a pleasant hike on the Union Creek trail in Wenatchee National Forest when three Growler jets flew low overhead at about 2:30 p.m. It took more than an hour for my ears to stop ringing.</p> <p>These are just five specific instances of times when the noise of Growler jets has dominated my family's soundscape (Although I cannot confirm that the jets at Mt. Rainier and Union Trail were Growler Jets; they may have been another type of military jet.) Dozens of other nights, such as this one (9:30 p.m. on June 11th 2019), as I write this comment, the constant roar of jets taking off and landing on Whidbey Island goes on for hours in the background, even though I am indoors with the doors and windows closed. Many times during the day, jets roar low over my home on the Quimper Peninsula.</p> <p>While I understand the need for training as well as the importance of the military to Washington State's economy as well as the Nation's security, I feel that minimizing impacts to communities and wild soundscapes is important. For me, this type of noise is a cause of anxiety not only because of the audible impact, but because we all know that it represents our country's continuing dependence on a military industrial economy. The sounds of war are not comforting to me, as opposed to those who like to suggest that it is the "Sound of Freedom." Could we accomplish the goals of providing a secure defense for the region and our country, as well as training our military, by using technologies that have less impact on our collective soundscape? What is your team doing to address this issue?</p> <p>The EIS states that the Naval Training alternatives I and II "would not</p>	<p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). The potential impacts to the economy are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	adversely affect public health." However, the studies fail to assess the long term and cumulative effects of jet noise on mental health. Assessments were done purely on decibel levels. While these measurements may equal or be less than ambient noises of traffic, music, or other ambient sounds in the local urban environment, it is the quality of the sound that matters when assessing mental health. We are living in a war zone. This is not a "normal" acoustic environment for humans or any other creatures to live in, and should not be considered "necessary" collateral damage for providing national security. Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments for the EIS.	
Dashko-1	I strongly oppose the Navy's proposed off-shore testing. In new research published in the Proceedings of the Royal Society B, they discovered that the sound emitted by sonar is so intense that marine mammals will swim hundreds of miles, dive deep into the abyss or even beach themselves to flee from the sounds that are literally unbearable to them. In particular, beaked whales are one of the marine mammals that are often found beached due to sonar testing. Prior to the 1960s, beaked whale strandings were extremely rare. But once the 60s rolled around, the Navy started to use mid-frequency active sonar (MFAS) to detect submarines. And from the 60s onwards, whales washing up on beachings became a very common occurrence. The paper recently published is a summary of what was discussed at a 2017 meeting of beaked whale experts in the Canary Islands and revealed that sonar distresses beaked whales so much that the marine mammals ends up with nitrogen bubbles in their blood very similar to what divers would call decompression sickness or the bends. The nitrogen can cause hemorrhaging and damage to whales vital organs. This is just one piece of evidence and the list goes on and on. With global climate change affecting our world at unprecedented rates, this is not the time to harm our oceans even more than they have been harmed. Please do not continue with the proposed testing.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Dashko-2	I do not support the Navy's plan to perform sonar testing along our shores. Research shows that sonar testing can be harmful to marine life, and therefore, to the vibrancy and sustainability of our oceans. Along with many of my community members, I urge the Navy not to perform sonar testing as outlined in Draft Supplement EIS/OEIS. Thank you for considering the wellbeing of our ocean.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Dautaj-1	Plz do not destroy the enviroment of orcas	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Davies-1	No No No sonar testing causes whales to go wildly off course going from known,safe routes to unknown waters.... This has been the cause of hundreds of beaching episodes as they find themselves in too shallow waters... The whale population is under immense threat already (whaling, plastic debris, toxic pollution and low fish stocks)so as well as dying in large numbers there's the threat of beaching....	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Davis Ka-1	Our oceans are imperiled. Much of our marine life is endangered. We are witnessing mass extinctions at an unprecedented rate. We need to do everything we can to save and protect precious marine life. Naval testing is terrible damaging to sea life. There is no justification for it.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Davis Kr-1	Sonar testing in the open waters without regard for the health and well-being of the sentient creatures who reside there is barbaric, ignorant, and destructive. This must not continue.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Dawes-1	<p>I am deeply concerned about the economic hardship that is occurring to the residents of Whidbey Island and other affected areas. Numerous people living in the noise zones are putting their homes up for sale usually at reduced prices.</p> <p>Whidbey Island depends on tourism and the increased roar of jets overhead will have a negative impact on our tourist dollars.</p> <p>Citizens can experience increased health care costs due to lost sleep and the health implications that accompany it.</p> <p>There are many factors that are vital for the well being our our citizens and keeping us safe from attack is certainly one, but not to the exclusion of all others. Our Pacific Northwest is a treasure that needs to be protected in all areas, not just one.</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include aircraft flights in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>
Dawson-1	<p>I would like my comments to be entered in the record in opposition to the Navy's planned expansion of weapons testing in the Pacific Ocean. I am not a scientist; I don't a lot of facts and figures prepared for you. I am opposing this action as a human being who is concerned about the continued existence of life on this planet. I oppose these actions on moral and environmental grounds.</p> <p>War has to be the most damaging of human activities for the health of the planet and its inhabitants. Science has overwhelmingly confirmed that our planetary ecosystem is on the verge of collapse. The ocean ecosystems are sick and dying. The oceans are the lifeblood of our planet; AS THE OCEANS GO, SO GOES THE PLANET.</p> <p>The NOAA has made an official declaration of an "unusual mortality event" for the Eastern North Pacific population of gray whales, a designation the agency defines as an unexpected and significant die-off of any marine mammal group. This is a five-fold increase this year alone. There is no doubt that military testing in the ocean has a significant negative impact on whales and other sea mammals which use sonar to navigate, and who depend on a toxic and stress free environment to survive. The web of life involves ALL members of an ecosystem in mutually dependent existence. The destruction of one element has repercussions throughout the system. Instead of wasting valuable resources on finding new ways of killing humans and other species of animals, we need a new paradigm for the future; seeking peace and cooperation with other nations. Anything less is mutual suicide, by the destruction of the ecosystems which sustain life on earth.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	It is your responsibility as human beings to stop these destructive practices. Think about your children and grandchildren. Please!	
De Carvalho-1	I'm totally against sonar testing which are proven to harm marine mammals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
de Klerck-1	Science provided us with technology. Science provided us to end the second world war. Science also taught us a lot about race, history of the planet, the climate and how it turned into an emergency nowadays, and about wild life and it's coherence with the ecosystem and the planet. Marine life is a key part of the thermocyclis on earth and is essential for the regulation of life on this planet. Among them there are several of the most intelligent species on the planet, and one of the largest species and mammals of the planet. These beautiful creatures however are given a very hard time by sonar sound tests created by you, Navy. I understand that during war you must have some nice working material, but there is no war. You are causing species to have PERMANENT hearing damage, endangered and intelligent species. We have technology for everything. You can't convince me that there isn't an alternative way of testing the sonar than the way it's been tested now. Artificial basins, barriers, computer based or sound labs. Enough is enough. Humans are destroying the planet in every way possible. It's time to change this. We are guests, not rulers.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
De la Cuadra-1	I am 100% against the harmful practices of underwater sonar testing. These practices have proven to cause harm to marine animals, PLEASE STOP! I am begging you because these animals cannot.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
De la Mora-1	Stop King the Wildlife. Its not your right	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
De Rooy-1	<p>Having attended a number of public hearings on this issue I lack all faith in the governments likelihood to amend its planned program. That Jene McCovey's questions were not answered at the hearing speaks loud and clear. Ms. McCovey is a highly respected member of the Yurok Tribe who, although wheelchair bound, manages to attend and contribute to hearings of this sort and ignoring her questions is a slap to the entire community. What the Navy plans to do will harm whales and dolphins and even the smallest take of that population should not be allowable. The damage done to the ocean environment, including the toxic garbage left behind is not acceptable, particularly in an already severely damaged ocean environment. We need to be repairing, preserving, not further damaging our precious resources. The trainings must stop.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
De Souza-1	<p>I am writing to state that I strongly OPPOSE the sonar testing the navy is doing in the oceans. Scientific research shows that all dolphins and whales utilize sonar to hunt and communicate. By blasting sonar in the oceans you are effectively disrupting their only way to source for food and stay together as a pod. Case studies have already shown dolphins and whales beaching themselves after sonar testing has been performed in the area or basically starving to death if they are unable to hunt. Please stop this extremely cruel and inhumane testing immediately!!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Debas-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's EIS clearly indicates that the Southern Residents will be harmed by their testing and training activities, and that this is not acceptable. Our Southern Residents need quiet in order to "hear" their prey. • I would like to remind the Navy that in 2003 during a training session, the J pod quit foraging and instead spent time and calories trying to leave the area instead of hunting and eating. • In pursuing these activities, the Navy violates the Endangered Species Act, which should be protecting the orcas. • The designation for the orcas' critical habitat is under review and the 	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Navy should not be allowed to move forward until the designation is final. I urge the Navy to respect the Southern Resident Orcas' Endangered Species status and take steps to mitigate further harm. You need to protect the critical habitat of the orcas and prohibit testing and training in these waters. Please ban sonar and explosives in these waters. The Navy should not engage in any activities that can harm marine life.</p> <p>Thank you for taking these concerns seriously and please do not conduct trainings in the habitat of orcas or other endangered species that could potentially harm them.</p>	<p>The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p>
Decrona-1	<p>There are many indications that marine mammals and fish are impacted negatively by the use of Sonar in their environment. After reading about the efforts currently being made by the U.S. Military to understand the hazards that Sonar present to the marine biosphere, I acknowledge that the Navy is not indifferent or unaware of these problems with using Sonar in the marine environment. I am concerned, however, that the harm Sonar does to the marine animals is not granted the importance that it deserves, in my opinion, and that appropriate action is not taken to protect the species adversely effected.</p> <p>In a quote from Jon Li's article, "Military Sonar and its Effects on Whales", April 1, 2019, the adverse effects upon whales and dolphins is summed up thus:</p> <p>"Numerous long-term studies have shown that when marine life is impacted by intense sound waves, it can disrupt breeding and feeding patterns, and even migrations. In some cases, whales will swim hundreds of miles out of their way to escape from intense sound waves, abandoning their pods or calves, or simply beaching themselves. In other cases, temporary or permanent hearing damage can be caused through exposure to such intense sonar, leaving whales unable to communicate or navigate, meaning that they are vulnerable to attack or starvation."</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Dee-1	Cetaceans, including Killer whales, have sensitive hearing. They rely on sound for everything they do in their home waters. In other words, they use their echolocation to navigate, hunt, socialize, and protect one another from predators. Since sound travels fast over long distances, sonar and other man-made noises interfere with cetaceans' daily lives and the outcome can be downright disastrous with injuries and untimely deaths. I strongly urge you not to consider engaging in any military training exercise in areas teemed with cetaceans, including and especially the critically endangered Southern Resident Killer whales. Many thanks for your understanding and consideration.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Defossez-1	It goed beyond all reason to put animals through such damaging events!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Dehaven-1	It is deceitful and counterproductive to conduct an EIS that is only intended to facilitate what you've already decided to do. We saw how ineffective this process was when the OLF / Growler expansion was being considered. You are doing again what you did then: using a whitewashing EIS to justify your preconceived plans. You should be ashamed of your lack of integrity. Our military used to pride itself on being accountable to the people. You have abandoned that principle.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Dekker-1	Despite its length, the DEIS failed to provide essential information. Important statistics (like the 22 crashes since 2000 of the EA-18G and its closely related F/A-18 E,F aircraft) were withheld. It also omitted several aggravating factors at the Outlying Field that are conducive to catastrophic accidents capable of	The noise model used, MR_Nmap uses state of the art science and is the appropriate method to evaluate aircraft noise in special use airspace such as the Olympic MOA. This model is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>endangering the populace, the environment, local properties, and the pilots themselves.</p> <p>To provide acceptable civilian safeguards and livability, the Navy prefers at least 2,000 unsettled acres to conduct a training program of this kind. Yet, repeatedly, the Navy has granted itself waivers on Whidbey, and local policymakers have looked the other way. Today, there are training missions over 664 acres of populated land on Whidbey Island. Thus, the Navy is in violation of its own safety standards, thereby putting islanders at risk. Aircraft noise levels included in the Navy's DEIS are wrong. They are generated by a flawed and outdated computer model. In addition, they represent only an average of flying and non-flying times.</p> <p>You asked for "substantive" comments with specifics on the EIS. Here is substantive: Thousands of people, and myriad wildlife already hear and feel the bone-rattling, ear-drum shaking roar of these aircraft already. Multiply each additional proposed fly-over by the number of people and wildlife that experience this noise EACH FLYOVER and then multiply that by the proposed number of flyovers; THAT is indeed substantive. You cannot hide it, bury it, or dismiss it. No new jets; no new flights. Period.</p>	
Deleeuw-1	<p>Please do not go forward with sonar testing!! Our whales are in an already critical survival situation, this will cause more detriment to the struggling whales!! Please do not do this, for the sake of our ocean life.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Delgadillo-1	<p>I am 100% against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. As someone who has lived with sensory processing disorder, living in a state of fight, flight or freeze in reaction to noise stimuli—I know how profoundly disruptive noise can be. For marine mammals who's life depends on sounds and frequencies, you are sentencing them to a devastating life and demise.</p> <p>A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas.</p> <p>"For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival,"</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Calambokidis said.</p> <p>Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations. Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times.</p> <p>I am 100% against underwater sonar testing! Please stop this!</p>	
Dellas-1	<p>This is my first public comment regarding this issue, though ive been aware of these activities for many years. I address the over arching philosophical question of who are we, what are we trying to acomplish and whether or not its acceptable to further harm nature in our pursuits. Given the preponderance of evidence i think any reasonable person would agree that activities such as the navy proposes are not justified and no mitigations will offset the potential harms. In closing i believe it is indisputable that the collective effect of human activity over particularly the last one hundred years is destroying the earth and with it all life on earth. I question whether these activities further this destruction, and if so, why?</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Demits-1	<p>My concern is marine life. They communicate through sonar, and all the mammals will beach themselves and die. They're already in a distressed position due to the overfishing and all the toxins and trash that we have put into the ocean. Now the Navy wants to come in with sonar testing and explosives in our ocean? We will have no more marine life for the future. The children growing up will only see pictures of whales, they won't see the whales spout. I have been in commercial and sport fishing, and from my knowledge of the law, you're not allowed to even follow a whale with a boat, let alone torment them and destroy their habitat and their ability to communicate with each other. I think it's very important that we preserve our oceans. And I'm very against any oil drilling, any kind of war games. I think the money would be better spent in educating people how to save our environment and save our animals. Something for our children for the future. We need to clean up our messes. We can start by cleaning up garbage, not blowing them up.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
DePalma-1	<p>No more flights. Defund the military!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
DesRochers-1	GET SONAR TESTING OUT OF THE SALISH SEA. The orcas are having a hard enough time with farmed salmon diseases. Stop harming coastal marine life.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
DeVincet-1	<p>I first take issue with the Navy's assertion that: Navy activities are unlikely to have long term consequences on marine mammal populations." *****</p> <p>According to Oceana:</p> <p>" The U.S. Navy's training and readiness activities in the ocean cause considerable harm to marine mammals, primarily through the use of high-intensity active sonar and the detonation of underwater explosives. For the current five-year period of activity, the Navy estimated that it would kill more than 250 whales and other marine mammals; cause permanent injury, including lung and hearing damage, to 3,000 more; and disrupt foraging and other vital behavior more than 30 million times."</p> <p>Beyond that the Navy has suggested that the effects of the active sonar and explosions are local and time limited however, a study by Oceana on the effects of the Sonar reported:</p> <p>"In 1997, another experimental sonar trial took place off the coast of California close to the island of San José, ending up with the stranding of three whales and a sperm whale. According to scientists in the area, the sound waves from this experiment could be recorded along the whole length of the Californian coast".</p> <p>It is meaningless to say that the effects are localized when there is no place to go. Furthermore, the effects of the sonar and the explosions impact all ocean creatures, including those that the whales consume. Just this year whales have been found dead on shores with 80 pounds of plastic in their digestive tracts. There have been so many whales washed up on Pacific beaches this year alone (70+) that NOAA is beginning to investigate. Some have been caused by ship strikes but many are dying from starvation. These factors add up and yet the Navy wants more explosions?</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Regarding the PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES: Importance of Training and Testing with Active Sonar and Explosives NEW EVALUATION for using the NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE: While the Navy states that “Defense against enemy submarines is a top priority for the Navy” – Please note this reason for blowing up explosives on the West Coast may no longer be necessary – at least not as it once was. We now have a president, and a good portion of the Senate, that no longer fear Russian aggression – and indeed may have already succumbed to it. Although Russian Submarines had been the nemesis of the US Navy for many decades, it would appear that is no longer the case. Furthermore, what is the point of blowing up the Ocean when the president lets the enemy in the front door and the Oval Office and the Senate refuses to stop future election intrusions by this hostile nation? Why not just let the ocean creatures alone now that our leader sees immigrants on the Southern border as the real threat? When both the President and the Senate are giving the Russians a free pass to choose our politicians, defense of the ocean ports is rendered futile and thus all the sonar and explosions just for practice are completely unjustifiable.</p>	
DeVoid-1	<p>It is my belief, that by flying these planes through Port Angeles, Olympic National Park and many other air spaces, the Navy will be robbing these places of something growing quite rare. Quiet. The Olympic National Park is home to many unique flora and fauna that bring people here from all around the world. I believe this noise pollution will adversely affect both the animals and tourist’s experiences, which in turn will impact local businesses with revenue loss. Please do not proceed with this plan and ruin one of the last quiet places in the lower 48.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
DeWeea-1	<p>This testing has proven to be harmful to marine life so it must be stopped now. When one species is affected, all life in the ecosystem is affected, which in turn affects us. Please do not harm our ecosystems further.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Dickerson-1	<p>The increased activity of the Growler jets in the vicinity of the OLF will be extremely disruptive to me and the other people I work with. our office is directly under the flight path of the jets, and when they fly, we are unable to conduct business over the phone or have clients in the office. It also makes concentration very difficult. There are eleven people that work in the office and adjacent shop regularly.</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include aircraft flights in the vicinity of Whidbey Island or the OLF. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Dilling-1	<p>Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Greetings,</p> <p>Please include me on the Supplemental EIS/OEIS mailing list to receive notification of public meetings and project information.</p> <p>Here are my comments for the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>1. What are the mitigation proposals for curbing the noise over the Olympic Peninsula? Real noise data - not just computer generated data needs to be gathered. The EIS for the addition of 36 more Growlers at Ault Field did not use real data. An Outdated system which the Navy defines as "probably not legally defensible" was used. Here in San Juan County we know that the decibels projected by NoiseMap are not accurate. The same 36 Growlers are now flying over the Olympic Peninsula and it appears that the same faulty outdated computer software is being used to predict Growler impacts on the Peninsula.</p> <p>2. It has come to my attention that the Navy will be upgrading the Growlers Twin F414 Engines that have 17,000 pounds of thrust with new engines that will have 26,000 pounds of thrust. This means MORE GROWLER NOISE not less. WHEN DO WE GET TO COMMENT ON THE EIS THAT ADDRESSES THE NOISE IMPACTS OF THE NEW ENGINES WITH 26.000 POUNDS OF THRUST?</p> <p>3. Convenience for Navy Personnel rather than what is good for residents and the environment of the Olympic Peninsula and the NW Washington region seems to be the priority. We have many members of the Navy in our family and have always respected the Navy community - but now it appears that the Navy is the BULLY IN THE ROOM and does not care at all for the tax payers whose homes are now being degraded and the veterans who have chosen the quiet of the Olympic Peninsula to help them recover from their tours of duty from the various wars they have served in. I have spoken with many PTSD veteran residents of the Peninsula who are struggling to understand why the Navy is not choosing to mitigate the noise or base the War Training Operations in more suitable locations. - which DO exist.</p> <p>4. As our resident Orca population struggles to survive, the Navy continues to use sonar where they live and hunt. These "takings" are excessive and should be stopped immediately.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>The engines used for the noise model were the F414-GE-400 engines, which are the current engines installed in the F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft. Appendix J has been revised to include the engine type modeled for the EA-18G aircraft. The GE F414-400 enhanced engine is currently only in a research phase for the Navy, and is not installed in any aircraft, nor are there plans to purchase or install it. If this engine were to be introduced to the fleet of F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft, the Navy would measure the noise emissions from this new engine.</p> <p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

Commenter	Comment	Navy Response
Dimondstein-1	I'm against the entire spectrum of war games. The US military is a prime actor driving climate change and extreme weather, world wide. Sonar impacts marine mammals up to 300 miles. There's no way the navy can live up to mitigating its aquatic terror.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Diomedou-1	Our oceans are dying from pollution, seismic activity and over fishing. Naval activity needs to consider the needs of these highly intelligent mammals - it's their oceanic habitat NOT ours... humanity will never learn and we will all suffer it's ignorance	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Dionne-1	This magnificent animals deserve total respect and protection from us humans. They have already suffered and endured enough. Please respect their environment and stop the training an testing of	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	EIS/OEIS. Thank you in advance	<p>minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
DiVall-1	Stop It!!! This is wrong!! These animals are being harmed--- they are basically endangered!! Stop it!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Divenere-1	PLEASE NO SONAR TESTING!!!	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Dizin-1	I do not believe that this type of testing is necessary for the Navy. There are too many harmful effects to marine life and the environment. The testing is a destruction and expensive waste of time. Our Navy can be strong and effective without it.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology <p>The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com</p>
Dlouhy-1	Please find another location for your test. The sound will hurt the resident orcas. This is their home, you can do your tests somewhere else.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Dobson-1	The Southern Resident orcas are critically endangered due to previous and ongoing damage by man to their environment and food sources. The last	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>thing they need now is for sonar testing which will have a dreadful, adverse effect on their means of communication, food locating, and navigation. They and the other inhabitants of the Salish Sea should be protected not be subjected to further harm.</p> <p>If sonar testing is really necessary it should only be carried out in any area after extensive and thorough research into the location, its inhabitants, existing environmental damage and the potential harm that will be caused. Where a species is critically endangered, as are the Southern Residents, a different, more suitable location for the testing should be found.</p> <p>As the ex wife of a military veteran I fully support the military but the days have gone when testing could be carried out without heed of the damage it might cause.</p> <p>We are the custodians of this planet and it is our duty to protect it and all its inhabitants for this and future generations. Please do not push ahead with sonar testing in this area - if it must be done at all!</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Dodge-1	<p>I ask that the Navy respect the Southern Resident Orcas' Endangered Species status and take steps to mitigate further harm. The Navy needs to protect the critical habitat of the orcas and prohibit testing and training in these waters. Please ban sonar and explosives in these waters. The Navy should not engage in any activities that can harm marine life. The Navy's EIS clearly indicates that the Southern Residents will be harmed by their testing and training activities, and that this is not acceptable. Our Southern Residents need quiet in order to "hear" their prey. In 2003 during a training session, the J pod quit foraging and instead spent time and calories trying to leave the area instead of hunting and eating. The Southern Resident Orcas have two calves and we should give them every chance at survival possible.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p>
Doe-1	<p>Stop your sons resting in that sea place</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Doherty-1	<p>The Navy predicts that there would be more than 500,000 instances of marine mammal behavioral impacts, harassment, and injuries over five years, including 275,000 instances of temporary hearing loss, and more than 600 instances of permanent hearing loss. This is unacceptable and inhumane.</p> <p>Vessel strikes from increased water traffic will increase marine mammal death rate. We have already seen the loss of nine Grey whales in the San Francisco Bay area in the last six weeks. The western North Pacific population of grey whales is estimated to include fewer than 200 individuals.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Dohrmann-1	<p>Please stop these testings. You know they disturb/hurt the marine mammals. They are so beautiful and they really do have enough problems caused by humans... We are the most intelligent species on this planet. We should care more for those, who can't help themselves! We do have this responsibility.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Donahue-1	I oppose the increase in testing in California waters. I encourage the Navy to work with the Sinkyone Intertribal Council to exclude California from testing 12 miles from shore.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Donaldson-1	Dear Sirs, As guardians of our glorious world, please, reconsider this testing as it is extremely harmful to marine-life within the area! There have been scientific evidence sent to your good-selves on this subject and I do hope you will consider this with an open mind and reconsider the project and any-other similar testing in the area, thank you for your time and patience! Pamela Donaldson	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Doneson-1	I completely object and am against this type of testing. We are destroying the oceans for this cruel and unusual testing which offers very little Benifet	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Doody-1	You admit that you understand this practice harms their hearing, a sense that is essential to their survival, but you do it anyway? Really? Sad and unacceptable. This needs to end now.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Dougherty-1	<p>1- because the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) suggests asking the National Marine and Fisheries Service (NMFS) and/or the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to serve as lead agencies when a proposal concerns oceans; this EIS asked the National Marine and Fisheries to be a lead agency however since this is such an enormous plan for the next 7 years I strongly object to not asking the NOAA to join as a lead agency also. Would the NOAA have granted this plan to extend for 7 years which is two years longer than the 2010 five year training and testing EIS, and the 2015 five year training and testing EIS?</p> <p>2 - because this study's cumulative effects does not consider the recent Gray Whale extreme die off, labeled by the NOAA as an Unusual Mortality Event or UME.</p> <p>3 - because there is evidence some of the dead gray whales washing ashore on the Coasts of Alaska, Washington, Oregon and California are emaciated and starving and because one of their major feeding areas in the North West is exactly the hub of your proposal activity and has been the hub of activity in Puget sound since 2010. (designated by National Marine Fisheries as important to feeding during the March through May season). Your map shows both of these statistics, your study in Puget Sound and the feeding grounds of the Gray Whales overlap precisely. (There are other factors being found to cause the deaths of this population and the year's NOAA study is not complete.)</p> <p>4 - because according to this EIS the eastern boundary of study is 12 miles out. The migration corridor's outermost boundary for the whales is 10 kilometers offshore which is 6.2 miles. In K-3-3 section the EIS states that aerial surveys covering the near-shore portion of the study area document gray whales were present during all surveys within 25 kilometers of the coast (Adams et al, 2014). 25 kilometers is 15.5 miles. I strongly object to your use of nautical miles for one measurement and kilometers for others. Furthermore why are you disregarding that the habitat of the California Gray Whales has no undersea borders? It is their habitat and they are affected by low frequency active sonar for hundreds of miles. The parachutes and all debris from the training and testing do not obey boundaries on a map, neither do the whales, neither do underwater acoustics. The lines on these real to us maps are clear to human minds for</p>	<p>In August 2018, the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) was amended by the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2019 to allow for seven-year authorizations for military readiness activities, as compared to the previously allowed five years. The Navy's activities qualify as military readiness activities pursuant to the MMPA as amended by the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2004. Therefore, it is appropriate that the Navy request a seven-year authorization from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). It is will be determined by NMFS whether or not to grant the Navy's request.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>NMFS makes the determination of species considered as distinct stocks or population segments. However, the Navy did consider the gray whale presence in Puget Sound in its analysis of potential impacts.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>communication but useless to whales living and communicating in fluid currents, underwater sound conduction, shifting food chain patterns, etc.</p> <p>5 - because the Pacific Coast Feeding Group gray whales have been documented within the Study Area in the spring, summer and fall months and this EIS designates them as a small group. I object to your description of this group as "small. They are approximately 200 in number. They should be considered differently because they stay around the Puget Sound for more time than the others but their size does not matter in this analysis. We are looking at the cumulative impact on all Gray Whales.</p> <p>6 - because the NEPA site was compromised by censorship of pertinent information needed and wanted prior to January of 2017 and thereafter. On the top of the epa.gov website is printed "We've made some changes to EPA.gov. If the information you are looking for is not here, you may be able to find it on the EPA Web archive or on the January 19, 2017 snapshot" The link led me to "This content is not maintained and may no longer apply for current information visit epa.gov." In January, 2017, in the first days of the Trump presidency many governmental sites were excised and information erased, notably (that I am aware of without further research) for the environment: EPA and NASA and National Parks' sites. This should be prosecuted in court as a well planned Executive censorship of scientific data which had been collected and held in trust for the common good of American citizens and global citizens and all life on earth.</p> <p>7- because I could not print information off the NEPA website for my research The Summary of the Endangered Special Act: Laws and Regulations section on epa.gov would not allow me to cut and paste and print this page. Or print it directly from the site.</p> <p>8- Because I consider the Environmental Protection Agency as it exists presently (as are all Federal Departments in our government since 2017), a political tool; no longer faithful to its mission of protecting the environment. I also witness daily how each federal department and agency are actively dissembling, and destroying their stated missions. This is not to say there are not people still sincerely working in such agencies for the common good, however they are being obstructed every step of the way. Therefore, I cannot trust the CEQ's assessment of my objections to a conflict with the Navy's NWTTEIS 2019 assessment of adhering to law.</p>	
Dougherty-2	<p>9- I was told at the May 3rd meeting Fort Bragg that because Executive Order 12114 (1979) mandates the Navy must test newest weapons for National security and further I was told that the constitution mandates the military to protect American citizens, first. Period. It is the primary mission</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>of the Navy and the Navy must comply with NEPA requisites as a secondary. I challenge this position as biased towards the Weapons industry in which many politicians have stock, have worked for and/or lobbied for, and/or are members on Boards of Directors and profit extensively from global weapon trade. Weapon escalation and its effects: creating, testing and training selling and using this weaponry endangers the safety and welfare of American citizens, global citizens and all life on earth. I challenge this position because it can be proven that United States Military's actions around the globe are contributing to climate change and that this endangers all American life for generations, as well as global citizens as well as all life on the planet. Your "protection" is killing us. One of the Naval scientists at the May 3, 2019 meeting in Fort Bragg responded to this fact with "the Navy is not the only one." To which I honestly and wholeheartedly agree. However you are asking me for my input into this EIS; we are looking at the Navy and the environment. Good for us to be honest here.</p> <p>10 - because weapons escalation has accelerated beyond any rational, common sense of defense and protection and is a real danger to all. "United Technologies Corp is nearing a deal to merge its aerospace business with U.S. defense contractor Raytheon Co and form a new company worth well over \$100 billion ... " "Raytheon, maker of the Tomahawk and the Patriot missile systems, and other U.S. military contractors are expected to benefit from strong global demand for fighter jets and munitions as well as higher U.S. defense spending in fiscal 2020, a lot of it driven by U.S. President Donald Trump's administration." Reuters, June 8, 2019</p> <p>11- because military expenditure in our country and globally are depleting resources vital for American citizens' and global citizens' rights of the pursuit of survival and health, and because such funding if used for the benefit of all life could solve many of the areas of conflict between other nations and ourselves: famine, drought, poverty, migration, lack of healthcare, lack of education, lack of sustainable farming, lack of sustainable fishing, failing infrastructure, the use of war and threats to solve differences instead of negotiations and non-violent communication. In 2015 the Military spending of China, Russia, Japan, France, India, United Kingdom, and Saudi Arabia all totaled equaled \$567.2 billion and the military spending for the United States alone that year was \$596 billion. (Business Plan for Peace, Scilla Elworthy: p 19)</p>	<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Dougherty-3	<p>12A - Cumulative Impacts: because you define "cumulative impacts" in a limited, selective manner. I will use two charts as an example of this and for simplification 1 will only use examples for Alternative 1 as shown in this EIS. Chart p 3-39: the Annual number and location of extended decelerators and Parachutes. This chart illustrates these two items and also illustrates where they would be used: offshore or inland waters. They are also separated into 3 categories: small, medium and large; they are also categorized into testing and training use. And, finally these figures for Alternative 1 of this 2019 study are compared to the final 2015 EIS. To begin with it is good to note these are not actual statistics but projections, they are estimates into the future. 2015 final EIS shows the yearly probable statistics for the study from 2015 to 2020 and Alternative 1 of this 2019 study projects what will most likely be occurring between 2020 and 2027.</p> <p>Small decelerators and parachutes for this 2019 EIS - offshore, training= 9,354 inland training = 0 offshore testing= 1,759 inland testing= 224 total= 11,337</p> <p>Medium decelerators and parachutes for this 2019 EIS offshore, training= 4 inland training =- 0 offshore testing = 0 inland testing = 0 total - 4</p> <p>Large decelerators and parachutes for this 2019 EIS offshore training =98 inland training = 0 offshore testing =0 inland testing =0 total - 98</p> <p>If we take the three totals and multiply by 7 for the seven years of the study. 11,337 small decelerators and parachutes x7 = 79,359 4 medium decelerators and parachutes x7 = 28 98 large decelerators and parachutes x 7 = 686 and if we total those figures it means 80, 073 But even this is not the accurate figure of the accumulation of decelerators</p>	<p>In the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy considered the current Affected Environment, which includes the existing materials expended during previous years' training and testing.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>and parachutes in the ocean in the study area.</p> <p>If we take the items from 2015 Final EIS</p> <p>Small decelerators and parachutes offshore = $8,928 \times 5 = 44,640$</p> <p>Medium decelerators and parachutes offshore $24 \times 5 = 120$</p> <p>Large decelerators and parachutes offshore = $145 \times 5 = 725$</p> <p>total decelerators and parachutes from 2015~2019 = 45,485</p> <p>So adding up estimates of decelerators and parachutes in the ocean from 2015 till 2027 = 80,073</p> <p>45,210</p> <p>total = 125,283</p> <p>And this does not include the decelerators and parachutes from 2010 EIS from 2010-2015. This is a brief example of my argument with the faulty framing of cumulative impacts and the gap between tables and numbers and the reality to marine life who live in real time in the only ocean they have.</p> <p>Example 2:</p> <p>Chart 3.0-19 Annual Number and Location of Expended Wires and Cables.</p> <p>Fiber Optic Cables EIS 2019</p> <p>offshore training= 0</p> <p>Inland training= 0</p> <p>offshore testing= 36</p> <p>inland testing = 197</p> <p>total = $233 \times 7 = 1,631$</p> <p>Guidance wires</p> <p>offshore training = 2</p> <p>inland training = 0</p> <p>offshore testing = 152</p> <p>inland testing = 230</p> <p>total = $384 \times 7 = 2,688$</p> <p>Sonobuoy Wires</p> <p>offshore training = 9,338</p> <p>inland training = 0</p> <p>offshore testing = 4,049</p> <p>inland testing = 48</p> <p>total = $13,435 \times 7 = 94,045$</p> <p>so the total of wires and cables to be placed in the ocean from 2020 to 2027 =</p> <p>1,183</p> <p>4,298</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>94, 045 total= 99,526 PLUS the EIS from 2015 - 2019: Fiber Optic Cables offshore training= 0 inland training = 0 offshore testing = 0 inland testing= 122 total = 122 x 5 = 610 Guidance wires offshore training= 0 inland training = 0 offshore testing= 92 inland testing =155 total= 247 x 5= 1,235 Sonobuoy Wires offshore training = 8,928 inland training = 0 offshore testing = 1,000 inland testing = 6 total = 9,934 x 5 = 49,670 total wires and cables in ocean from 2015-2019 = 610 1,235 49,670 total =51,515 There will be approximately 51,515 plus 99,526 or a total of 151,041 cables and wires in the ocean in this study area by2027. (Not counting the wires and cables in the ocean from 2010 to 2015.) Here are specifics of just two types of materials accumulating in the ocean and we are then to consider these total figures to be permissible in the general category of stressors of entanglement? We are then to consider continuing down the general list of stressors: high energy lasers, physical disturbance, and strikes from vessels, vessel movement, in water devices expended or recovered, explosive munitions that may result in fragments, not to mention sound and pressure, annual number of expended or recovered targets, annual number and location of sea floor devices, annual number and location of expended chaff and flares, sound producing activities such as sonar and explosions, injury from rapid pressure changes,</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>auditory injury, possible nitrogen super saturation, injuries affecting reduced ability to acquire food as examples in which in each category you assess the effects to be acceptable to each species studied? Some of the tables in this EIS separates items such as parachutes and decelerators into 13 categories (offshore training, inland training, offshore testing, inland testing, Alternative 1, Alternative 2, 2015 EIS offshore training, inland training, offshore testing, inland testing, Alternative 1, Alternative 2 and this data is given as annual numbers for a seven year plan. This is helpful to see each the data on each major category however it is misleading when it comes to understanding the cumulative impact if these numbers. Cumulative is also a consideration of events outside of this study, such as climate change. In the week of January 18th of this year the Pentagon released a report "Effects of Changing Climate to the Department of Defense". This study looked, (arbitrarily) at 79 mission assurance priority installations of all the armed forces and found that 53 of the 79 are at risk for flooding and 36 out of 79 are at risk of wildfires. "The effects of a changing climate are a national security issue with potential impacts to Department of Defense missions, operational plans and installations." This congressionally mandated document was delivered to lawmakers but not officially announced or reported to the public. Numerous environmental organizations released the report.</p> <p>Many military bases are already running into issues caused by climate change. One example of many from the report: Langley-Eustis in Virginia has seen a 14" rise in sea level since 1930 with flooding at the base becoming "more frequent and severe." The rising temperatures (one aspect of change) in oceans are causing dramatic changes in marine life population and weather. Just because you may not believe the Navy is responsible for the starvation of gray whales this year (or maybe it is because of heavy presence in Puget Sound) the fact THAT IT IS HAPPENING and affecting the California Gray Whale Population is part of assessing cumulative impacts on this population along its entire habitat range. Climate change, vessel collisions, oil spills, nuclear reactor spills, decline and shift of food chains, may not be entirely created by the Navy but must be seen as factors contributing to the decline of Marine life and habitat over the years. If you take a study in 5 or 7 year segments and start each study with the last study without acknowledging declining Pacific Ocean species and habitat you are not assessing the cumulative impacts on our environment. You are not abiding by the guidelines of the NEP</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Dougherty-4	<p>12 B - Cumulative Impacts</p> <p>because this NWTTEIS does not include the impacts of from the Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing (HSTT) EIS/OEIS 4,000 page, 2018 document which affects the same whale population in their migration. That particular HSTT EIS was for testing and training to begin late 2018 for five years. How long have those training and testing operations been going on, for how many years? Same whales.</p> <p>" ... the Navy's use of sonar and underwater explosives has come under fire by environmental conservation groups that have sued the Navy for harming marine and mammals. Three years ago, a federal judge ordered the Navy to implement some temporary restrictions on training and ship transits, in line with its 2013-2018 permit. Those limitations don't carry through into the new permit, however." USNI News, Navy Issues Final Study Seeking Continual Use of Training Ranges Hawaii California Ranges Gidget Fuentes, 10/29/2018. Same whales.</p> <p>If we are truly talking cumulative impacts of simultaneous Naval operations in their migratory route and not simply two different locations as separately impacting that migration, if we are truly adding up ALL THOSE parachutes, wires, cables, sonar testing, etc etc etc impacts in the ocean from both sites over all the years of operations, THEN WE ARE TALKING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS. And though your science may not verify this, it is the assertion of many scientists that such huge impacts in the ocean off the Northwestern United States, San Diego, Hawaii and Florida affect the entire earth which affect all populations of life on earth as we are all connected and affected by negative impacts on any form in this web of life.</p> <p>For these reasons and those I have not had time to fully research for this proposal, (am a working grandmother with a limited amount of time) - I ask you to cease all naval testing and training off the coasts of Alaska, Washington, Oregon and California.</p>	<p>In the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy did consider the Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing (HSTT) EIS/OEIS and its potential for Cumulative Effects (see Table 4.3-1).</p>
Douglas D-1	<p>I am the General Manager of the most luxurious ocean front hotel in Fort Bragg, CA. We rely on tourism for survival and much of our tourism is driven by guests coming to see our whales and other sea life. Fort Bragg used to rely on logging and fishing, but times change and we now are a tourism driven economy. I implore you not to do the Navy's testing off our coastline. There must be another way to ensure our countries safety than killing off more sea life. Please reconsider your decision.</p>	<p>Wildlife-dependent recreational activities, such as wildlife viewing, or whale watching, are also discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p>
Douglas J-1	<p>I am completely against underwater sonar testing because it is proven to be extremely harmful to the sea life that inhabit this earth alongside us.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Douglas K-1	Hello, please do not practice your Navy under water sonar testing in the Salish sea. It would greatly harm all the Marine life there including the endangered orcas that live in this area. I understand that perhaps the welfare of the sea is not a top priority for you, however it should be because if the biodiversity of the sea plummets, even in this small area, so will the human population, as we, and every living thing, depend on the sea to live. This message is targeted at the US Navy however I believe that we all need to cop on.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Douglas L-1	I 100% disagree with sonar testing. The sound hurt my ears listening to it trough my phone, I can't imagine how unbearable it must be for the animals. Please put a stop this nonsense.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Douglass-1	While I deeply appreciate the need to train our military forces, I am an Army Mom, I would respectfully submit that this part of WA state has not only many human inhabitants affected by the noise but is home to many species of wildlife too. There must be some other place that isn't so dense in human and other inhabitants to practice in. Please do not just consider financial economies. When an ecosystem is placed under environmental stress, there are consequences that ultimately affect us all.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft and ships are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Downey-1	My husband is a former US Marine. My patriotism should not be called in question when I report that the flights over my home have become abusive and oppressive. I'm no expert and I don't know why some nights the noise is more piercing than others. Perhaps the wind coupled with the acoustics of living in a more densely populated part of Fidalgo Island (in central	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include aircraft flights in the vicinity of Fidalgo Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Anacortes). Training beyond midnight seems excessive. There are days I have to cover my ears indoors and certainly times I cannot even speak to a neighbor who is less than 2 feet from me due to noise. I'm deeply concerned about the proposed increase in training flights. I hope the Navy will reconsider the impact this training has on the people of Anacortes and Fidalgo Island.	http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Downward-1	Please do not test sonar equipment in the Salish Sea or Puget Sound. Our resident orca population is struggling to survive and cannot thrive with sonar testing in their home waters. I appreciate the Navy's protection and understand the need to test equipment, but I plead with you not to do the testing in the Salish Sea or Puget Sound. Thank you for your service.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Doyle-1	The Navy's EIS clearly indicates that the Southern Residents will be harmed by your testing and training activities, this is not acceptable. Our Southern Residents need quiet in order to "hear" their prey. In 2003 during a training session, the J pod quit foraging and instead spent time and calories trying to leave the area instead of hunting and eating. In pursuing these activities, the Navy violates the Endangered Species Act, which should be protecting the orcas. The designation for the orcas' critical habitat is under review and the Navy should not be allowed to move forward until the designation is final. Please respect the Southern Resident Orcas' Endangered Species status and take steps to mitigate further harm. We need to protect the critical habitat of the orcas and prohibit testing and training in these waters. Please ban sonar and explosives in these waters. Please do not engage in any activities that can harm marine life.	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i> . Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.
Drell-1	First of all, this format is an insult to the public. I know that the ten tribes of the Intertribal Sinkyone Council has been asking for several weeks that the format be a more traditional format so that the people who come can hear each other's questions and hear the answers that they get. That's a format where we all learn. The cocktail party style open house is extremely difficult. I've tried to navigate several of those and it's hard to hear, you get different answers from different booths, and the worst of it is that the community that comes to learn about the situation, become informed, is denied the benefit of hearing the concerns and the information that their fellow community members want to share. So it's a disservice to everybody except those who arranged it and apparently want to hide behind their little tables. So, I am submitting comments. My name is Ellen Drell. I am with the Willits Environmental Center, and I'm submitting comments on behalf of the Willits Environmental Center. And along with our comments from the Center, we also incorporate the comments submitted by the Intertribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council by reference. The -- the thrust of these comments is that we humans on the planet are facing a crisis of spiraling climate change. Everybody, every nation on earth, has pledged to try and do something about it. And the "do something" means to reduce to zero, in the not distant future, our greenhouse gas emissions and to do everything we can to sequester carbon. That includes doing everything we can to maintain -- well, I should say, to maintain at least the present state of health of the ocean. Because a healthy ocean is one of the most important carbon sequestration ecosystems on earth. The Navy also has to participate in that activity. And rather than proposing to do the same old war testing and training that they hope will not cause too much damage, they need to devise a defense system that does not emit greenhouse gases and that actually starts to do some healing on the planet. That's the thrust of our comments. I go into more detail. But the Navy must be a partner with the rest of us. They don't stand apart. And if we don't turn around and do something to control this warming climate and the catastrophic climate changes that are affecting every corner of the globe, there will be nothing	The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	left to fight for. And I'm not saying there aren't things to defend. There are certainly things about this country, our freedoms, our way of life, the beauty of our natural environment, that I want to defend. And so I understand the need to defend what we hold dear. But we cannot defend it by contributing to the destruction of the worldwide environment. So our various arms of the military have to join with the rest of the citizens of the world and get on the same page and start working to devise a system of defense and a system of life that does not contribute to global warming.	
Dryfhout-1	I feel the Navy has been very thorough in their assessments to continue training and testing on the North Olympic Peninsula. As United States Citizens, we have a dire need for our Armed forces and their continued training to be prepared to defend this country. I fully support the Navy's efforts and their proposed continued training and testing on the North Olympic Peninsula. I am proud of their efforts and work to protect us and I hope my fellow citizens are as well.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Dubowski-1	To whom it may concern, All Marine Mammals (cf. UME of Gray whales, endangered southern killer whales, etc...) are suffering right now because of lack of food. Idem for marine birds in the Bering sea (tufted puffins). Acoustic shockwaves (explosions, sonars, airguns (seismic prospection)) produce letal traumas on all membranes but there is NO necropsy rightly performed to put it in evidence (cf. the attached document on the lesions). The power of your guns are increasing when membranes are not more resistant ! So, the only effect of your naval game will be a full destruction. And you know it perfectly, and this public consultation is just an hypocrisy to look like "democratic" when you will do what you want. Your military training are made to protect the access to energy abroad, not to protect US citizens. It's the reason behind all the wars (and the reason of being of NATO), whatever the damages on citizens, whatever the damages on environment. Oceans are agonizing thanks to you In conclusion, and definitely, Sibylline Oceans NGO's asks for the cancelling of your military's plan in Northwest Training and Testing	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/• The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org• The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr• The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology• The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Dundo-1	I Say no yo sonar!! Digo no al sonar en el mar,estás especies están en peligro y probar sonares en su hábitat daña severamente su vida. Por favor no hagan más pruebas de sonar	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Dunn C-1	<p>While this comment is specific to the Olympic Peninsula, it applies to other parts of Washington. I frequent the Kettle River Valley, the Cascades, and Olympic Peninsula. While there are occasional military planes, and while there is some point where parks and forests can be overwhelmed by noise, we are nowhere near that. I find it thrilling when planes buzz through the Kettle River Valley. There is some limit for specific areas, but on a general basis, military planes are nowhere near being a burden on any recreational land that I hike in frequently.</p> <p>I was informed of this comment period by the Washington Trails Association, of which I am a member.</p> <p>Park Service and Forest Service employees are best positioned to comment on whether overflights are "excessive." While some limitation is necessary, my outdoor experiences do not make me believe we are at a point on the Peninsula that we need limitations. That may change in the future, of course.</p>	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Dunn S-1	<p>Yesterday Navy Growlers flew so low over my home in Greenbank, Washington, they cast a shadow on the deck. Too low, and too loud. In the 16 years I have lived here full time, the planes have gotten louder, fly more often and yet I feel less safe! Now the Navy wishes to expand the flights over Olympic National Park - a wonderfully pristine park we should all be able to quietly enjoy.</p> <p>None of my concerns expressed over the years seem to have been considered substantive because the damage continues to occur. The Navy just continues to do what it wants, what is wanted by the politicians owned by corporations who make money with government contracts - selling fear. Damage is done to our wildlife, and to the human life. We all need peace to prosper.</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include aircraft flights in the vicinity of Whidbey Island or the OLF. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p> <p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Duplessis-1	Stop sonars and let the orcas alone. They are in them element, not you. Oceans, seas are their home not yours ! Too many creatures die by our stupidity and cupidity, enough !! An angry French girl.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Durham-1	You need to stop blasting sonar testing near endangered populations of whales. The southern resident killer whale population doesn't need you blasting sonar near them when they are already endangered. They are already suffering without you adding more to it so please knock it off.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Durkee-1	I demand a minimum of 100-mile wide test free corridor along the Pacific Coast.	The Navy's mitigation involves numerous distance-from-shore restrictions for active sonar, explosive, and non-explosive training and testing activities. For example, the Navy will not conduct explosive training or explosive testing (except explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing) 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures, including development a new mitigation area known as the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. It would not be practical for the Navy to prohibit all training or testing activities within 100 miles from shore for the reasons described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), Chapter 5 (Mitigation), and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Durkee-2	Hello: Please work meaningfully with Pacific coast Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life. Expand prohibited activities in the 50-mile mitigation area to include use of sonar. Use the "best available science" referenced in the Draft SEIS be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Expand your monitoring program to include effects fo training and testing beyon potential harm to species population levels. Expand your list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections. The cumulative effect of the ocean acidification should be considered in the SEIS.	Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.
Durriyah-1	In a few years ago I've free ticket to watch a sircuss (dolphins, whale, sealion, and etc) At the first time I feel happy for seing them near and close. But, I think they are not happy like us who enjoyed the show. So I think that we are a selfish people if we don't stop this bad habit. And I hope we can be a best superhuman to save our 'friends' from God. With Love +62	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/• The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Duvall-1	<p>The Navy has adequate bases all over the planet. We don't want you in the Olympic peninsula; it is largely a public land area which should be reserved for wildlife, trees and recreation of humans. We don't want you killing marine life with war games in the Ocean waters off the Washington coast. There is no impact on these land or ocean ecologies that is acceptable. There is no "acceptable taking" on these lands or waters. use one of your current bases. Stay out of the Pacific North West.</p> <p>Main article: List of United States Navy installations Domestic[edit]</p> <p>United States Navy (59)</p> <p>State/Territory Base State Base</p> <p>California NAWS China Lake Mississippi NCBC Gulfport</p> <p>NB Coronado NAS Meridian</p> <p>NAS Lemoore NS Pascagoula</p> <p>NPS Monterey Nevada NAS Fallon</p> <p>NAS North Island New Jersey NWS Earle</p> <p>NB Point Loma NAES Lakehurst</p> <p>NB Ventura County-NAS Point Mugu New York NSA Saratoga Springs</p> <p>NB Ventura County-NCBC Port Hueneme Pennsylvania NAS Willow Grove</p> <p>Naval Base San Diego Rhode Island NS Newport</p> <p>Connecticut NSB New London South Carolina NSA Charleston</p> <p>Washington, D.C. Washington NY Tennessee NSA Mid-South</p> <p>United States Naval Research Laboratory Texas NAS Corpus Christi</p> <p>Florida Corry Station NTTC NAS JRB Fort Worth</p> <p>NAS Jacksonville NAS Kingsville</p> <p>NAS Key West</p> <p>NS Mayport Virginia Chesapeake NSGA</p> <p>NSA Orlando NSASP</p> <p>NSA Panama City Training Support Center Hampton Roads</p> <p>NAS Pensacola NAB Little Creek</p> <p>NAS Whiting Field NS Norfolk</p> <p>Georgia General Lucius D. Clay National Guard Center NAS Oceana</p> <p>NSB Kings Bay Wallops Island ASCS</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft and ships are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Dobbins ARB NWS Yorktown Guam Naval Base Guam Guam Andersen Air Force Base Hawaii NS Barking Sands Washington NBK Bangor Joint Base Pearl Harbor Hickam NBK Bremerton Illinois NS Great Lakes NAS Whidbey Island Indiana NSWC Crane Division NS Everett Louisiana NASJRB New Orleans West Virginia NIOC Sugar Grove Maine Portsmouth NS Maryland Cryptologic Warfare Group Six[34] (Fort Meade) NSA Annapolis[35] (Annapolis) NAS Patuxent River NSF Thurmont United States Naval Academy Indian Head Naval Surface Warfare Center (in Maryland, but a part of NSASP of Dahlgren, Virginia) Joint Base Andrews (USN/USAF) Overseas[edit] Bahamas[edit] Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Detachment AUTEK Bahrain[edit] Naval Support Activity Bahrain Brazil[edit] United States Naval Support Detachment, São Paulo British Indian Ocean Territory[edit] Naval Support Facility Diego Garcia Cuba[edit] Guantanamo Bay Naval Base Djibouti[edit] Camp Lemonnier Greece[edit] Naval Support Activity Souda Bay, Souda Bay, Crete Italy[edit] Naval Air Station Sigonella Naval Support Activity Naples NCTS Naples Japan[edit] Naval Air Facility Atsugi Naval Forces Japan, Okinawa	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>United States Fleet Activities Yokosuka</p> <p>United States Fleet Activities Sasebo</p> <p>Kuwait[edit]</p> <p>Kuwait Naval Base</p> <p>South Korea[edit]</p> <p>Commander Fleet Activities Chinhae</p> <p>Spain[edit]</p> <p>Rota Naval Station</p> <p>United States Air Force[edit]</p> <p>Main article: List of United States Air Force installations</p> <p>Domestic[edit]</p> <p>United States Air Force (71)</p>	
Dyer-1	<p>Using sonar is highly detrimental to porpoises who utilise sound extensively in day to day life which in turn will LIMIT THEIR SURVIVAL.</p> <p>A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal Of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbour porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters. This does not include the 76 CRITICALLY ENDANGERED SOUTHERN RESIDENT ORCAS.</p> <p>over 7 years harbour porpoises in inland Washington waters will likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to Navy calculations. Sonar will cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a 'behavioral reaction', (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound), at 101,377 times.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Dyer-Kindy-1	<p>Please reconsider this training as it will undoubtedly disrupt the fragile ecosystem of the area including causing irreparable harm to mammals dependent on sonar for survival. Please see this Seattle Times article listing the various studies that have been done in this area.</p> <p>https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/navy-plans-testing-of-futuristic-technology-sonar-harm-to-mammals-in-pacific-northwest/</p> <p>The Navy can do better.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
E		
E-1	<p>Please rethink the sonar testing. It really is damaging and painful for the sea life. Whales Dolphins orcas will all suffer. Imagine someone letting off that kind of sound and energy in your home and how you would feel. What would you do? Where would you go? How would you manage this? The sea is their home. Please rethink.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Eaton-1	Don't disturb the orcas with your tests. Protect the environment and its inhabitants! Not just humans, animals matter too. We need them as much as they need us. Stop your sonar testing!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Eaves-1	I support the training for our pilots. It is extremely important the training is very detailed and realistic. Jet noise is not a problem and hasn't been with the extra OLF training on Whidbey Island with the Growlers.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Edwards-1	I am a resident of the Mendocino coast in California and I have an AS degree in marine Science. Over the last few years some very unusual conditions have impacted the Eastern Pacific Ocean over the continental shelf. Many species such as birds, crab, Seastars, Abalone, Nereocystis kelp forests and marine mammals have been severely affected by warming oceans, wasting disease and starvation. Crab season has been delayed in our area due to low meat development and domoic acid levels. Seastar Wasting Disease has led to the canceling of the Northern California Abalone season this year. Purple Urchin are a main prey Seastars and their populations are usually controlled by them. Without Seastars the multitude of Urchins are eating all the kelp which is the main food of Abalone, leading to their starvation. Scarcity of food has also caused the starvation Sea Lion pups and whale strandings. I feel that all biological resources in the Eastern Pacific (examples above) are under extreme stress and that the Navy has not sufficiently analyzed the impact of continued weapon testing and noise on an already compromised environment.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Efremova-1	I am 100 percent opposed to sonic testing because of the effect that it will have on marine life. It is known to be harmful and disruptive, and we must	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	protect our southern residents and all the other species that call the Salish Sea home from threats like this.	Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Egan J-1	Please stop doing this when marine mammals are present in the testing area. If you cannot be sure that the area is clear, then move to more open, vacant waters for the tests. You know that you are harming wildlife so act like the protectors you claim to be....	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Egan L-1	I am sending this with deep appreciation and respect of marine mammal life that exists within the naval test patch on the west coast. The species that rely on sonar as their bridge for survival for communication and food need to be protected by humanity not further endangered. We, as humans, were intelligent enough to create this technology, we can find an adapted way to test that doesn't destroy critical life and intelligence in their habitat. The repercussions and connections of this technology on sonar reliant species is already being documented. We know better. We are better than this. Our greatest potential of power as humans when we can work in relation and partnership with other forms of intelligence, which may require modifications and re-adaptations along the way. These sonar reliant species hold forms of technology that we humans can't even understand yet. Our biggest role as humans include caretaking, guardianship, and stewardship aspects. We are bigger than this. I	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	appreciate the Navy extending the public comments space so us slow East Coasters can catch on.	
Eide-1	<p>Stop YOUR underwater activities in Puget Sound. The remaining Orcas deserve to have a quiet environment. Their existence is becoming unbalanced.</p> <p>Instead dig in and make their environment better. Patrol the tourist boats and kayakers, support quiet waterways and invest in San Juan and Island County for the generations to come.</p>	<p>The Navy is fully aware of the plight of the Southern Resident killer whales. In 2019 a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Governor's Southern Resident Killer Whale Task Force working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales.</p> <p>The Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals in areas that are particularly important for biological life processes, such as feeding and migration.</p> <p>Procedural mitigation measures already in place and proposed to continue include ceasing activities that could be harmful to marine mammals when marine mammals are detected within defined mitigation zones.</p> <p>The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.</p>
Eifert-1	Yesterday I endured three hours of hiking along the Obstruction Road in Olympic National Park. I watched your jets go overhead in a constant barrage of noise, far beyond what a national park should be. It was over powering. How is this protecting America? What is the point of protecting anything if we kill the very thing we're supposedly fighting for? Olympic National Park is our heritage, our legacy and the exact thing you guys are fighting for - and are killing. Please just consider going offshore on your trips out and back. What is wrong with you people?	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Eis-1	I simply do not want the oceanlife disturbed so drstically. What if someone piped that same sound or sounds into your home day shameful....	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Ekrem-1	We must limit/outlaw all sonar testing in ocean waters immediately to protect marine life and heal our oceanic biomes.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Eldred-1	<p>The Navy's EIS clearly indicates that the Southern Residents will be harmed by their testing and training activities, and this is not acceptable. Our Southern Residents need quiet in order to "hear" their prey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please be reminded that in 2003 during a training session, the J pod quit foraging and instead spent time and calories trying to leave the area instead of hunting and eating. • In pursuing these activities, the Navy violates the Endangered Species Act, which should be protecting the orcas. • The designation for the orcas' critical habitat is under review and the Navy should not be allowed to move forward until the designation is final. Please respect the Southern Resident Orcas' Endangered Species status and take steps to mitigate further harm. Please protect the critical habitat of the orcas and prohibit testing and training in these waters. Please ban sonar and explosives in these waters. I am concerned that the Navy should not engage in any activities that can harm marine life, especially the endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales. 	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p>
Ellers-1	Please see attached letter.	See responses below.
Ellers-2	<p>Dear Sir or Madam:</p> <p>I am a resident of Port Townsend, WA, and often hear the growler flights originating on Whidbey. They already keep me up at nights and disrupt my daily activities like gardening outside with the current level of noise from their operations. Any further expansion is unacceptable.</p> <p>Moreover, I am involved with advocacy work and actions on behalf of our critically endangered Southern Resident Orcas. The potential risk of further harm to the orcas in itself merits the denial of the expansion.</p> <p>More details supporting my position that opposes this expansion are below.</p> <p>Wildlife/Marine Life/Bird Populations. Puget Sound is the nation's second largest estuary. The waters of the Salish Sea are some of the most biologically significant and productive marine areas in the world, home to both abundant and threatened species of marine life, including six endangered whale species, threatened Stellar sea lions, threatened and endangered salmon, steelhead, and rockfish species, and endangered leatherback sea turtles.</p> <p>The rivers of Olympic Peninsula are important habitat where salmon reproduce. Aircraft noise and sonic booms have been implicated as a cause of lowered reproduction in a variety of animals. The J, K and L pods of Southern resident orcas that inhabits the Salish Sea is on the decline; only 76 remain as of the date of submitting these comments. Both high and low frequency noise have negative impacts on whales' ability to navigate and identify food. The carbon dioxide in jet exhaust acidifies the water, damaging the web of marine life that sustain salmon, the orca's primary food source. Additionally, chemical compounds from the Navy's fire fighting fire retardant, already in Whidbey's aquifer, enter Puget Sound as surface run-off. These effects, taken together, will further stress the pods</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>and may make the difference between survival and extinction.</p> <p>The Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary includes 3,188 square miles of marine waters off the rugged Olympic Peninsula coastline. The sanctuary extends 25 to 50 miles seaward, covering much of the continental shelf and several major submarine canyons. The sanctuary protects a productive upwelling zone, home to marine mammals and seabirds. Along its shores are thriving kelp and intertidal communities, teeming with fishes and other sea life. Scattered communities of deepsea coral and sponges form habitats for fish and other important marine wildlife. Olympic National Park is home to the endangered spotted owl and the endangered marbled murrelet. Its coastline is the biannual flyway for billions of migrating birds that depend on navigational signals disrupted by the jets. Growlers also collide with birds. 15 Reported "mishaps" include "large flock of birds hit after takeoff," "bird strike shut down engine," "bird ingested sometime after flight," and "encountered bird flock that FODed (foreign object damage) both engines." National Parks and Other Protected Lands. Puget Sound is bordered by 68 state parks and 8 national parks and monuments, wildlife refuges, forests, and public lands. These assets help drive approximately \$9.5 billion in travel spending, including 88,000 tourist-related jobs that bring \$3 billion to the region, much of it to Washington State. Increased noise over the Olympic National Park threatens its status as a UNESCO World Heritage Site and Biosphere Reserve.</p> <p>The San Juan Islands National Monument encompasses 1,000 acres spread across a unique archipelago of 450 islands, rocks, and pinnacles that includes scientific and historic treasures, a refuge for wildlife, and a classroom for generations of Americans.</p> <p>Deception Pass State Park is Washington's most-visited state park, offering fishing, swimming, hiking, and bird-watching opportunities. During flyovers by the jets, campers have chosen to pull up stakes and fold up their tents, shortening their stay to escape the noise. The U.S. has a proud tradition of setting aside lands for public enjoyment. Public enjoyment is inconsistent with the purposes of a military installation conducting warfare exercises.</p> <p>Pacific Northwest reserves, parks, and monuments provide a home for birds, mammals, and marine life. Migration patterns, mating habits, and feeding patterns are disturbed by noise from the Growlers. The presence of the Growlers conflicts with an important mission of the National Parks Service to preserve the soundscape of parks.</p> <p>Particularly negatively impacted will be Whidbey Island's Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve, the first and only in the nation, which tells the</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>story of the Native Americans who occupied the prairies and forests and the settlers who followed. The Reserve draws visitors seeking to experience an authentic setting; its tilled fields, estuaries, and quiet skies represent the best of “heritage tourism.” Yet, Ebey’s Reserve bears the brunt of Growler jets as they “touch and go” on the nearby runway. Noisy jets flying overhead are incompatible with the peace and authenticity of a historical reserve.</p> <p>40 years ago, the community on Central Whidbey made the decision to protect Ebey’s Reserve; property owners gave up their development rights. Allowing military jets unlimited access to the airspace above the Reserve diminishes the significance of this community effort. Historical structures—barns, cabins, storehouses—are threatened by Growlers that fly 300-600 feet overhead.</p> <p>Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires that adverse effects on historic properties must be avoided, minimized, or mitigated. While weakening of the structures and outright damage from intense low frequency vibrations from the Growlers is virtually guaranteed with 100 flights on busy training days, the Section 106 requirement has been disregarded. Although the Navy is required to consult with local authorities— mayors, commissioners, and managers of Ebey’s Reserve—it has failed to do so, instead issuing a “memorandum of agreement” that none of the partners have agreed to. The Navy terminated negotiations in November.</p> <p>Climate Change A four-fold increase in Growler flights will add 60,000 metric tons of additional carbon dioxide—a known cause of climate change— and speed ocean acidification, harming coral reefs, shellfish, and marine ecosystems.</p> <p>Native Americans. An increase in Growler flights will impinge on the treaty-promised hunting and fishing rights of native peoples. Pacific Northwest native tribes rely on the forests, rivers, and oceans for their survival and way of life. The lands and seas on which they depend are subjected to military maneuvers: bombing practice, ship-sinking, and sonar buoys that have killed whales, dolphins, porpoises, and other marine mammals.</p> <p>Water (Drinking, Agricultural). For years, Navy personnel trained with a chemical foam to extinguish a potential fire at a Growler crash site. Two of Coupeville’s community wells have been contaminated by these chemicals. While industry and local fire stations are required by law to eliminate this type of fire-fighting foam, the Navy—along with refineries and chemical plants—is exempt and maintains a</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>stockpile. A four-fold increase in operations at the OLF increases the likelihood that foam will be used. • Central and South Whidbey islanders have no access to fresh water apart from the aquifer underlying the island. This natural reservoir makes Whidbey Island habitable. One Growler crash could contaminate all of Central Whidbey's water supply and its single-source aquifer.</p> <p>New studies reveal safe levels of these toxins is a tenth of the current EPA standard. Coupeville water is above the new limits. In August of 2018, Senator Maria Cantwell, joined by other senators, introduced legislation to hold federal agencies, including active and decommissioned military bases, responsible for contamination of ground water by fire-fighting chemicals.</p> <p>Toxic Noise. The intensity, frequency, duration, and altitude of the Growlers is a threat to public health, igniting a firestorm of protest in several counties because of the deafening and toxic noise they produce. Aircraft noise levels included in the Navy's DEIS are wrong. They are generated by a flawed and outdated computer model. In addition, they represent only an average of flying and non-flying times. They do not reflect actual noise measurements at Coupeville's Outlying Field (OLF). The Navy's noise assessment is inaccurate and misleading.</p> <p>Measurements taken at Ebey's Reserve near Coupeville show damaging levels of noise, up to 115 decibels— well past the 85-decibel level that begins to cause permanent hearing loss.³ • Children exposed to loud noise show decreased reading comprehension, delayed development, impaired cognition, and memory loss. In 2013, the US Air Force disclosed that operations of the F-16 fighter aircraft in a Vermont neighborhood assaults children with noise sufficient to cause learning impairment and estimated that 45 percent more children will have their learning impaired if the F-35 jets are based in that neighborhood.</p> <p>The children of Central Whidbey are at risk. A moving aircraft causes compression and rarefaction, setting air molecules in motion and producing pressure waves. High-thrust engines, like those in the Growlers, emit low-frequency “windows rattling” pressure waves that penetrate into body organs and cause medical problems. The Navy recognizes the dangers of jet noise and protects its pilots and ground personnel. All personnel working in such areas receive hearing protection devices and are routinely monitored for health effects. Residential areas under the OLF flight path far exceed the Navy's threshold of a hazardous noise zone, yet civilians are left to fend for themselves.</p> <p>Risk of an Accident. The Growler's F-18 airframe is one of the most</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>accident-prone military airframes in existence. Between 1980 and 2014, the F18 sustained 39 accidents; 22 crashes of the EA-18G and F/A-18 E,F have occurred since 2000. The F-18 Super Hornet platform has a mishap rate well above the average of all military aircraft, including two serious mishaps involving EA-18G Growlers, since December of 2016.⁶ Given this history, increased flights would endanger schools, hospitals, homes, parks/play fields, and highways located near the runway. Parts of state Route 20, the only north-south highway on Whidbey Island, lie beneath the Growler's highest-risk crash zone. Coupeville's elementary, middle, and high schools are all located within four miles of the runway. Hospitals and fire stations are also close by, as are businesses and residences. To provide acceptable civilian safeguards and livability, the Navy prefers at least 2,000 unsettled acres to conduct a training program of this kind. Yet, repeatedly, the Navy has granted itself waivers on Whidbey, and local policymakers have looked the other way. Today, there are training missions over 664 acres of populated land on Whidbey Island. Thus, the Navy is in violation of its own safety standards, thereby putting islanders and visitors at risk. The runway itself is unsafe. The 5,400-foot runway, built prior to 1943 to accommodate aircraft built in the 1940s, is nearly 3,500 feet too short for Growler jet "touch and go" operations, which require 8,800 feet. The runway cannot be extended. For 32 years, the runway has failed to meet Navy runway safety standards. Thus, the Navy is putting its own pilots in danger by asking them to train on an inadequate runway. Our pilots should have the best possible training, and the Navy should provide a training site that provides realistic carrier landing and takeoff conditions in a way that does not needlessly endanger pilots or civilians. A single Growler costs \$85-100 million. These very expensive weapons, paid for by taxpayers, should be deployed in an area equipped to handle their needs. At present, the runway cannot do that.</p> <p>Property Values and Property Taxes. Proposed increased operations will likely cause Accident Potential Zones (APZs) to be imposed. Island County will have to change zoning designations to prevent development. Similar downzoning has had negative effects on other communities, making mortgages and home loans difficult, impeding housing sales, and reducing property values.⁹ Unoccupied houses and deterioration of affected areas presents social, public health, and safety issues. Approximately 4,400 land parcels with an assessed value of \$1.3 billion will be affected.</p>	
Ellers-3	<p>Tourism</p> <p>Many communities around Puget Sound depend on tourism, especially</p>	<p>The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism and Recreation). No negative effects to</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>those on the Olympic Peninsula and our islands. (Olympic National Park is by far the largest contributor to the Olympic Peninsula economy.) Allowing the area to become a giant military staging ground will cripple the tourism industry and threaten small businesses: inns, B&Bs, restaurants, farms, wineries/distilleries, retailers, and outdoor recreation (whalewatching, diving, kayaking, paddle boarding, boating). • Coupeville is the second oldest town in Washington State. It attracts upwards of 90,000 tourists per year.¹¹ A four-fold increase in Growler flights would drive tourists away and diminish the economic vitality of Coupeville.</p> <p>Outdoor recreation is valued at \$21.6 billion and helps to create 199,000 jobs. Outdoor enthusiasts spend the most when they are recreating on the water. This is more than the \$15 billion contributed to our economy by military and defense industries. Jobs in Washington depend on its pristine skies, lands, and waters.</p>	<p>tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p>
Ellers-4	<p>Farming, Fishing, Local Economies. Farms on Central Whidbey produce food for the island and for restaurants throughout the region. They contribute to the island's local economy and food security. But farmers cannot tend their crops during Growler operations because of noise deemed unsafe for workers by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Quadrupling flights threatens farming on Central Whidbey.</p> <p>Jet engines do not burn cleanly, but their toxic by-products tend to disperse high in the atmosphere. But, because the Growlers fly at low altitudes during landing practices, toxic particulates fill our air, fall into our waters, and drift down to our soils. Healthy food cannot grow on acreage exposed to constant pollution from above, which is why California—with strict clean air regulations— prohibits such maneuvers.</p> <p>The average annual commercial value for Puget Sound crab, shrimp, mussel, oyster, geoduck, and other clams is \$44 million. Recreational shell fishing is valued at \$42 million per year; recreational fishing in Puget Sound at \$57 million a year; commercial fishing at \$4 million a year. What might the additional noise and carbon dioxide pollution from more military jets do to water quality and to these economies?</p> <p>Economic Effects of Hosting the Naval Base. The presence of the Navy means lost revenue for Island County and increased demand for county services in the following ways: Although Navy children attend district schools, the school system is reimbursed only 25 percent of the cost of educating them. Sailors often use local support services funded by sales and property taxes paid by civilians. The military brings in people who are given a “market rate” housing allowance that has driven up rent prices,</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>forcing out those who can no longer afford higher rents. •</p> <p>A workforce housing crisis exists on Whidbey Island. Local businesses cannot keep up with demand for housing or expand because employees cannot find affordable places to rent. Although only 109 new housing units are created annually in Island County, the Growler squadron expansion will import an estimated 634 personnel and their families. The Navy has no plans to expand housing on the base. Why not? Housing additional Navy personnel off base creates more hardship for working class community members.</p> <p>The external costs of living with jet noise is imposed without warning or recourse on citizens across the region: in San Juan, Skagit, Jefferson, Clallam, and even Snohomish and Okanogan Counties. The proposed expansion will likely increase these costs. The effects of inflated housing markets and increased traffic congestion in Island County are also felt by residents of Island County's neighbor, Skagit County. The proposed expansion will likely magnify these effects.</p> <p>National Security and Operational Readiness. It runs counter to military policy to station all crucial defense assets on one base, yet the Department of Defense plans on doing just that by locating the entire Growler squadron on Whidbey Island. Whidbey Island sits atop five fault lines. Growler squadrons are vulnerable to an earthquake.</p> <p>In summary, this action by the Navy does not honor public process and our irreplaceable natural resources, and must be rejected. This decision—to single site all Growlers in Puget Sound—comes from “the other Washington,” which has no sense of our state, regional, or local conditions and needs. Thank you for considering my comments.</p>	
Elliot-1	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>The Salish Sea is an important contributor to biodiversity and ecosystem health. In turn, this supports healthy socio-economic functions of the local communities surrounding the Salish Sea. Sonar testing is proven to severely disrupt marine organisms, ones that are already tolerating threatening conditions due to human activities. We do not need to put more pressure on these ecosystems, and instead need to find way to reduce pressures and support them so they can continue to support our socio-economic functions. I urge you to reconsider your use of sonar. If not for the animals, or the coastal communities, for our children and the future. There is a rapid loss of wonder in this world, please do not let nature become just a childrens story. Allow them to experience and see what we have been able to.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Elliott-1	Sonar Testing causes permanent hearing loss for all marine mammals. It is inhumane to do this to the dolphins and whales whose communication relies on their advanced hearing that can hear sounds for miles. You are debilitating already endangered species. No more sonar testing	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ellison-1	I object to underwater sonar testing which has been proven to harm marine animals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Elmasian-1	Let the orcas live in peace! They don't bother us, why do humans torture them?	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Eltringham-1	The impacts of military sonar tests on marine mammals and other marine fauna is substantial, despite your awareness of this you continue to stage	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	such tests across the coastal United States. It is irresponsible and causes irreparable damage to marine systems that are already at risk due to human activity. If the United States Navy has any respect for our seas or the health of waters utilized by thousands of families then these tests should either be cancelled permanently or relocated to areas where marine mammals are at least not frequenting, the idea of testing in the middle of a territory occupied by an endangered population of killer whales is ludicrous. I sincerely hope you reconsider your plans to blast the Salish Sea with high pressure 235 decibel sound waves and cause irreversible damage to a critical and diverse marine habitat.	and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Elwell-1	We are all sharing this planet that we all call home - humans, animals other cetaceans are highly sentient, intelligent beings that have been decimated in their millions, captured and stolen from their families, harassed by boats, chopped up by propellers, stabbed with harpoons, endlessly polluted by our trash and now their brains are being invaded by your irresponsible & frankly petrifying sonar! Imagine being subjected to a car alarm in your ears and not being able to hear anything or catch food!! That is what you are doing! Stop this now, please. Where there is no blue, there is no green.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Emerson-1	I am 100% against US Navy Sonic testing in the Salish Sea. This harmful practice endangers all marine life. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Emerton-1	Please stop sonar testing! It harms whales and is inhuman, immoral and unethical!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Endicott-1	As a member of a military family I appreciate the service and know training is need. As these southern resident orcas are endangered; I ask that some out of the box ideas be entertained; so training is not in thier habitat. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Endress-1	Please do not allow ANY sonar testing in the Salish Sea. The marine life in this sea is already facing so many obstacles. This would be devastating. We used to travel to your area specifically to see your marine life. After a disappointing trip a couple of years ago, we will not spend our money travelling there again until we see a real effort to protect the marine life, not encouraging even more harm.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Erickson-1	Please dont do this. Please think twice about what you would be allowing. We are talking about the extinction of a species. These whales deserve a chance and we are the only ones who can give them that chance. This sonar hurts them. It could kill them. They are starving as it is. This isnt right. We are better than this.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Erion-1	This is a time where our planet and ecosystem are at such high risk with climate change. Please protect the Olympic peninsula which is a rare and precious treasure from terrible noise pollution which will have a negative impact on a vital ecosystem.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ervin-1	We know you care about our oceans too. And you've got some of the best talent in the country to come up with innovation. Please stop the sonar practice. Show the world something new!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Esselstyn-1	I am very much opposed to the use if sonar in the Salish Sea.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Etchart-1	I am in strong opposition of sonar testing and deeply concerned it will impact wildlife	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ethier-1	I am shocked that the Navy would carry out these risky exercises with out thinking of these whales. I look upon the Navy as a protector of our oceans not a destroyer.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Ettelson-1	<p>On May 31, 2019 the NOAA declared an "Unusual Mortality Event" on stranded and dead whales along the coast in California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska.</p> <p>This NEW INFORMATION should be considered in the Cumulative Effects Analysis in the DEIS since it documents a Wildlife Emergency that will significantly add to the negative impacts on whales in addition to what has already been documented in your existing analysis bringing this species under greater threat than was accounted for in your study requiring additional mitigation measures than what has already been proposed.</p> <p>Thank you for your considering my concern.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p>
Ettelson-2	<p>The recreational and commercial fishing industry in Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte counties along the north coast in California has a significant economic impact on those communities. This is also true in the coastal communities in Oregon, Washington, and Alaska. Potential negative impacts resulting from your project may impact this fishery resource.</p> <p>The existing condition of this industry should be considered in the analysis. For example; According to the Final Report to the Coastal Conservancy, CALIFORNIA'S NORTH COAST FISHING COMMUNITIES HISTORICAL PERSPECTICE AND RECENT TRENDS, Pomery, Thompson, Stevens, AUG 2010; "Since 1998, landings and value have been consistently below 45 million pounds and \$50 million, respectively." (P. 28). Although this industry has diminished, it is still a significant economic component to this area. "Reduced fishing opportunities has increased economic stress and uncertainty for fishery participants." (P. 54).</p> <p>An Economic Analysis to recognize this fishery's impact on the effected region must be included before you can assess your Project's direct, and</p>	<p>The Navy revised the affected environment description to include information more specific to the Northern California fishing industry, in addition to the existing description of the regional fishing industry.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	indirect impacts on this fishery. Cumulative impacts from already dwindling marine populations in addition to whatever the consequences resulting from your current proposal can cause some economic damage that should be analysed so all the impacts can be considered.	
Ettelson-3	<p>On May 31, 2019 the NOAA declared a; "Unusual Mortality Event" on stranded and dead whales along the coast in California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska.</p> <p>This new information should be considered in the Cumulative Effects in the DEIS since it documents a "Wildlife Emergency" that will significantly add to the negative impacts on whales, in addition to what has already been documented in your existing analysis, bringing this species under greater threat than what was accounted for in your study requiring additional mitigation than what has already been proposed.</p> <p>Does the "Wildlife Emergency" identified by NOAA affect your analysis?</p> <p>Thank you for considering my concern.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p>
Evenson-1	<p>The document does not adequately evaluate the recent mass die-off of whales beaching on our shores.</p> <p>Why has the Navy not evaluated this situation?</p> <p>Why has the Navy not investigated the die-off to determine what was causing it?</p> <p>The Navy continues to train and exercise in the Pacific and could be affecting these protected species, but doesn't even try and find out if this is so. Certainly Navy training and exercises are one of a number of factors.</p> <p>The public has the right to know more of the relationship between the die-off and the Navy's activities. This document is inadequate to that task.</p> <p>The Navy takes the position that it has not been proven that its past activities have caused harm. But when harm is caused and alarming, the Navy must find out if that position is borne out. It is not acceptable to the public that proof of harm must be supplied by the public or other agencies before the Navy will alter their plans. Employing the "Precautionary Principle," the Navy must suspend this EIS until a full investigation on the whale beachings is completed and peer reviewed.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p>
Evenson-2	<p>The environmental document does not adequately address many species adequately, but focuses mainly on whales, salmon, and marine mammals. The ocean is a web of life. What affects small life forms, affect larger life forms. By not addressing impacts to all these life forms, you are missing the big picture of what training exercises do to our ocean.</p> <p>There are too many species to list here, and that is the point. The Navy is subjecting the ocean and its life forms to high energy waves, polluting</p>	<p>In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy thoroughly analyzed the potential impacts to all forms of marine life and habitats. See Section 3.3, Marine Habitats; Section 3.4, Marine Mammals; Section 3.5 Sea Turtles; Section 3.6 Birds; Section 3.7, Marine Vegetation; Section 3.8, Marine Invertebrates; and Section 3.9, Fishes.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	substances, increased traffic and sound (both motors, sonar, and the presence of a large metal craft slapping its way over the surface or knifing its way through the depths). Picking out a few species to consider is doing a piecemeal job, something that does not survive legal muster in California or the nation.	
Everett-1	I live in Crocket Lake Estates. The planes fly directly over our house. With all windows closed the sound was so intense that we could not hold a conversation. My dog could not find a place to get relief from the sound. Just out of curiosity we recorded the decibels and they were close to a hundred. It has gotten way out of hand. I usually have no problem with the planes, but it has gotten out of hand now. Please reconsider your schedules and flight routes.	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island, including the Crocket Lake Estates. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
F		
Faber-1	Well, I just want to say that this coastline, which we protect and that's why we live here, is very special, because there's an upwelling of the water from at least south of Point Arena to north, here. And it upwells in such a way that there's more food and more critters than in other places, so it supplies the ocean with life. However, recently, under global warming with climate change, the water's been heating up and then getting cold and heating up, and a lot of life, a lot of critters, are getting sick, and the food chain has been incredibly compromised. In fact, there are people here who are a part of a diving team that are trying to replenish the water, the ocean, with seaweed and things that sustain life. They are trying to replenish the plant life that's been dying. There's a whole diving team. Because we're very aware of the fact that this is a really critical area for the life of the ocean. Meanwhile, we have climate change and the entire ocean is threatened and life everywhere in this ocean is seriously threatened. This ocean is life for human beings, and it cannot sustain what the Navy wants to do. They can go a hundred miles out and it will be better. I wouldn't like them to do any of it, but if they have to, if they're further out they won't be in the pathway of the traveling animals. And this is critical to human survival. And they need to stop doing business as usual. This is not business as usual. We have serious climate change on this planet, and they have to do it differently, and they cannot stay here. They cannot do what they want to do here. They cannot disturb the waters in the same way and expect that this ocean is going to sustain the life that it's been sustaining.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Fackerell-1	Though I support our troops, the noise pollution over our populated areas of Coupeville and Greenbank due to the increased Growler flights is harmful and unbearable.	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island, Coupeville, or Greenbank. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Surely the Navy can find ways to significantly reduce the noise or find less populated areas over which to practice. The cost to our children 's health due to noise pollution should be enough for the navy to find alternate solutions. Central Whidbey 's nature reserves are already being negatively impacted due to the noise affects on the animals that we are working so hard to protect for so many years. Tourism is negatively impacted by the noise created by the Growlers. People simply are not choosing to visit Central Whidbey. This has already hurt our local economy. Please find meaningful alternatives to increasing these very noisy planes over Central Whidbey which are having a very negative impact on the lives of thousands of local Central Whidbey residents who up to now have supported and valued our relationship with the US Navy.Thank you very much!	Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Fagerholm-1	The Navy was for many years a good neighbor...as the planes flew over, it was easy to dismiss the noise as "the sound of freedom". Sadly, that's in the past. The increase in frequency of flights and the elevated noise level of the growlers feels like total disrespect and a disregard for our beautiful rural way of life. Total disregard for the sanctity of the Olympic National Park and all the surrounding communities. The penis in the sky says it all..."we're the U.S. Navy...we can do whatever we want...we're in control here". ...and all of us who live here are just collateral damage...we don't count. This is not right.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Fain-1	I'm not sure what you mean by "substantive" comment Your testing obviously. effects Marine life in a negative way. I don't really think this is going to do any good commenting but I have to try. Please stop testing, our oceans are in trouble. Our Marine life on the Northern California Coast have already been stressed due to dwindling food scources, but you know that. Stop testing because it simply adds more stress. Do the right thing, I hope this counts as substantive.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Fairbanks-1	I strongly encourage the Navy to go with the NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE. Please do not let our Olympic National Park, coastline, people and animals be harmed!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Farber-1	I am a patriotic supporter of the US Military and moved to Whidbey Island with my wife in 2005. We were made aware of the activities of NAS Whidbey and were more than happy to support them.	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island or Coupeville. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>However, as flight missions have increased 400% (starting in March of 2019), it has become increasingly difficult to experience a satisfactory "quality of life" due to increased training missions over our home (and our neighbors' homes). Much as we support the military, the military must also support the US citizenry, and activities that make it impossible to enjoy outdoor life as well as very difficult to enjoy indoor life (due to the noise level increase) must be taken into consideration by the navy.</p> <p>Noise level outside our home has increased to a decibel range of 100 - 120; noise level inside our home has increased to 80 - 100 decibels. And, unlike many of our neighbors' homes, our home was built with extra sound insulation, including all triple-glazed windows and doors.</p> <p>With the proposal of increased training activities, the corresponding increase in noise levels at our home will make it impossible to continue to live in Coupeville or the surrounding area. The health and well-being of patriotic US citizens must not be overlooked by the US military. We are not asking that the military stop all (or even most) of their activities; we are asking that the military work with the local homeowners, understand the noise levels within and outside our homes, and understand the impact that this has on our lives.</p> <p>Due to the four-fold expansion in training missions over Whidbey, any additional expansion of naval operations (such as the use of this area as an additional training center) is unacceptable, as it will make civilian life in our area untenable. The burden of supporting the US military is something that should be borne fairly and equitably among ALL citizens of the U.S. Putting some extreme burdens on just one local group of civilians -- to the point where you are forcing us out of our homes and jobs -- is NOT what a democracy is all about. We ask, in all fairness, that the navy look for an alternative location for its planned expansion of military training activities.</p>	<p>Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>
Farrell-1	<p>recently, both the atlantic monthly and the new yorker magazines have been publishing solidly researched articles on the significant impact "as well as doing devastating damage to ecosystems," that sound has on human life.</p> <p>from the new yorker: "Scientists have begun to document the effects of human-generated sound on non-humans—effects that can be as devastating as those of more tangible forms of ecological desecration." (https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2019/05/13/is-noise-pollution-the-next-big-public-health-crisis)</p> <p>in order to know what's happening--actually happening--to humans as well as our living environment, actual data related to noise must be collected.</p>	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the failure of this project to address ACTUAL sound considerations--by refusing to take responsibility to for the objective collection of date related to the sound they are proposing to introduce to our social and natural environment on whidbey island--is unconscionable. how are we to agree on appropriate noise-abatement strategies when we don't know, for real, what's being introduced?</p> <p>unless and until the navy accounts for the impact of their actions in a credible and objective fashion, they have no ethical--and possibly legal--right to proceed.</p>	<p>databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Farver-1	Is there a net positive effect on the ocean and its creatures because of any of this? If not please find a new way to train. Perhaps invest \$ into simulators like the FAA. Cheaper, safer and more effective.	The Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, see the discussion in Section 2.4.1.4 (Simulated Training and Testing Only) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that discusses the need for live training specifically for aircrews.
Fattel-1	I am against testing in the Salish Sea. Orcas are important to natives, the water is important to natives. Orcas are already starved and endangered in this area. Please do not harm them or their importance any further.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Faulkner-1	<p>The serious condition of the ocean and all the living beings in it is infinitely more of a security threat than the possibility of war with North Korea or China. At the Navy's May open house meeting in Fort Bragg the Navy heard one comment loud and clear:</p> <p>WAR IS OBSOLETE</p>	The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The current disruption of ocean ecology is a threat to all of us humans; we can't survive long on a planet with a dead ocean. To live up to its mandate to protect the citizens of the United States, the Navy with all its resources, should be actively addressing the calamitous condition of the ocean not dropping plastic bombs into an environment already strangling on plastic, not deafening sea mammals with low frequency sonar; they depend solely on their hearing to survive. Has the Navy taken into account that 80 dead whales have washed up on the beach of Mendocino County? What about the hundreds of little grey murrelets who bailed out of the ocean, staggered up the beach and then died?</p> <p>Has the Navy ever heard of a body of knowledge that has sustained both the indigenous peoples of the earth and the land and seas that they have taken care of for thousands and thousands of years before the genocidal attacks on them? This knowledge is called Indigenous Traditional Ecological Knowledge or ITEK. I don't see it in the supplemental EIS. ITEK is based on the understanding that all living beings are related. Perhaps the mindset of the Navy has not allowed it to grasp this simple fact of relatedness. It seems that any Inuit in a kayak knows more about whales than the Navy.</p> <p>Representatives of the ten Native American tribes of the Sinkyoune had requested that the Navy's May open house be organized so that we could all be together while we listened to the Navy and got answers to our questions. The Navy did not honor that request. Instead the Navy mumbled and murmured from all sides of the room at once rendering itself incomprehensible. The EIS is equally muddled, concealing more than it reveals about the Navy's takings of sea life.</p> <p>The Navy should reconsider the Tribe's request. Create another meeting along the lines that they wanted so we can get the information about the bombing and the deafening that we have a right to know. Throw out that dysfunctional EIS and start over with one that actually communicates. Address the danger to us human beings as ocean ecology fails.</p>	<p>examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy will continue to consult with the Tribes. Through Government-to-Government consultations, the Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.</p>
Favorini-Csorba-1	<p>I am completely against SONAR testing as it has been proven to harm marine animals. Our orcas need protection more than anything now, and testing that actively harms them is simply cruel.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Feehan-1	Please do nothing to put the marine animals at risk	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Feen-1	<p>The Ninth US Circuit Court of Appeals in California on July 19, 2016, ruled that the low-frequency active sonar (LFA) systems used by the US Navy for training missions violates the Marine Mammal protection Act, and negatively impacts whales, dolphins, and walruses who rely on sound to navigate the seas.</p> <p>Coastal Mendocino County is my home. I have been blessed to watch Grey Whales on their yearly migration for the past twenty years. I have also been witness to the many impacts of multiple ecological stressors on our Oceans. I am deeply concerned that the Navy's LFA training missions along our coast will have profound negative impacts.</p> <p>The court said, "This systematic under-protection of marine mammals cannot be consistent with the requirement that mitigation measures result in the 'least practicable adverse impact' on marine mammals."</p> <p>Michael Jasny, director of the National Resource Defence Council (NRDC)'s marine mammal project said, "It's important to understand that the ocean is a world of sound, not sight. Marine mammal species perceive these SURTASS/LFA sounds as a threat and react accordingly."</p> <p>I encourage the Navy to consider that performing these training missions along the path of the Grey Whale Migration during the Whale's migration is a serious violation of the intention of "Incidental Take." It is well known scientific fact that these training missions will result in deafness (a deaf whale is a dead whale), hemorrhage, and death for Grey Whales and other marine mammals. If LFA training missions are carried out along migration paths while Grey Whales are migrating, "Incidental Take" becomes "Intentional Take."</p>	The Navy's proposed activities do not include use of the Navy's LFA system, described in the comment.
Feinberg-1	No to sonar! SAVE THE RESIDENT ORCAS!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Feitelberg-1	The whales do not have various navigation systems. The Navy can change where and how it practices. Leave the whales alone.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Fellows-1	<p>I first off want to thank you for all protecting our shoreline boarders. I grew up in the Pacific Northwest, the ability to see Killer Whales in the wild is unlike any where else. It is a magical, powerful and unique experience for all those lucky to see them swim wildly through the Salish sea and San Juan's. This image is an identifier for western Washington. It brings people To western Washington which created economic growth to communities and surrounding areas.</p> <p>Currently we have 76 killer whales in our southern resident population. They are suffering from pollution issues and starving from lack of food (salmon). Sonar testing would increase unneeded harm to the killer whale populations.</p> <p>If the Navy decides to continue to test and use sonar in the areas proposed. They will be one of the main reasons why our southern resident Killer Whales will disappear and go extinct. Sonar testing has been proven to harm and cause extreme neurological damage to not only Killer Whales but many other marine animals. Many studies of sonar testing harming marine mammals have concluded that sonar can harm echolocation of Killer Whales and other marine mammals which will effect their ability to hunt and communicate causing further starvation.</p> <p>Please understand that losing our killer whale populations would be detrimental to the Pacific Northwest's identity, community, economy and ecological prosperity. Please do not allow sonar testing in the Salish Sea and the areas that have known Southern Resident Killer Whale activities.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>With this in mind, wildlife-dependent recreational activities, such as wildlife viewing, or whale watching, are also discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p>
Feltham-1	<p>Dear Department of Defense and U.S. Navy,</p> <p>You have asked the public to comment on the Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS).</p> <p>I am unable to attend a public meeting, but do want to share my comments. I am deeply concerned about your "Proposed Action" for three</p>	Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>reasons.</p> <p>First, the effect on humans. As a resident of Port Townsend, the noise from Growlers and other Navy aircraft is already far too loud and far too frequent. It affects our health to constantly be hearing Navy training. I am shocked and upset that you propose increasing the current level by 300 flights per year in the Pacific Northwest. Our towns and parks should be protected from noise. For example, Olympic National Park is a UNESCO treasure, and people come from all over the state, the country, and the world to experience the beauty and tranquility here.</p> <p>Second, the effect on animals. I am firmly opposed to the use of sonar, explosives, and dropping of excess fuel in the sea. I do not believe what you have written about "Navy training and testing activities are unlikely to have long-term consequences on marine mammal populations." Many animals communicate and protect themselves by hearing, which is blocked by the noise of aircraft and sonar. The noise from Navy aircraft affects marine mammals, other mammals and birds in the Olympic National Park, national forests, state parks on the Olympic Peninsula, and in Puget Sound and along our Pacific coast. Please watch the film "Sonic Sea:" http://www.sonicsea.org/ We should be working to reduce the noise pollution in our oceans from transportation, commerce, oil exploration, and the military, not increasing it.</p> <p>Third, the effect on the environment. Sonar, explosives, and dropping of fuel in the sea are very harmful to our local ecosystems. Our oceans are fragile, and already imperiled by ocean acidification. Although I and many others have written many letters and attended your forums expressing concerns about the noise and the environmental effects of an expansion of Growlers on Whidbey Island, the Navy selected their "Preferred Alternative." Please listen to our concerns!</p>	<p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Fergus-1	<p>Protect The People and The Environment; not the corporations, not the industrial complex!</p> <p>I am adamantly opposed to the military's off-shore training and testing. There is plenty of ocean not near the shore, where training can happen with out affecting the wilds of the ocean! We are loosing our wildlife, as we destroy the ocean. It needs to stop!</p> <p>Additionally:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The adequacy of the assessment of Tribal cultural impacts as well as environmental impacts from the Navy's training and testing activities is especially important because these activities take place in the Pacific Ocean, which holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes 	<p>Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>and is critically important for the wellbeing of all people and lifeforms on this planet.</p> <p>2. The Navy should work meaningfully with the Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities.</p> <p>3. The Navy should prohibit use of sonar within the 50-mile mitigation area. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals.</p> <p>4. The "best available science" referenced in the draft SEIS should be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy's NWTRC.</p> <p>5. The Navy's monitoring program should be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.</p> <p>6. The Navy should expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing.</p> <p>7. The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.</p>	
Fern-1	<p>It has got to stop. Completely inhumane and unnecessary.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Fernandez-1	<p>The EIS clearly indicates that the Southern Residents will be harmed by the testing and training activities, and that is not acceptable. Our Southern Residents need quiet in order to “hear” their prey. In 2003 during a training session, the J pod quit foraging and instead spent time and calories trying to leave the area instead of hunting and eating. You will be violating the Endangered Species Act, when you should be protecting the orcas. The designation for the orcas’ critical habitat is under review and the Navy should not be allowed to move forward until the designation is final. Please respect the Southern Resident Orcas’ Endangered Species status and take steps to mitigate further harm. You need to protect the critical habitat of the orcas and prohibit testing and training in these waters. Please ban sonar and explosives in these waters as well. Please do not engage in any activities that can harm marine life.</p> <p>Protecting these beautiful wild creatures is so very important.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service regarding the Navy’s Proposed Action and potential impacts to endangered species, as required under the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p>
Ferrell-1	<p>I was very disappointed to hear about your testing which will put the Southern Orca residents at risk. There are two calves whose health could be serious impacted negatively in addition to the harm to the general population as indicated in the Navy’s EIS. The Orcas are dependent on sound to find their prey and the sound chaos will decrease their ability to hear and force them to move to areas where the needed prey fish are not. In 2003 during a training session, the J pod quit foraging and instead spent time and calories trying to leave the area instead of hunting and eating. Critical habitat is under review and the Navy should postpone or change location.</p> <p>Such activity violates the Endangered Species Act and that responsibility should not be forgotten or ignored. The population has been decreasing since the 1960s and it is obvious that humans created the problem</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	(removal of wild orcas) and should accept the responsibility of trying to help them sustain and grow in numbers. I respectfully request that the Navy cease this harmful practice.	the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i> . Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.
Fields M-1	How on earth can anyone think it is a good idea to conduct warfare jet training in an environmentally sensitive area that has been designated as a wildlife refuge and a National Park?? Add to that the plan for “incidental takes of marine mammals ... and incidental takes of threatened and endangered marine species” and you have a recipe for ecological disaster. If such training is necessary and such damage has to occur somewhere, make it somewhere that has already been damaged, not one of the last pristine areas in the country.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Fields T-1	Ban testing on Orcas and all sea animals	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy’s ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Navy’s Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marin-species-monitoring.us/• The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org• The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Fincher-1	No, to sonar testing in the Salish Sea. We have critically endangered species, the Southern Resident Killer Whales, among many other marine mammals that can't handle these loud and damaging sounds. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Finholm-1	Please reconsider this destructive and fatal testing. Scientific evidence is abundant on the effects of sonar on marine mammals. Pay attention to it. The results speak loud and clear, mammals beaching themselves, washing up dead. What further examples do you require? To ignore the evidence and facts is irresponsible, your actions matter.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Finley-1	Sonar "testing" in open ocean waters is extremely destructive. Nothing could justify the amount of damage being done to wildlife by this activity. Please stop damaging ocean dwellers.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Fiskeseth-1	Please consider the safety, health and well-being of marine mammals when conducting any military test or experiment	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Fissenden-1	I totally oppose the navy to do sonar testing in the Salish Sea.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Flanigan-1	National Parks were established as sanctuaries to protect Natural Resources, animals of all ilk, and maintain natural beauty for all generations. No matter a person's financial standing, Parks were to be a refuge from the press of people and the noise of machinery in our modern world. I am an outdoor enthusiast, backpacker and environmentalist. The Navy's use of Olympic National Park, a World Heritage Site and designated Quiet Place, as well as the Olympic Marine Sanctuary for training purposes with the "Growler Jets" destroys the sanctity of these places. Wild animals and birds like the Marbled Murrelet cannot arbitrarily move from their current homes to escape the jet noise. Whales, seals and other marine creatures who depend on quiet water and a free expanse of air to communicate with each other are under attack from the Growlers. And so are Humans. I have heard the Growlers at my Port Angeles home, but recently, I was sitting on a friend's porch along the Calawah River and experienced the bombardment of noise, louder than I've heard in PA, but just as loud as in the mountains. We had to stop our conversation entirely	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>due to being drowned out by jet noise. I could no longer hear the river or birds. Even the local dogs barking could not be heard as the jets flew overhead.</p> <p>Training IS necessary for Navy personnel. The location of that training over Olympic National Park and Sanctuaries is NOT necessary. Jets can practice maneuvers farther out to sea. Leaving Whidby Island and flying over the Olympic mountains is NOT necessary. Increasing the bombardment of noise with additional jets is preposterous. I lived in the Forks area for 20 years. My friends on the West End moved there for solitude, beauty and quiet. The level of noise from these Growler Jets is louder than any other aircraft I have experienced in my 30 years of teaching in Forks. Children are distracted in class, playground aides have difficulty communicating with their charges, and adults experience the same frustration, anger and impatience as I do.</p> <p>I have seen no studies of sound recordings' impact on wildlife, impact on children, and the sustained impact on adults. It amounts to a type of incessant harassment when the jets are flying over the West End. Obliterating all natural sounds like rivers, birds and even wind in the trees as I hike is not acceptable.</p> <p>I want to see Olympic National Park keep its Quiet Zone designation. I want the Navy to move their training farther out at sea and totally avoid flying over the Olympic Mountains where I hike. I want to see scientific studies of the impact of Growler Jet noise on endangered species, migrating species and humans. The 2010 sound data from three lowland locations is not sufficient to fully understand the louder impact of these Growlers, resounding up the Hoh River, booming over the trees and wind on the Rugged Ridge Trail, or deafening the sound of waves/water at Thompson Creek (all regions I love to hike). Take them out of the Park and Sanctuary regions, please!</p> <p>All of this must be considered and be addressed as part of the EIS requirements.</p>	
Fleming-1	<p>If tests have been done and proven to be to the detriment of the testee's and in this/these instance/s the marine life of Orcas etc, then the tests should stop immediately. To harm these creatures and jeopardise their well-being is absolutely ludicrous. Please stop if you have a heart that beats for health & love ♥</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Flesch-1	I am the proud son of a Navy veteran and I am vehemently against the sonar testing proposed, especially in the Salish Sea/Puget Sound. I do not support the proposed testing anywhere, but the Salish Sea is similar to an island, in that it is holding a vast amount of biodiversity, sometimes not found anywhere else in the world. When we, as humans, make decisions, we affect the ecosystem as a whole. We are the keystone of the keystone species, and it is my opinion that we must do what we can to mitigate our negative impacts on the environment. It is an acknowledged fact that this proposed testing will have negative and even detrimental affects on the marine life that share these waters with us. How are we making decisions? What kind of values and principles are we applying? I believe we need to be more holistic in our decision making, considering what is it that we do the things we do in service to? Is it in service to thriving life? America is a global leader in most categories, I would very much like to see more consideration for the environment and lives other than humans when we make decisions. This proposed testing by the Navy is unacceptable. Please withdraw the plans to do harm to marine life.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Fletes-1	I am against all Navy sonar practices in the Salish Sea and in any area that is harming the beloved and endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales as well as all sea life! Please STOP all Navy sonar practices!!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Flint-1	I am 100% *against* underwater sonar testing, which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. Please stop this disturbing practice.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Flores Ga-1	This is a terrible terrible thing you are considering doing. Why is this even being considered knowing what it does to an already endangered species?! Like we haven't done enough harm as it is you insist on doing more. I know you need these things for your reasons of national security and so we can win wars for money and oil. But there's gotta be another way. You've got genius's working for u if they can figure out how to do half the crazy <i>[expletive deleted]</i> u guys do they can come up with a safer less harmful way to do this. How could you sleep at night. WEVE KILLED OFF TGIS WHOLE ENTIRE SPECIES! WEVE KITERALLY WIPED OFF THE FACE OF THE EARTH NEARLY COMPLETELY AND ITS NOT COMING BACK does our military really not care?! You people are sick and should be the ones wiped off the face of the earth if you could really do this to such a beautiful creature and many others as well SO STOP THIS	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Flores Gi-1	Being able to experience the silent forest is something I never would have imagined. It was worth it to hike in the middle of the jungle and experience the surrounding sound. I would never, especially coming from San Francisco, CA imagined that I would have the time to experience something so precious and pure about nature. I would preserve this national forest until the end of time and fight to make sure that we keep this purity alive.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Flores L-1	Please stop torturing all sea animals with this sound!!!! These animals belong in the sea and we don't have the right to bother them in their habitat. Thank you	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Foe-1	Please stop. Why are these tests done? For me they seem senseless. Isn't it enough that there are millions of ships driving through the oceans and all the plastic in the home of the dolphins and other mammals. The ecosystem of the ocean keeps us humans alive but we keep destroying it?! Please	The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	stop!! A change in everyone's thinking about nature is highly relevant today.	Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Forbes-1	Based on data and analysis by military and other government-funded research, the harms to marine mammals caused by sonar testing in the Puget Sound and contiguous ocean bodies is unacceptable. I strongly protest continued sonar testing and urge the military to come up with other ways to maintain our safety without this collateral cost to our ecosystem, the health of which is also vital to our biological and economic well-being.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Foreman-1	We are at a critical point in climate change and ecosystem/biodiversity collapse and we cannot afford to release ANY more toxic compounds or additional harmful acoustics into our environment! Making smart long-term decisions for the sake of a livable planet is the most important thing we can do right now. Please do not to release ANY heavy metals, depleted uranium, toxic chemicals, or harmful acoustics into the Puget Sound (or any oceans) or its surrounding environment.	The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Forrest-1	No seismic testing! This is harmful to marine life! I oppose this practice that can harm endangered marine life and other mammals that depend on sonar.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Forster-1	These amazing, beautiful creatures need to be saved and deserve to be protected.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Forsyth-1	<p>I live in Saanich, BC, Canada, and we are regularly bombarded by noise from your fighter jets. Even when I am in my house with all the doors and windows closed, I can hear them above my television set. Sometimes this goes on for days at a time. It is particularly disturbing since the sound of the jets is exactly like the sound of a small earthquake, and every time I hear one I stop to see if there is an earthquake and I need to take shelter. This impacts my mental health. It's worth noting that I live fairly far inland and don't hear the jets as loudly as residents of Oak Bay and other places along the shoreline.</p> <p>I can only imagine how terrible this must be for citizens of your own country who live closer to the military base where the sound is much louder. It must be absolutely unbearable for them. They are suggesting that an independent party measure the sound levels around the islands and the Olympic Peninsula. I think this is a very good idea - objective scientific data would help you find a solution that people can live with and would also show that the military cares about its citizens.</p> <p>I understand that you need to train your military to protect your country. That's an unfortunate reality. But these jets are extremely loud and a nuisance across a large populated area, not to mention some beautiful parks. I think the purpose of the military is to serve and protect its citizens, and to ensure peaceful relations with other countries, so people can live a life of peace and freedom and enjoy their beautiful country. But at the moment your jets are aggravating your own citizens to the point where they are being forced out of their homes, and annoying citizens from other,</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	friendly, countries, like Canada. That doesn't really fit with your mandate, does it? You need to get quieter jets, or move the training to an unpopulated area, or just make peace with your enemies so you don't need them in the first place.	
Fossum-1	Sonar testing should not happen in the habitat of endangered Southern Resident Killed Whales (The Salish Sea). These whales are already struggling to survive as they slowly starve from lack of Chinook salmon. Sonar and boat traffic have both been proven to interfere with foraging behaviors in SRKWs, making the already difficult job of finding the salmon even harder. They have been shown to expend more energy on foraging when boats are present and sonar can interfere with their own echolocation practices. Experimental Navy sonar practices have been well documented as the cause of strandings and deaths of cetaceans around the world. We should be doing everything we can to improve the living conditions of the SRKWs that have lived in these waters long before humans, not adding to their difficulties.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Foster A-1	The impact of this project will be devastating to the Southern Resident orcas. They have suffered enough, please leave them be!	The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Foster D-1	Southern Resident Orcas and all marine inhabitants of the Salish Sea are being seriously harmed by the US Navy's harmful sonar practices. The Orcas are struggling for survival already and desperately need our protection. Please stop this destructive testing!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Fowler S-1	Please maintain a 100 mile wide test free corridor along the pacific coast.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations);

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft and ships are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Fowler V-1	We are destroying the earth.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Fox A-1	<p>I am writing in response to the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As a daughter and a wife of men who have served honorably in our U.S. Navy, I am well aware of the need for the Navy to train to defend our nation against all foreign adversaries.</p> <p>The Navy contends that their guidelines for training and the number of possible tests and munitions are not negotiable. I do feel that the NMFS needs to continuously monitor all Navy operations so that there can be alternate options available at all times in the permit time table.</p> <p>Our ocean environment is under attack from many outside sources besides the impact of the Navy. We have an island of plastic growing daily in the Pacific. Climate change is real and we are suffering the impact on a daily basis from global warming. We each have to evaluate how we can limit our environmental impact.</p> <p>The dropping of live ordinance in fishery areas, harms to marine mammals and sea creatures from sonar and underwater detonations, harmful chemicals to sediments and water quality all contribute to what you consider "incidental" harm. These are actual causes of death and debilitation to marine life and are not " incidental" in our cycle of life.</p> <p>I am pleased that the Navy recognizes "new science". In 2015 a settlement was reached with the Navy making whale habitat in Hawaii and Southern California off limits to sonar. A federal appeal court also ruled that the Navy should not have been allowed to use low-frequency, long-range sonar in some locations.</p> <p>These factors are biologically important, especially now, as our Southern Resident Killer Whales are on the brink of extinction. I have heard their communications on hydrophones and their calls to one another cease as they are drowned out by underwater noise. Recently, we have two new baby SRKW. Will their fate be that of their cousin, who died so young last year, or will we give them every opportunity to survive?</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	It is imperative that we be flexible to not only defend our nation, but to defend our environment that is degrading at a rapid rate. Our legacy and future lie in the hands of agencies who are to uphold and defend our nation and our environment. It is your responsibility to balance the scales.	
Fox R-1	It is well known and scientifically accurate to state that SONAR, especially the high-energy types employed by UNN warships, is very damaging, even lethal, to all cetations, seals, and, on a cellular level, all oceanic life, period. Our country has devastated the seas for far too long. This must end, now!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Fox V-1	I am 100% against the navy doing sonar testing. This is clearly affecting the marine life and should not be allowed to continue Please STOP!!!!!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Franceschini-1	I do not approve of this. I think we, the human population as a whole, need to be very considerate of murky future of the Southern Resident orca community along with other marine life. Their future is in our hands now and we need to act responsibly and respect the wildlife we share our only home planet with.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Frank-1	<p>As you are aware, marine mammals that depend upon sound will be adversely affected by these plans. This includes harbor porpoises, killer whales and humpback whales.</p> <p>Harbor porpoises will experience temporary hearing loss, at a minimum, nearly 100,000 times from the sonar according to the Navy's own information. In addition, they will suffer permanent hearing loss approximately 1,000 times and negative behavioral reactions over 100,000 times. This could negatively impact the species in this region.</p> <p>These animals will be exposed to sonar multiple times. Killer whales, a group already in decline, would exhibit negative behavioral responses during the seven year period. In addition, humpback whales, also endangered, would experience temporary hearing loss or negative behavioral reactions nearly 500 times because of the use of sonar. This is an unacceptable cost and the Navy needs to develop alternative plans.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Franks-1	<p>As you know Marine life is already stressed due to global warming, plastic pollution, overfishing, etc. Species extinction is really happening. The last thing we need is a new hardship thrown into the mix Please do your testing way offshore in relatively dead zones or do not do it at all.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Free-1	<p>I do not agree with Northwest training and testing. It's devastating to wild animals in the water.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Freed-1	<p>When we moved out to our place seventeen years ago, which is eight miles west of Port Angeles, up against the ONP, we were blown away by how peaceful and quiet it is. Now there are more noisy planes, jets and helicopters flying over pretty much every day. Why on earth would you think that flying over a national park, known for it's quiet, peaceful setting would be okay? Let alone practicing for war? Please take your maneuvers and practice over your own space. At the very least find communities who are happy to see you fly over and do it there. The people who visit the ONP don't want you. The wildlife certainly doesn't want you. The neighboring property owners don't want you. I don't want you!!!!</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Freedlund-1	I, Ali Freedlund, a private citizen of Petrolia, California write the following comments regarding the NWTI Draft EIS/OEIS on behalf of myself. That said, I have worked to restore the Mattole river watershed for the past 23 years. 1 attended hearings on the matter and wrote comments the last time this subject came to Eureka. Because of job timing I could not attend this year. I support the fact that explosives will not be used within 50 Nautical miles of the coast due to impacts to ocean life, fisherman, and cultural uses. However, I am adamant that this limit be extended and that sonar also not be used in testing and training due to the impacts on the wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals that are federally protected. What does federal protection mean anyway?? From the document we know that whales and other marine mammals are affected, often to their death from this practice. What about their sense of family (communications), stability, travel? They are bound to be confused if not deafened when being bombarded by ghastly ear-bombing levels of sound. What about the effects on migrating salmon? It is well known that our populations of whales, marine mammals and salmon continue to decline. We must protect this vital ocean web of life. Please prohibit the use of Sonar and other Training and Testing for 100 miles of our coast!	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy considered restricting sonar and explosives even further from shore, but for the reasons stated above, rejected this measure as unnecessary.</p>
Freeman-1	It's time to put the safety of ocean life above testing weapons against the imaginary enemies of the U.S. There will be collateral damage. From the point of view of ocean life this scheme is a no-brainer.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Freidberg-1	I absolutely oppose the planned Navy training and testing exercises that will negatively impact marine mammals in Puget Sound and in Pacific coastal waters. There is plenty of solid science indicating that noise pollution and noise injury to marine mammals threatens their ability to communicate, feed, and survive. Some of the affected species are already endangered (Southern Resident Orcas). They need all the protection they can get if we are to have any hope of preventing their extinction.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Freitas-1	This is unacceptable. Why no one in the Navy nor in the government care about it? Get out of there! Our marine wildlife don't deserve this.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
French-1	<p>We have known for a long time that naval sonar has devastating effects on marine life but just exactly how it leads to sickness and death was a mystery till now. In new research published in the Proceedings of the Royal Society B, they discovered that the sound emitted by sonar is so intense that marine mammals will swim hundreds of miles, dive deep into the abyss or even beach themselves to flee from the sounds that are literally unbearable to them.</p> <p>In particular, beaked whales are one of the marine mammals that are often found beached due to sonar testing. Prior to the 1960s, beaked whale strandings were extremely rare. But once the 60s rolled around, the Navy started to use mid-frequency active sonar (MFAS) to detect submarines. ? And from the 60s onwards, whales washing up on beachings became a very</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>common occurrence. The paper recently published is a summary of what was discussed at a 2017 meeting of beaked whale experts in the Canary Islands and revealed that sonar distresses beaked whales so much that the marine mammals ends up with nitrogen bubbles in their blood very similar to what divers would call decompression sickness or the bends. The nitrogen can cause hemorrhaging and damage to whales vital organs. The big question that was brought up was how an animal that lives in the ocean and is adapted to perform deep water dives for hours at a time can obtain decompression sickness? Well simply, the sonar is so powerful, the animals dive deep too quickly causing the sickness.</p> <p>?In the presence of sonar they are stressed and swim vigorously away from the sound source, changing their diving pattern,? lead author Yara Bernaldo de Quiros told AFP.</p> <p>?The stress response, in other words, overrides the diving response, which makes the animals accumulate nitrogen. It?s like an adrenalin shot.? The conclusions are drawn from autopsies of dead whales, although a handful of animals were killed by other threats inflicted by humans, such as collisions with ships or entanglement in fishing nets, as well as disease. The authors note that to mitigate the impacts of sonar on beaked whales, we must ban its use in areas where they?re found. A moratorium on the use of MFAS around the Canary Islands in 2004 shows just how well this works ? no atypical strandings have been seen since. The researchers urge other countries where sonar is deployed, such as the US, Greece, Italy, and Japan, to follow suit.</p>	
Freudenberg-1	<p>We have no right to do infringe upon protected lands and waters: the Makah wanted that tip of land because they see themselves as people of the sea; more clearance needs to be protected around the Makah and Quinault reservations. They deserve more respect, and their having already shared so much of their original homeland as our Olympic National Park necessitates that that Park be protected from such noise pollution as well. The resident orca population are already struggling. Flying further out to do such testing would protect the Puget Sound as their habitat, as well as helping to protect salmon runs.</p> <p>American identity is diminished if we secure military might at any price. These are vital protections, and we will not be able to undo the damage if we take for granted the very core of this region's native life.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft and ships are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Friedlander-1	<p>I am very concerned about the Navy's use of sonar. The southern resident orcas are endangered and any additional harm to them right now is unconscionable. Please, do not go through with this dangerous testing. It is</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	likely that marine life will suffer from temporary deafness which will make communication between orcas impossible.	Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Friedman-1	Scientific studies have repeated shown that acoustic and seismic testing have a serious impact on sea life. A study in 2017 showed that seismic testing had a major negative impact on zooplankton. If sonic pollution has a serious impact at that basic level of sea life, imagine the impact on higher level sea life, including mammals, with the continued increase in sound pollution of the seas. While I understand the need for some testing, and the need to ensure that the Navy meets its statutory mission, the science is clear. Testing directly harms the environment of the sea, and therefore, the waters connection to the human environment.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Friel-01	See attached letter.	See responses below.
Friel-02	1. Navy impacts on Southern Resident orcas were in fact recognized as an issue by the Orca Task Force in Washington state. The EIS inaccurately claims that “Navy actions were not the sources for any of the identified threats” in the report by the Southern Resident Orca Task Force (Office of the Washington Governor, 2018) (page 3.4-46). In fact, concerns about the Navy’s use of sonar equipment impacting the Southern Residents was raised in the very first Orca Task Force meeting (5/1/2018 meeting minutes). Recommendation 25 in the final report was “Coordinate with the Navy in 2019 to discuss reduction of noise and disturbance affecting Southern Resident orcas from military exercises and Navy aircraft.” It further continued: “The governor should meet with the U.S. Navy’s Commanding Officer for the region that includes Washington state to address the acoustic and physical impacts to Southern Resident orcas from Naval exercises in waters and air of Washington state. The governor should request the Navy participate on the Vessels working group in Year Two and identify actions to reduce the Navy’s impacts to Southern Resident orcas” (emphases added) (Office of the Washington Governor, 2018). In addition, potential impacts from Naval activities are recognized as a threat to Southern Resident orca survival and recovery in both the U.S. and Canada Southern Resident orca recovery plans.	The Task Force Final Report did not identify Navy sonar among the major threats. The major threats identified in the report are a lack of prey, disturbance from noise and vessel traffic, and toxic contaminants in the waters they inhabit. The Navy, as acknowledged by the Governor's Task Force in 2018, was not previously requested to participate in the Task Force, and the Navy was not made aware of conversations held during meetings in 2018. The Navy has since been invited to take part and, as a result, a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Task Force’s working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor’s Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Friel-03	<p>2. Given the small size of the endangered Southern Resident orca population today, and the fact that they travel in groups, harm to a single individual orca can easily mean a population-level effect. Each individual orca in the current population matters if the population is to avoid extinction. There has been a net loss of 12 individual Southern Resident orcas since 2011. The population has continued to decline since the 2015 NWTT EIS. In 2016, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) declared that Southern Resident orcas are one of the marine species most at risk of extinction nationwide. The final EIS will need to be updated with the latest number of Southern Resident orcas alive today, which is currently fewer than the 77 stated in the draft.</p> <p>The Draft EIS states that “the use of sonar and other transducers during training activities as described under Alternative 1 will result in the unintentional taking of killer whales incidental to those activities” (page 3.4-190). The EIS Fact Sheet Booklet states that 99.84% of all estimated takes of marine mammals would be Level B harassment, disrupting natural behavior patterns such as feeding, surfacing, nursing, breeding, sheltering or migration to those point where those patterns are abandoned or significantly alter. These—and especially feeding, breeding, and nursing—are all critical activities for the Southern Resident orcas now, given that they have produced only two surviving calves in the last three years, two orcas are visibly emaciated, and nutritional stress is recognized as a primary threat to the population. Up to 69% of all detectable pregnancies between 2008 and 2014 were unsuccessful, and low availability of Chinook salmon appeared to be a significant cause of late pregnancy failure (Wasser et al. 2017); Level B harassment by Navy activities that interferes with both feeding and breeding or displaces orcas from preferred foraging areas is of significant concern and will further contribute to the Southern Resident orcas’ low reproductive success.</p> <p>Table 3.4-40 in the EIS estimates two behavioral impacts to Southern Resident orcas per year from sonar and other transducers. It is unclear whether that means just two individual orcas will likely be affected; if so, we question whether that is realistic given that pods of orcas travel together. We are particularly concerned about new and increased impacts to Southern Resident orcas from mine explosives, which can cause injury or death, and the use of mid-frequency sonar, which can impact other marine mammals out to 16 km offshore. wildlife within 2,000 square miles – well outside the reasonable area that marine mammal observers are able to survey to record marine mammal sightings and initiate mitigation</p>	<p>There are several sources of abundance numbers for marine mammal species. For consistency, the Navy uses abundance numbers of Southern Resident killer whales (as well as other marine mammal species) provided by NMFS in the most recent Stock Assessment Report. The Navy tracks this species closely and will continue to use the most recent available data.</p> <p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>measures. In fact, military exercises have been documented to impact orcas right here in the Salish Sea.</p> <p>In a population with strong family ties, the loss of one orca also directly affects the others' chance of survival. When a female resident orca dies, it increases the mortality risk of her male offspring under age 30 by 3.1 times, and the mortality risk of her male offspring over age 30 by 8.3 times (Foster et al. 2012). In late 2018 and early 2019, for example, it was reported that male Southern Resident orca K25 was observed to be doing poorly after the death of his mother, K13.</p> <p>3. There are documented cases in this region of U.S. and Canadian naval activities, including active sonar training and explosive testing, causing direct harm to the Southern Resident orcas.</p> <p>In 2003, an active sonar training exercise conducted by the U.S. Navy in the eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca and Haro Strait caused one of the Southern Resident killer whale families (J pod) to stop foraging and exhibit abnormal behaviors and movement, change direction multiple times, and group together in shallow water where they are at increased risk of stranding. In a video recording of the incident, sonar can clearly be heard above the water. More recent incidents involving testing of sonar and explosives by the Canadian Navy in Southern Resident orca habitat are examples of the potential impact of the activities proposed in this EIS. A juvenile Southern Resident female was stranded in 2012 with evidence of trauma consistent with an explosion or high-pressure impact, a week after the Canadian Navy had been conducting sonar exercises in the region. An exact cause of death was not determined, but experts in underwater noise who continue to review her case believe that the most likely cause of death was an underwater military explosion. In 2017, explosives detonated by the Canadian Navy near a group of Southern Residents (L pod) caused the whales to group together suddenly and flee the area. These examples show that just one incident of training and testing activities impacting Southern Residents can cause significant harm, death, or displacement from preferred habitat.</p>	
Friel-04	<p>4. Other agencies and operators are taking new, meaningful steps to reduce noise and disturbance affecting Southern Resident orcas. The Navy must also increase its protections, or it will become responsible for a larger share of the cumulative impact and potentially negate some of the benefits of the other actions being taken.</p> <p>In 2019, Washington state has taken big steps to reduce impacts on Southern Resident orcas from other vessel types, recognizing that noise</p>	<p>The Navy is fully aware of the plight of the Southern Resident killer whales. In 2019 a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Governor's Southern Resident Killer Whale Task Force working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	and disturbance have significant adverse consequences for this endangered population. In May 2019, Governor Inslee signed into law a bill that increases the distance that vessels must stay away from the Southern Residents and enacts a 7-knot speed limit within a half nautical mile of these orcas. The legislature also allocated funding for a new hybrid ferry and funding to convert some ferries to hybrid-electric power. Washington State Ferries is also doing a baseline noise inventory and developing solutions to address noise and frequencies of concern. Meanwhile, in 2019, voluntary ship slowdowns will continue and expand for the third year through the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority-led Enhancing Cetacean Habitat and Observation (ECHO) Program – a Canadian program that directly benefits Southern Resident orcas in the inland waters. The Navy should increase its own mitigation efforts so that there is still a significant net benefit to the Southern Residents in terms of reduced noise and disturbance when all these other entities are increasing their protective measures.	<p>The Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals in areas that are particularly important for biological life processes, such as feeding and migration.</p> <p>Procedural mitigation measures already in place and proposed to continue include ceasing activities that could be harmful to marine mammals when marine mammals are detected within defined mitigation zones.</p> <p>The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.</p>
Friel-05	5. The designation for Southern Resident orca critical habitat is likely to change later this year. The Navy should not make final decisions about training and testing in the potential new critical habitat areas off the coasts of Washington, Oregon and California until this designation has been made. NMFS has committed to proposing a rule with an expanded designation of critical habitat off Washington, Oregon and California by early October 2019 – an area encompassed by the NWTT range. Advancing this EIS now for activities in an area that is on the cusp of being designated as critical habitat is irresponsible. The Navy should wait until NMFS makes its final designation for expanded critical habitat before pursuing activities that would adversely affect the area. Changes in the Navy’s mitigation measures are likely to be necessary so that the proposed action does not “result in destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat.”	The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Friel-06	6. Recent variations in Southern Resident orca presence in the Salish Sea are complex and should not be an excuse for exercising less caution in the inland waters. The EIS states that “foraging during the spring in Salish Sea by Southern Resident killer whales has declined in recent years as they shift their range and forage for Chinook salmon or other prey species elsewhere in response to reduced prey availability in that historically used inland waters foraging area” (p. 3.4-26). Even spending time elsewhere, Southern Resident orcas are not getting enough food and are showing signs of malnutrition. The inland waters foraging area is still critically important if they are going to	The statements quoted from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS are part of an establishment of the environmental baseline the Navy then uses to estimate potential impacts resulting from the Navy’s activities. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The commenter incorrectly asserts that the Navy suggests that protective measures in the Salish Sea are less important; however, the Navy has not suggested that and does not consider that to be true. The mitigation measures developed for both NWTT Inland Waters and the NWTT

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>survive and thrive. In recognition of this fact, state and federal governments are actively working to restore salmon populations in the inland waters. It is difficult to predict orca presence on a long-term or even annual basis, and the Navy should not assume that the shift outside of the Salish Sea in the spring and summer is a permanent change.</p> <p>The Southern Resident orcas are still sighted in the Salish Sea frequently. In fact, Olson et al. 2018 noted that K and L pods have been increasing the duration of their stay in the inland waters by staying in the Salish Sea through the fall and into the early winter. The Navy should consult with orca biologists to gather other recent information, in addition to reviewing recent published literature on Southern Resident orca presence in the Salish Sea.</p> <p>The EIS implies that changes in the Southern Residents' presence in the Salish Sea mean that protections there are less important than they used to be. In fact, it should be reason for an extra layer of caution. Reducing noise and disturbance in the heavily-trafficked inland waters could enable the Southern Residents to forage there more effectively and therefore spend more time there as they have historically. Recent information on foraging locations should not be interpreted as a reason to decrease or discontinue mitigation efforts to avoid impacts to Southern Residents in the Salish Sea. Additionally, the Navy should consider that when the Southern Resident orcas are not in inland waters, they are likely to be in their offshore area, which is subject to additional training and testing activities that do not occur in the Salish Sea. The Navy should consider additional mitigation and monitoring in the orcas' offshore habitat given the potential increased use of this area and the unique activities—such as active sonar—that take place in this portion of the NWT range.</p>	<p>Offshore Area for the Proposed Action represent an increase over the mitigation developed for the 2015 NWT Final EIS/OEIS.</p>
Friel-07	<p>7. The EIS should include two additional studies related to impacts on Southern Resident orcas: Wieland et al. 2010 and Emmons et al. 2019. Wieland, M., A. Jones, and S. C. P. Renn. 2010. Changing durations of Southern Resident killer whale 23 (<i>Orcinus orca</i>) discrete calls between two periods spanning 28 years. <i>Mar. Mam. Sci.</i> 26(1):195–201.</p> <p>This study found that the Southern Residents make a behavioral adjustment as a result of vessel noise, as measured through an increase in mean durations of discrete calls. "Because they are adjusting their vocal behavior, we must consider the very real possibility that engine noise is hindering their ability to communicate, and may well impact their efficiency at using acoustics to forage and navigate, as well" (Wieland et al. 2010). These findings should be incorporated into 3.4.2.1.1.4 on masking (page</p>	<p>Wieland et al., 2010 was incorporated in Section 3.4.1.7.4 of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS as recommended by the commenter.</p> <p>The Navy-funded research presented in Emmons et al. 2019 was considered in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, but the report was not cited because it was still in the process of being edited by the authors and had not been finalized. The report has since been finalized and is cited in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy does not frequently conduct training or testing activities in the location of the Cape Flattery Offshore hydrophone since that area is highly</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>3.4.103, which talks about other species but not killer whales) and into the odontocete discussion on page 3.4-120.</p> <p>Emmons, C.K., M.B. Hanson, and M.O. Lammers. 2019. Monitoring the occurrence of Southern Resident killer whales, other marine mammals, and anthropogenic sound in the Pacific Northwest. Prepared for: U.S. Navy, U.S. Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, HI. Prepared by: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Northwest Fisheries Science Center under MIPR N00070-17-MP-4C419. 25 February 2019. 23p.</p> <p>This report states that there were 148 mid-frequency active sonar events detected between 2011 and 2017, with the peak overlapping with occurrence of the three killer whale communities (including Southern Residents). This is concerning because, as the EIS states, exposure to mid-frequency sonar has been directly linked to separation of a killer whale calf from its group (page 3.4-102); the separation and loss of a single calf would be a serious blow to the small population, given that there are so few calves and the southern residents have had limited reproductive success in recent years. Exposure to mid-frequency sonar has also been directly linked to mass strandings of cetaceans (page 3.4-127). In addition, the EIS states that newer high-duty or continuous active sonars have more potential to mask vocalizations, particularly for mid-frequency cetaceans like killer whales, and “longer-term consequences could include potential decrease in recruitment” (p. 3.4-102). The Southern Resident orcas cannot afford any further decrease in their already very low recruitment rates.</p> <p>The findings from Emmons et al. 2019 regarding seasonal use of different offshore areas by Southern Resident orcas and other whales should also be used to minimize adverse impacts by shifting sonar and explosives testing and training by season and by location.</p>	<p>utilized by commercial vessel traffic, making it an undesirable location for the Navy to conduct activities, especially sonar training or testing.</p> <p>The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on Southern Resident killer whales and other marine species in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitat areas, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures specific to Southern Resident killer whales. For example, in the NWTT Offshore Area, the Navy developed a new mitigation area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, which encompasses waters off Cape Flattery. The Navy’s mitigation now includes annual limits on hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and prohibits explosive Mine Countermeasures and Neutralization Testing in the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. All other explosive activities are required to be conducted 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. In addition, the Navy developed a new mitigation to issue annual awareness notification messages to alert ships and aircraft to the possible presence of increased concentrations of Southern Resident killer whales seasonally, which will further help avoid potential impacts from vessel movements and training and testing activities on this species.</p>
Friel-08	<p>8. New whale report alert systems should be used for real-time monitoring and early warnings to build on the limited capacity of lookouts.</p> <p>The Navy should explore the use of newly available apps and technology that provide real-time information on whale presence in the Salish Sea and along the coast. Using this technology could expand the ability of the Navy’s marine mammal observers to be aware of and respond to the presence of Southern Resident orcas. For example, the Whale Report Alert System (WRAS), developed by the British Columbia Cetacean Sightings Network, alerts mariners to the presence of whales so that mitigation measures may be enacted to reduce the risk of disturbance and collision. Orca Network, Whale Scout, and other organizations in Washington also</p>	<p>The Navy developed new mitigation for Navy biologists to initiate communication with the appropriate marine mammal detection networks in NWTT Inland Waters prior to conducting explosive mine neutralization activities involving the use of Navy divers, Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training, Civilian Port Defense – Homeland Security Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Exercises, and Small Boat Attack Exercises. This mitigation will help the Navy plan activities in a way that minimizes the potential for exposure of Southern Resident killer whales, as described in Section K.3.3 (Mitigation Areas for Marine Species in NWTT Inland Waters). The Navy will also continue to assess the practicality of other available monitoring techniques as technologies advance.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	contribute to a Whale Sighting Network with close to real-time reporting in the Salish Sea.	
Friel-09	<p>9. Additional information is needed on the anticipated timing of the proposed activities.</p> <p>The EIS should detail the times of year during which the proposed activities will take place. The Southern Resident orcas have exhibited seasonality in their movements, and information from tagging studies, coastal surveys, and passive acoustic monitoring allows some degree of prediction for when and where they may be traveling and foraging. Any overlap in their seasonal movements and the Navy's testing and training activities will increase impacts on these species. Information about timing should be made public in the EIS and the Navy should seek to adjust the timing of their activities to minimize such overlap.</p>	<p>As stated in Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities), because of the nature of training and testing requirements for forces that must be ready to deploy at all times, activities could occur throughout the year. The Navy added additional details on seasonality and day/night requirements of its activities to Appendix A (Navy Activities Descriptions) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy did consider seasonal movements and behaviors of marine species in its effect analysis. The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species either seasonally or year-round in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitats, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).</p> <p>The duration of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS is for the foreseeable future, while the Marine Mammal Protection Act permits would be in place for seven years.</p>
Friel-10	<p>10. The intended duration of the EIS is not clear.</p> <p>This EIS is unclear as to the duration of the planned activities. A change in the 2019 Naval Defense Authorization Act extended the Navy's authorization for marine mammal take and harassment under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) from five to seven years. It is not stated in this EIS whether the proposed activities were analyzed for impacts over a five-year time period or for the extended seven-year time period.</p>	<p>The duration of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS is for the foreseeable future. The analysis would remain valid unless the Navy makes substantial changes in the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns, or there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts. The Marine Mammal Protection Act permits would be in place for seven years.</p>
Friel-11	<p>11. Increasing the Navy's testing and training activities at this time is counter to what the endangered Southern Resident orcas need right now to have a chance at recovery.</p> <p>Without bold and immediate actions, the Southern Residents are likely to go extinct within our lifetimes. Everything we can do now to protect the Southern Resident orcas is critical. In a time when we should be taking action to address and decrease threats facing the population, including reducing noise and disturbance, the Navy's proposed activities increase the risks from ocean noise, vessel strike and disturbance, potential direct harm and injury to Southern Resident orcas, and displacement from preferred habitat.</p> <p>The Navy must consider the current crisis facing the endangered Southern Resident orcas and make new adjustments in its testing and training activities. Despite being listed under the Endangered Species Act for nearly 14 years, this unique population is not recovering and is continuing to decline. It is obvious that status quo actions, including the Navy's training</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	and testing activities, are not serving the Southern Resident orcas. Given their highly endangered status and continuing decline, the Navy should be considering how to reduce impacts and increase protections for Southern Resident orcas.	
Froebe-1	<p>06/12/2019</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>My name is Brel Froebe, and I am a resident of the Mendocino Coast. I am very concerned about the proposed trainings. The proposed trainings by the Navy will harm dozens of protected species of marine mammals -- Southern Resident killer whales, blue whales, humpback whales, dolphins, and porpoises -- through the use of high-intensity mid-frequency sonar. The use of sonar has been directly connected to many instances of beached whales that have died from baro-trauma after military sonar exercises. A deaf whale is a dead whale.</p> <p>How will the Navy guarantee marine animals will not be harmed when sound travels and there are no sound barriers in the ocean to stop it? Since the release of this EIS, the NOAA has declared a gray whale emergency, due to the 77 whale deaths that have washed up on the west coast. Scientists estimate that these 77 whales are only 10% of the number of gray whales that have died off.</p> <p>https://www.montereyherald.com/2019/05/31/feds-declare-emergency-as-gray-whale-deaths-reach-highest-level-in-nearly-20-years/</p> <p>Can the Navy revise the EIS so that it reflects this new data and state of emergency?</p> <p>How will this new information impact the navy's "take" of marine mammals?</p> <p>How will the Navy make accurate counts for take and stay within the allowed incidental take numbers?</p> <p>Also since the drafting of the EIS, it has been reported that there has been a die-off of over 300 common murrelets. Scientists do not know the cause of this major die-off.</p> <p>https://www.advocate-news.com/2019/05/24/major-die-off-of-common-murrelets-underway-along-the-mendocino-coast/</p> <p>Will the Navy postpone their testing plans until it is certain that no murrelets will die as a result of the testing?</p> <p>Will the Navy revise the EIS to take this new information into consideration?</p> <p>The InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council has already submitted a statement to you opposing the testing expansion proposed in the EIS.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities. The Navy will continue to consult with the Tribes. Through Government-to-Government consultations, the Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>These tribes have been stewards of this ecosystem long before the Navy ever existed. I urge the Navy to listen to what these tribes are telling you. They have knowledge of and relationship with this land that is unique and their culture depends on the sustainability of our pacific ocean ecosystem. According to the Navy's Northwest Training and Testing environmental impact statement (EIS), in the thousands of warfare "testing and training events" it conducts each year, 200,000 "stressors" from the use of missiles, torpedoes, guns and other explosive firings in US waters happen biennially. These "stressors," along with drones, vessels, aircraft, shells, batteries, electronic components and anti-corrosion compounds that coat external metal surfaces are the vehicles by which the Navy will be introducing heavy metals and highly toxic compounds into the environment.</p> <p>How will the Navy guarantee that they are not releasing toxins into the oceans? How will the Navy guarantee it will not cause stressor that severely injure and kill marine life?</p> <p>As a concerned citizen, I stand in solidarity with the InterTribal Sinkyoue Wilderness Council in opposing all Navy testing off the west coast that has any negative effect on marine mammals, kelp, fish, and bird life.</p>	
Froebe-2	<p>So after listening to the presenters today, I feel strongly, based on the facts that have been presented, that the environmental impact and costs far outweigh the benefits of any Navy testing on the Mendocino coast or anywhere along the western United States coastline. The amount of hazardous waste that will be dumped in the oceans, paired with the negative impacts on marine life, will destroy the ocean as we know it. I want to appeal to the conscience of whoever's reading this to please look in their hearts and imagine seven generations from now. Meaning, think about your future children's children's children's children, and what kind of ocean and world do you want to leave to them? If the Navy continues to pollute the ocean at the rate that it is, it will negatively impact the oceans to a point where the vibrancy of life as we know it will no longer exist. I also want to express my anger about the way in which this public information session was held. It seems like a deliberate attempt to silence this community and not let community members hear each other and have a unified understanding of the issues. I hope that, in the future, traditional public information forum and comment format will be used, rather than having separate information booths that dissipate the power of communal voice. Thank you.</p>	<p>The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Froess-1	This is a stain on our great Navy. We have done enough to these poor, magnificent creatures. Enough is enough! Please, please, stop this testing!!!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Frost C-1	I just wanted to show our household's support for your plan.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Frost S-1	Please keep the Navy's garbage out of our oceans, lakes, and streams.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Fuller-1	<p>To quote Gordon Hempton in his book, One Square Inch of Silence, I do not want "silence to go extinct." The Growlers are loud, louder than commercial aircraft. To add their, as an addition to the current aircraft flying above Olympic National Forest, is to further press silence into extinction.</p> <p>And one more thing...has the Navy forgotten Pearl Harbor? I'd like to know why it's a good plan to house all of this type plane in one place, Whidbey Island – where I do happen to live under the flight path of Paine Field now.</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Furlong R-1	<p>I have 2 degrees in the biologic Sciences from the University of Washington, including a doctoral degree.</p> <p>I am writing to comment on proposed Noise exposure increase in the Salish sea, related to Navy growler activities.</p> <p>The marine industry, which includes shipping, whale watching, and recreational and commercial boating and fishing, are all going to be asked to make alterations in operations to accommodate the need to reduce noise that impacts the orca population and their ability to feed. It is an</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>absurdity, and an anathema, that the the Navy not only neglects to participate in this effort, but is planning to actually increase operations and noise exposure of this harmful type. See the attached letter re the science regarding the impacts of noise on the Orca whales, as well as dolphins in the Salish Sea.</p> <p>We strenuously object to any Navy growler operations changes that do not involve substantial REDUCTION. An increase in operations and consequently noise exposure, is unacceptable.</p> <p>Richard Furlong MD</p>	
Furlong Z-1	<p>"In a recent project review of the Trans Mountain Expansion (TMX) Project, the National Energy Board (NEB) found that the increase in marine vessels associated with the Project would further contribute to cumulative effects that are already jeopardizing the recovery of the SRKW (Southern Resident Killer Whales)."</p> <p>https://waves-vagues.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/Library/40646713.pdf</p> <p>https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/navy-plans-testing-of-futuristic-technology-sonar-harm-to-mammals-in-pacific-northwest/</p> <p>https://news.ucsc.edu/2019/03/marine-mammal-hearing.html</p> <p>"A deaf whale is a dead whale"</p> <p>https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/jun/14/stranded-whales-ocean-navy-sonars</p> <p>"The deafening noise of sonar, used by warships to detect enemy submarines, can injure dolphins and whales, driving them to surface too fast or beach themselves — with sometimes fatal consequences — to escape the din."</p> <p>https://local12.com/news/nation-world/more-dolphins-die-in-aegean-sea-group-suspects-navy-drills</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
G		
G-1	<p>Please recognize the pain, distress, and utter cruelty you are imposing on the orcas and other affected inhabitants of the ocean. Please STOP SONAR TESTING. Stop ignoring that your actions have direct and long term consequences. Stop ignoring the destruction you are causing the EARTH- a living entity. This is what happens when small minded, ignorant, confused humans are positioned into power and am disgusted with embarrassment regarding how the world must view it from the outside. Please, do better. please honor the lives of the ocean and of the earth. Please stop contributing to the embarrassment of this nation! please stop causing animals pain and discomfort. please consider the well being of the world, and please ACT to promote genuine, thoroughly-considered changes.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Gage-1	The Salish Sea should not be the location of sonar testing or use due to the negative impact on the habitat of the critically endangered Southern Resident Orcas. Thank you	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Galera-1	Please stop this cruelty!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Galliher-1	Absolutely against! In a world full of hate and cruelty, I don't feel testing sonar when we know it causes hearing loss and puts animals in distress, is worth it. I support our military 100%, but I sure hope they make the right choice on this one. That or they need to come out with one heck of an explanation for why we should even consider sonar testing to be worth the cost to the animals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Galm-1	our world today is being tortured, tormented, beaten, abused, threatened, and shamelessly killing off the smallest of creatures to the largest. we are being selfish in our ways that your dream can come true at the cost of damaging our planet to where it cannot come back to its original state. no matter how long or how much time we would put into restoring our earth, it is now a hopeless feat. this earth is beyond repair and the most abused, abandoned, and tortured are our wildlife that have no say in what man is doing from day to day destroying their homes and their food sources. we dont have that right. how dare man put a crown on his head making him a king of the land. no one is a king. if all this testing, building, cutting trees, making room for man and his visions, in a very short time coming, there will be no earth, land, water and seas for us to exists even just a simple life	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	without the luxury of the amazing world of our animal species. THIS ALL MUST STOP NOW SO WE ALL HAVE A FUTUREIF ITS NOT TOO LATE ALREADY.	
Galvan-1	Can the US Navy please chill with the sonar testing?? Like i dont think someone is gonna attack you guys. The only this the US is good at is <i>[expletive deleted]</i> other places up, now they want to <i>[expletive deleted]</i> with the ocean. Please leave them the <i>[expletive deleted]</i> alone and use the money for environmental issues.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Galvin-1	I strongly object to the sonar testing. It could have catastrophic effects for animals who are already under pressure from pollution, noise and a lack of food. Please do not put the Southern Resident orcas more at risk than they already are!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Gan-1	I 100% against the underwater sonar practices which can cause harm to the marine animals. This practice limit the ability of marine mammals that utilise sound extensively to recognise the frequencies in sound, thus, limiting their survival. Please stop this.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Garbett-1	Please don't conduct war games in our ocean! I'm strongly against sonar testing! It is a death sentence to our endangered resident orcas along with everything else. Hearing loss or damage would prevent the resident orcas from finding the fish the need to survive. They are strictly fish eating orcas.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Garcia-1	This is very wrong! Please stop hurting animals! What would you do if they hurt your family! You can protect yourselves but animals can't this is our job to do so...	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Gardner M-1	Please stop,destroying the planet that is home to so much more than humans! We don't need sonar testing! What is that for? Is that for killing? What a sick twisted world we live in.The marine life should be able to live in peace, the world is on the brink of meltdown with the 6 th mass extinction and deforestation. Enough is enough!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Gardner P-1	Concern about our environment and the impact on our wildlife, plant life and farm lands. Putting so many Growlers in one place makes us more of a target from Eastern Asia. The flights rattle structures, the ground around Deception Pass bridge where that is a main on/off way to get off our island. The noise is creating a decrease in tourists at the parks in our region. Property values are no doubt going to go down.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>With the increase of military to accommodate these Growlers has and will stress our community, roads, traffic and they do not pay taxes here which the locals must cover.</p> <p>I don't know about the Growlers flying over native /tribal lands in area - but think that may be an issue.</p> <p>This area used to be call "God's Country" now no longer - sad</p>	
Gardner R-1	<p>We are suppose to be the guardians of Earth, we are killing our earth. Please do not do sonar testing or any testing that can harm wildlife and Earth.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Garreton-1	<p>I propose the Navy consider an additional mitigation zone off the California coast near Petrolia. According to research and studies conducted by Dr. Dawn Goley, Professor of Marine Biology at HSU, a new colony of elephant seals (<i>Mirounga Angustirostris</i>) have made a home along the coastline of the Punta Gorda lighthouse. (GPS: Lat- 40-14-57.48"N/Long- 124-21-1.08"W) Little is known about this new colony and the reasons for their interaction in this remote area. Please consider additional mitigation in this area to protect this new, developing colony.</p>	<p>The Navy considered the commenter's mitigation request; however, the suggested location is situated outside of the NWTT Study Area. The Navy did not develop mitigation areas outside the Study Area (e.g., in areas along the California coastline) because those areas would not overlap the locations where training and testing activities will occur under the Proposed Action; and therefore, would not be effective mitigation.</p>
Garsson-1	<p>NOAA and the U.S. Navy have known for decades the negative impacts of Sonar on Marine Mammals. The recent use of dangerous electromagnetic weapons testing off the West Coast, has also contributed to the deaths of over 100 Grey Whales—from Baja California up to Alaska. We have also seen what damage it has caused to the coral reefs on Kauai's North Shore at Barking Sands. No animal or person is safe from this deadly war technology.</p> <p>The Pacific Northwest Salish Sea is Home to the endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales. Why would the Navy be allowed to threaten their extinction with ongoing Sonar and EM Weapons(Raytheon) testing in the waters they call home.</p> <p>There are already enough man made threats, including diminished food sources and toxic pollutants. But the single biggest contributor to our planet's environmental degradation is the U.S. Military. Enough is Enough, we must protect the only home we know, and all it's inhabitants.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.
Gaulding-1	As an American citizen i do not approve of environmental terrorism. Please reconsider doing anymore harm to the creatures God created, and be safe yourselves, I understand the fear of enemies, but sea creatures are an important part of holding this world together. Peace and blessings	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marin-species-monitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Gay-1	Your actions will negatively affect humans and other mammals	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Gelbart-1	Do not cause the deaths of any more cetaceans. Stop the excessive use of deadly sonar. we must better protect endangered species. http://seavoice.com/news/2019/01/31/researchers-have-identified-how-naval-sonar-is-killing-and-beaching-whales/?fbclid=IwAR1bK6SR_7AEwSPf6VJwePyqVgLXQInnPKo9ksuqFHverQkp6qjDyRVxZlg It is our duty to protect species,not cause their demise.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Genevro-1	Please discontinue underwater sonar testing as its disrupting the wildlife that maintains our delicate ecosystems. Whales and other cetaceans have	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	no ability of escaping these damaging noises. Research has indicated sonar testing has even resulted in the death of these animals due to the intolerance of the noise. We beg you to stop and find more ethical means of testing sonar.	and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
George-1	My parents have been traveling to Whidbey Island for 15 years and now call the Island home in retirement. Never has it been a more obnoxious and unwelcoming place to live than now! The increase in growler test flights is pointless, obnoxious and a nuisance to every living creature in the region. Literally use your brains and do what is right a proper for the public and environment for once. People obviously don't like jets flying by 24/7 for gods sake.	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Gernsbacher-1	Please desist from sonar testing. The Pacific Northwest orca population is dire. We must do everything possible to encourage a healthful life for them.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Gertler-1	With climate change already creating disruptive and unprecedented changes in the ecosystem, it's clear that the ocean is not a limitless supply of resources, raising questions about just how much marine environmental ecosystem disruptions it can take. Chemicals and Waste: The chemical contamination, debris, sonar and other effects of the training will put the sensitive ecosystems in harms way. The draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the 2015 final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and byproducts in training & testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. This conclusion does not take into account the effects that climate change may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification will accelerate the corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts that remain. The Navy has documented that it plans to use 20,000 tons of heavy metals,	The Navy discusses ocean acidification in the context of climate change in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) and 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and includes information from scientific studies conducted since 2015. The Navy acknowledged in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) that "metals tend to dissociate" in more acidic ocean conditions. The Navy added a reference back to these two sections in the sections analyzing the impacts of explosives (Section 3.1.4.1) and metals (Section 3.1.4.2). Note that corrosion can also act to insulate ordnance and other metal items from contact with seawater and sediments, slowing or even halting further corrosion and movement of metals into the adjacent sediments and water column. The effects of climate change on the ocean environment, particularly effects specific to a particular region like ocean waters in the Pacific Northwest, continue to be researched and to evolve and are not necessarily

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>plastics and other highly toxic compounds over the next 2 decades in the oceans where it conducts war games, This means the likelihood of increased acidification from warming oceans from toxins, due to dumped munitions/metals.</p> <p>Can the Navy possibly know the degree of harmful impacts of chemical changes from explosives, from ocean acidification and warming and its corrosive effects?</p> <p>What is the Navy's plan for waste management, pollution prevention and recycling all of which could affect the water quality in the ocean. (Dumping cannot be considered "waste management")</p> <p>Marine Behaviors, disruptions and injuries. Aside from being concerned of the health of our ecosystems, we are a community that can be well affected economically by testing. We have commercial and tourist fishing, and whale watching expeditions, and lodgings/restaurants that rely on visitors to the coast, many of whom visit to see wildlife; whale migrations, seals, sea birds and if the ocean continues to warm we may see bottlenose dolphins here on the north coast.</p>	<p>predictable. For example, as described in Section 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality), increases in ocean acidity are believed to reduce the availability of carbonate in the water column, which is needed by organisms to generate calcium carbonate structures. However, increases in sea surface temperature associated with climate change appear to stimulate calcification at an even greater rate, essentially overriding the inhibiting effects of lower pH levels and leading to unexpected high abundance of cocolithophores (which build protective scales from calcium carbonate) in some ocean regions.</p>
Gertler-2	<p>The total impacts of sea sonar explosives, electromagnetic devices, underwater detonations. and explosive training over time are still unknown except for scientific documentation about the disruptive behaviors of sonar air guns, these behaviors include those needed for survival such as NAVIGATION/migration, breeding, nursing, hearing, feeding, and location of predators and prey.</p> <p>And as yet we do not know how the ingestion of chemicals and munitions have on sea mammal behavior. Evidence shows that whales will swim hundreds of miles, rapidly change their depths sometimes leading to bleeding from the eyes and ears and even beach themselves to get away from the sounds of sonar. Whales are capable of the "bends"; nitrogen has been found in their blood stream.</p> <p>Science studies have proven that sonar travels 300 miles under water. Even though the plan is to test 12 miles off shore, sound travels at 300 miles from the source. Sonar can be up to 140 decibels which is 100 times more intense than the level known to alter whale behavior, at 192 decibels the whale is deaf immediately, and a deaf whale is a dead whale.</p> <p>How will the navy guarantee they will not disrupt life sustaining behaviors of marine mammals and also Courts have clarified that a finding of "negligible impact" does not fully satisfy the Navy's obligation under the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and that the Navy is subject to an independent statutory requirement to ensure that mitigation measures are</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	sufficient. (Nat Resources Defense Council v. Pritzker, 823F.3d 1125, 1133 (9th cir. 2016 [sic])	
Giamberso-1	I am opposed to training over the Olympic National Park. There are other locations that would not have such a negative impact on the Park.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTC Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Giamberso-2	I'm concerned that the jets are not following their announced flight plan. It is my understanding that the jets would not fly over the green bank farm area. Our house is close to the farm, the address is 2752 Harbor Estates road and yesterday, 6/10/19, there were at least four flights in afternoon over my house. I left a complaint on the noise complaint line I am very disappointed that the Navy did not fully consider alternative sites to the OFL and choose one that does not affect the island so negatively. The least the Navy could do is honor its announcements about where the jets will fly. The noise is negatively impacting our quality of life and the property value of our house.	The activities proposed in the NWTTC Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Gianlorenzo-1	For the love of our whales, please stop this harmful testing.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Giannone-1	<p>Noise modeling in the NWTT EIS is used to estimate acoustic impacts, but the modeling studies pre-date the Navy's recently ordered F414-GE-400 Enhanced engines for the EA-18G Growler jets. Noise from flights over the MOA currently exceeds the projected dBA and percent time audible as outlined in Appendix J (Tables J-13, J-18, NWTT EIS, p. J-22, J-27). This is partly due to noise analysis that relies on standards for urban areas, as well as metrics that de-emphasize the low-frequency noise of the EA-18G Growler jets as heard from the ground. The inaccuracy can also be attributed to lack of current acoustic data. Further research in the MOA is required to provide accurate information about loudness for park visitors and residents and the impact on wildlife including ESA listed species. NWTT flight operations significantly impact the soundscape of the MOA and areas near the MOA (Lauren Kuehne, 2019). This EIS demonstrates the need for further research, with current conditions and information.</p> <p>Noise Analysis – Appendix J</p> <p>Lmax: The noise modeling (J.4.3) used to determine the Lmax for Training Operations (Tables J-13-16) relies on measurements done with a previous engine model. There is an enhanced engine model for the EA-18G Growler jets, which the Navy recently ordered, that has “up to 18% more thrust and twice the horsepower of its predecessor” (Defence Blog, 2018). Modeling with the F414 Enhanced Engine is needed.</p> <p>dBA: A-weighting is used along with the DNL noise measurement to “emphasize certain parts of the audio frequency spectrum” (J-4, NWTT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS 2019). This A-weighting filter “[adjusts] low and high frequencies to match the sensitivity of the ear.” A-weighting is common in the United States for noise assessment; however this weighting scale de-emphasizes low-frequency noise. A-weighting is also not standard for noise analysis internationally. While relevant to human hearing, it mischaracterizes the noise from the EA-18G Growler jets, because the predominant frequencies of those flights heard from the ground, are under 200Hz.</p> <p>Additionally, A-weighting, while relevant to human hearing, is not relevant to the large variety of frequency sensitivity in species populating the area, such as the ESA-listed Marbled Murrelet, many species of birds (see table 3.6-2 of the NWTT EIS Draft), small mammals, bats, and amphibians. More research is needed about the acoustic ecology of the MOA to project potential impact of aircraft noise in the low-frequency range especially.</p> <p>Table J-11: The baseline Ldnr in this chart ranges from less than 35 to 35.4 dBA. The proposed Ldnr for the 13.5 percent projected increase in sorties</p>	<p>The engines used for the noise model were the F414-GE-400 engines, which are the current engines installed in the F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft. Appendix J has been revised to include the engine type modeled for the EA-18G aircraft. The GE F414-400 enhanced engine is currently only in a research phase for the Navy, and is not installed in any aircraft, nor are there plans to purchase or install it. If this engine were to be introduced to the fleet of F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft, the Navy would measure the noise emissions from this new engine.</p> <p>A-weighting, which was used in the noise modeling described in Appendix J, best replicates human hearing and is the most appropriate for the assessment of annoyance from aircraft noise. A-weighted sound levels form the basis of the day-night average sound level (DNL) metric, which is the best available metric to relate aircraft noise to long-term annoyance. The Federal Interagency Committee on Noise found that “There are no new descriptors or metrics of sufficient scientific standing to substitute for the present DNL cumulative noise exposure metric.” The comment suggests that A-weighted measures may not be as accurate in determining the disturbing effects of noises with strong low-frequency components. However, the alternative measurement methodology using C-weighting increases the emphasis on lower frequencies when compared with A-weighting. C-weighting is most appropriate for impulsive or repetitive sounds, such as blast noise and machine gun fire, which contain significant low-frequency noise, as well as continuous noise sources such as pumps and compressors.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>over the current level ranges from less than 35dBA to 36 dBA. Because the modeling for these figures is done with the previous engine model and not the F414 enhanced engine (installation complete by Dec. 2020), it is not representative of current or proposed loudness (Defence Blog, 2018). These dBA measurements also are low compared to measured dB SPL in the MOA. In March 2019 flights over the Hoh River Trail exceeded 70 dB SPL using a calibrated Bruel & Kjaer Sound Pressure Level meter (meets IEC standards, ISO, ANSI and ECMA standards). There is not enough measurement of the noise from the ground with the current engine model and number of flights. The National Park Service study from 2010 is referenced in J.7 "Acoustics Monitoring Report;" the results from this report include that aircraft were audible 11.7% of the time and exceeded 52dBA less than 0.3 % of the time. This data is not relevant to current noise from aircraft. Current percentages range from 12-56% of daytime hours flights are audible in the MOA (Lauren Kuehne, 2019). The statement: "The data for this study were collected in 2010 but are considered relevant to current conditions related to Navy aircraft training" is inaccurate (J.27). Day-Night-Average: the majority of NWTT flights currently occur during daytime hours (Lauren Kuehne, 2019). Day-Night Averages Sound Level is considered standard criteria for consideration of noise in land-use planning, however it mis-represents the loudness and percent time audible. Averaging many loud daytime events with few nighttime events lessens the overall percent time audible and average dBA, even with "10dB adjustment for acoustical nighttime noise events" (J.4.1, J-4).</p>	
Giannone-2	<p>Public Comment on Draft Supplemental EIS This comment primarily addresses the acoustic impacts of the addition of 36 EA-18G Growlers to the fleet at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island (Record of Decision for Growler Environmental Impact Statement, March 13, 2019). The Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT) Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS proposes an increase of approximately 300 flights annually over the Olympic Military Operations Area ("Alternative 1," NWTT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Information sheet from Open House, 2019, p. 6). The noise analysis in the NWTT Draft Supplemental EIS, which is presented in Appendix J, includes relevant concepts but demonstrates the need for further analysis that accurately reflects the projected impact of increased training activities. Noise modeling in the NWTT EIS is used to estimate acoustic impacts, but the modeling studies pre-date the Navy's recently ordered F414-GE-400 Enhanced engines for the EA-18G Growler jets. Noise from flights over the</p>	<p>The engines used for the noise model were the F414-GE-400 engines, which are the current engines installed in the F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft. Appendix J has been revised to include the engine type modeled for the EA-18G aircraft. The GE F414-400 enhanced engine is currently only in a research phase for the Navy, and is not installed in any aircraft, nor are there plans to purchase or install it. If this engine were to be introduced to the fleet of F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft, the Navy would measure the noise emissions from this new engine.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>MOA currently exceeds the projected dBA and percent time audible as outlined in Appendix J (Tables J-13, J-18, NWTT EIS, p. J-22, J-27). This is partly due to noise analysis that relies on standards for urban areas, as well as metrics that de-emphasize the low-frequency noise of the EA-18G Growler jets as heard from the ground. The inaccuracy can also be attributed to lack of current acoustic data. Further research in the MOA is required to provide accurate information about loudness for park visitors and residents and the impact on wildlife including ESA listed species. NWTT flight operations significantly impact the soundscape of the MOA and areas near the MOA (Lauren Kuehne, 2019). Potential impacts of increased noise are largely unstudied so while the NWTT EIS includes noise analysis, it is not currently relevant and does not reflect the actual experience on the ground for people in the MOA. The document demonstrates the need for further research, with current conditions and information.</p> <p>*see attachment*</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>With current activity levels military aircraft are audible in the MOA (including at a location on the edge of the MOA which is in the Warning Zone, Figure J-4) from 12% to 56% of the time (Lauren Kuehne, 2019). At some locations in 2017, 80-100 flight events occurred in one day. The MOA includes part of Olympic National Park, which is internationally known for the naturally low SPL levels (One Square Inch, 2019). Measurements with calibrated Bruel & Kjaer SPL meter routinely read 22dB SPL. The quietness of the areas in the MOA when there are not flights contributes to lower Day-Night Averages; when there are not flights, it is very quiet. The proposed increase in activities, including flights over this area, would have a greater impact than is projected in this Draft Supplemental EIS. To represent and understand the potential impacts of the NWTT Electronic Warfare activities, further research is needed.</p> <p>The North Olympic Peninsula is a valuable resource, and Olympic National Park is a public resource. The NWTT activities can be conducted in a location that does not impact a sensitive, unique, and cherished wilderness area that is home to many people. 8 Tribal Nations, Olympic National Park, state forest land and marine sanctuaries are all located in the area impacted by the Northwest Training and Testing activities, especially flights. Many people live in the area. The North Olympic Peninsula draws millions of visitors annually from around the country and world who appreciate the opportunity to experience this diverse wilderness.</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Gibbs-1	I am 100% against your sonar testings, due to the harmful effects it has on surrounding wildlife.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Gienger-1	I was only able to attend your workshop in Fort Bragg for a short period of time. I fully support the letter of May 3, 2019 from the 10 tribes of the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council, and the letter of May 13, 2019 from the Seventh Generation Fund. Traditional and natural values of the coast and oceans must be respected, protected, and restored, may these be manifested.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/• The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org• The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr• The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology• The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Gilchrist-1	And first on the comment period, in previous years you've had the open-type like this and then the public comment period. And I like that format better than just the complete open period type. I prefer that. And my comment for the Navy is that we have dead zones in the Pacific Ocean, probably the other oceans too. And we don't need any more foreign materials dumped or shot into the ocean to further degrade the environment for the ocean animals -- life. So that's all. What part is our Coast Guard playing in putting anything into the ocean bombings or sounds? Anything? Are they dumping or are they testing or are they training with, say, projectiles that go into the ocean? I had heard that radio active materials were coming out here and that our Coast Guard	The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	was doing something with them. I'm not sure what. So I just wonder what part our Coast Guard is playing with that.	members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document. Coast Guard activities in the Pacific Ocean are not included as part of the proposed action in this NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Gill-1	I stand with the InterTribal Sinkiyone Wilderness Council in strongly opposing the Navy's proposed increase in operations. The Navy predicts over 500,000 instances of disruption to marine mammal behavior over five years including 275,000 instances of temporary hearing loss and 600 instances of permanent hearing loss. This is absolutely unacceptable. The ecosystem is exceedingly fragile and to stress it further is exceedingly is irreverent and short sighted.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/• The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org• The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr• The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology• The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Gilmartin-1	The time has come to protect our oceans, the creatures that live there have been hunted, fished, poisoned, and driven to hunger, decimation and near extinction. It is time we i the civilised world took a stand and said NO MORE to further destruction. Please put an end to these plans for sonar testing, surely you have done enough damage to cetaceans - time promote their well being for a change. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Gilmour-1	Certainly you have already heard and/or read all the substantive scientific evidence that clearly proves that military sonar and explosive testing is detrimental, and in too many cases lethal, to marine animals. Therefore, I am going to attempt to appeal to your moral integrity. Humans are here to be stewards of the earth. It is up to us to figure out how to live peacefully, respecting the amazing diversity of the planet, both human and animal. Please listen to your hearts, not only the wallets of the military industrial	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	complex, and do what you truly know is right: treat others, all others, as you would like to be treated. If that doesn't motivate you, then consider this: eventually what goes around comes around. There's only one amazingly complex and beautiful circle of life and it's all connected. Please shift from the "it's us against them" mentality from the past and realize, before it's too late, that we're ALL in this together.	the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Giolo-1	É cruel demais para os anjos do mar ! A Marinha Americana possui, certamente, tecnologia para resolver problemas assim, evitando condenar os animais!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Giordan-1	I am on the ground where the Growlers fly. Planes are too loud, sometimes too low happens all the time. My stress is profoundly affected by the roar and vibrations. I pity those of my neighbors that have PTSD. But you do not recognize that the planes have any effect outside of combat. Too many flights while we are at peace means those who live here never have peace.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Girvin-1	Given the recent what is called an "unusual mortality event" under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of large numbers of whales washing up dead on West Coast beaches NOAA, NMFS and the Navy, under Section 404 of this Act, are under a duty to develop a contingency plan "to minimize these deaths and provide appropriate care during an unusual mortality event ...and to determine the effects of the unusual mortality event on the size estimate of the population of marine mammals". The recent West Coast whale die offs are a problem that was neither known or considered by the drafters of the current Supplemental EIS. Given	The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>such critical new information, is it not appropriate if not mandatory, for another Supplemental EIS to be prepared by the Navy specifically addressing the potential adverse impact of its training activities on the now starving and severely threatened West Coast whales?</p> <p>I believe a Supplemental EIS should be prepared and the Navy should be directed by NOAA to (1) reconsider its sonar and explosive testing's impact on the migrating whales in their current severely weakened and dying state, (2) reevaluate its data and estimates contained in the draft EIS of the potential whale "takes" given the current die offs, 3) further adjust, if not curtail, its training and testing activities in the migratory passage areas of the threatened whales</p> <p>Until a Section 404 Marine Mammal Protection Act contingency plan is prepared by the Navy and NOAA NOAA should direct the Navy to immediately implement a moratorium of sonar and explosive testing in the coastal waters from CA to Alaska located in the migratory pathways of the West Coast whales</p> <p>Could you please respond on the manner in which the Navy and NOAA will implement their Marine Mammal Protection Act Section 404 responsibilities in regards to the current whale die off and how this process will impact the current Draft EIS.</p> <p>Could you also please respond with your position on why a Supplemental EIS should not be required from the Navy now specifically addressing the West Coast whale die off and the impact of the Navy war trainings on this currently and recently discovered threatened sea mammal population.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these concerns.</p>	
Giulini-1	<p>I moved here from the busy and noisy SF Bay Area about 24 years ago. Originally from Germany I fell in love with the peaceful and luscious Olympic Peninsula - a welcoming green sanctuary of belonging.</p> <p>It was meant to be: I found a house and amazingly beautiful and loving partner, and together we build our lives as yoga teachers and artists.</p> <p>We invested time, energy, and money into our property, our community, our careers, and our lives in Port Townsend</p> <p>Now we have to escape the noise when the growlers start making their rounds!</p> <p>No more gardening at such times, apologizing to yoga students for the disturbance, having to cancel meditation classes, and building a bed on the couch at night with two pillows- one over the right, and one over the left ear.</p> <p>I feel extremely distressed. We are in our 60ties and 70ties, and we have to</p>	<p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>give up our home. It has been taken away from us. We loose our beautiful gardens, our life-style, our health, our careers, our community,</p> <p>In my work as yoga therapist i focus on PTSD and the Nervous System's response to triggers such as incessant exposure to this kind of noise.</p> <p>Research in neuroscience has proven that it triggers an alarm- response in the sympathetic nervous system, which is in turn being highjacked by our bio- chemistry into a “flight/fight/freeze”response.</p> <p>This causes an increase of cortisol and adrenaline in the body, which takes days to normalize in the bloodstream.Long-term exposure to cortisol and other stress hormones can wreak havoc on almost all of your body’s processes, increasing your risk of many health issues, from heart disease and obesity to anxiety and depression.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <p>From : https://therevisionist.org/bio-hacking/hormone/cortisol/</p> <p>“High levels of chronic stress causes your brain to be unable to learn and to forget things. That’s because chronically elevated cortisol levels erode neurons. Note that this is not the same as a temporary boost of cortisol that the body experiences during exercise, which is beneficial.</p> <p>Chronic stress destroys the hippocampus overtime- over-pruning its dendrites, killing its neurons, and preventing neurogenesis. But at the same time the amygdala becomes a stronger structure in the brain because emotions activate or stimulate the amygdala.</p> <p>Another adverse effect of chronically elevated cortisol is that it lowers IGF-1 while maintaining high blood glucose levels in the blood. This results in a metabolic imbalance, which in the long run can lead to diabetes.</p> <p>Additionally, Chronically elevated Cortisol suppresses the Immune System for the worse.</p> <p>Another example is Cushing’s Syndrome, which is an endocrine dysfunction where the body is continually flooded with cortisol. This is called hypercortisolism. Its symptoms are similar to chronic stress, including weight gain around the midsection; breaking down muscle tissue to produce unnecessary glucose that turns into fat, insulin resistance that possibly leads to diabetes, panic attacks, anxiety, depression, and increased risk of heart disease. Know that the amount of hippocampus shrinkage and memory loss is directly proportional to the amount of chronically elevated Cortisol.”....</p> <p>Stress- causing exposure also impacts the Thyroid gland function, which is down-regulated during stressful conditions.T3 and T4 levels decrease with stress, causing the inhibition of the thyroid-stimulating hormone (TSH)</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>caused by glucocorticoids in the central nervous system.</p> <p>We can feel it in our lives: decreased sleep, decreased concentration, inability to focus and follow-through, irritability, anxiety and depression, less capacity do our work efficiently, less resilience....</p> <p>Having grown up in Germany in a household with my father having been a world war 2 veteran and my mother a red cross nurse during that time, where severe PTSD was the norm, i implore you to take our feed-back seriously.</p> <p>Show that you do care, that you act responsibly, that you are a good neighbor, and that you are here to protect and defend us against harm.</p>	
Gladstone D-1	<p>My wife and I are native Washingtonians and long-time residents (I am 74; she is 72) We have hiked a number of times in the Olympics in the last nearly 50 years. We now live on Camano Island and have to put up with constant noise and vibrations from Growler exercises. Enough already!! Leave the Olympics and their surrounding waters alone!</p> <p>You clearly have plenty of money to spend on fuel, etc. So take your toys and go play elsewhere, for example, Idaho or Montana where wide open spaces mask the noise. The Growler jet noise impact on wildlife and the quiet, peaceful experience in Olympic National Park is over-the-top and clearly inappropriate for this World Heritage Site.</p> <p>The Navy has choices, but there is only one Olympic National Park!</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Gladstone J-1	<p>And I just want to -- I just want to comment that I'm very much against all this sonar and the noise in the ocean. And I'm concerned about the whales and the marine life. And that's really all I have to say. I say it every year.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Glaskey-1	<p>Please don't compromise this group of or as that are already struggling due to man's Actions. You can test anywhere - take it far out to sea. There are two new calves - a miracle - in this pod. Please.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Gleisner-1	<p>To Those Who Wish to Further Destroy Our World and Life in Our Oceans</p> <p>Your report seems to present objective information about the care you plan to take in mitigation zones, yet admits “pursuant to the MMPA, the “use of sonar and other transducers during training activities as described under Alternative 1 will result in the unintentional taking of short-finned pilot whales incidental to those activities.</p> <p>The report (Vol. 2, p. 29) acknowledges, “The quantity of explosives used during testing activities under Alternative 1 would generally increase (Table 3.0-7) compared to levels presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS.” And under such increase, the damage to marine life will increase (p. 29), as the report states: “the impacts to marine invertebrates would be the same as those described in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS. Both pelagic and benthic marine invertebrates could be impacted by explosive stressors. Explosions would likely kill or injure nearby marine invertebrates.”</p> <p>I vehemently disagree with using our coastal waters to test any and all devices that will have any negative impact whatsoever on our marine life—from sensitive coral and other seabed life, to minuscule fishes and other tiny sea creatures upon which other fish feed, to the largest of our sea mammals. There is no need for our Navy to practice killing anything. When the need arises, if it ever does, then that is the time to deploy those machines and technologies which will ultimately annihilate us all.</p> <p>A Story: My neighbor asked me what I thought of him buying his ten-year-old son a gun for Christmas. I said I had no problem with this as long as he adhered to one request. He said, “Sure.”</p> <p>I asked him that after he gave his son the gun, that he helped him load it and then shoot the family dog. He was horrified.</p> <p>I explained that until a child, or anyone, realizes that what he is doing is taking a life away from what is most precious to him, or to someone else, that child or person will not have any perspective of what killing means.</p> <p>We are in a time in our society when killing is rampant. Perhaps it is because of the distance that is maintained with the use of video killing games and/or drone technology. Setting off bombs underwater or using sonic sounds or laser instruments to destroy is no different than using a gun to kill. They all destroy life and must be recognized as weapons which</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>can kill that which sustains us.</p> <p>A family pet is no different than the whales, turtles, etc. - the lives in our oceans which are part of nature's cycle. Anything which has the side effect of stunning the navigational needs of underwater animals and making them unable to find food, stay within their family unit for protection, or even know where they are is unacceptable.</p> <p>No where in your massive report is there any recognition of the continuity of life needed on this earth. No where is there one sentence which speaks to understanding the effect your practicing will do to the natural underwater world which is already threatened by plastic waste, Fukushima radiation contamination, nutrient changes due to warming waters.</p> <p>Thank you for your time. I am a daughter of a retired Marine First Sergeant, wife of a first husband who is retired from the Army, widow of a Veteran, stepmother of a Naval Engineer deployed on a Nuclear Submarine. All saw action in various wars and conflicts around the world. All suffered from a variety of PTSD, alcoholism, drug abuse, and depression. All admitted that they believe in our country and that war is not the answer.</p> <p>Any killing of marine life due to war games or practice drills with lethal weapons is totally unacceptable to me. Practice if you will on the screens of your computers where war games are played. Do not practice in our oceans.</p>	
Glover-1	<p>Come on, folks. When all is said and done, you know that you are not only ruining the recreational and tourist use of so much of the Olympic Peninsula (the noise levels from the jets are staggering!), but you are having an extremely detrimental impact on the wildlife that our state forests are supposed to protect.</p> <p>It is disingenuous to say that you need MORE information about the harm that your training exercises and flights are having. Essentially you are ruining the experience of nature that our state and national forest systems were set up to protect. FOR GOD'S SAKE PLEASE STOP IT!!!!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Glover-2	<p>I don't understand why you are underestimating the full impact of the Growler noise, using an average number of decibels per flight that doesn't at all reflect how hideously LOUD these planes can often be. Also the impact on such historical settings such as Ebey's Preserve have not been adequately acknowledged. For example, after several rather terrifying episodes when visitors I took to Ebey's Landing were frightened out of their wits by the Growlers (leading to us simply leaving the Preserve ASAP), how</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island or Ebey's Reserve. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>can you POSSIBLY say that the Growlers aren't having an extremely detrimental impact on the use of this Preserve, which is supposed to be PROTECTED??</p> <p>Please look at the reality here -- these Growlers are destroying the quality of life on Whidbey. Why can't you do these training flights in a less populated area, PLEASE???</p>	
Godfrey-1	<p>Please stop these damaging underwater tests. This is a cruel thing to do.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Goldie-1	<p>As regards the Draft Northwest Training and Testing supplemental EIS, in Section 5 Mitigation, there is no plan for preventing injury to birds, mammals, turtles or other sea life. Reporting injury is after-the-fact. Furthermore the proven effect of loud sounds on whales is not addressed. The damage to their brains and hearing isn't noticed until they beach themselves or have died.</p> <p>Appendix J (Airspace Noise) fails to consider specific alternatives that would greatly reduce Navy jet noise over Olympic National Park and that would reduce or completely eliminate Navy jet flyovers of the Park. The fact that such alternatives would not be as convenient for the Navy as what it currently does is not a valid reason for refusing to fully consider such alternatives. Flying over the Park, especially the parts of the park not directly on the west coast of the peninsula, is not a military necessity for training exercises. The Navy has many other airspaces it could fly in, but there is only one Olympic National Park.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Goldstein-1	<p>It is unacceptable that sonar is making large stretches of ocean uninhabitable for endangered killer whales.</p> <p>Whales have been observed leaving areas up 17 miles from the source of the sonar, with military grade devices having an even greater impact. Therefore, if out at sea, a minimum of 907 square miles surrounding each device (17 x 17 miles x 3.14) is potentially being made intolerable to whales.</p> <p>The noise is not just an annoyance - polluting their general environment - it interferes with their very being. Navigation, communication and subsequent feeding and mating are all adversely affected. Their primary prey - scarce salmon - involves a particularly targeted use of sonar to locate and catch them within a complex underwater terrain. In the long-term it can even destroy generational knowledge of safe feeding and breeding sites as vast areas start to be avoided (similar to that suffered by elephants and bison due to human encroachment and 'management'). Constant 'pings' can mentally impair them - much as a car alarm would do to us if we were forced to listen to it for long periods.</p> <p>In cases where naval sonar has been used in prime whale habitat, the whales have been located miles away in areas where they have not been seen in decades e.g. Haro Strait after sonar testing by the Canadian Naval frigate HMCS Ottawa made Victoria, B.C audibly uninhabitable.</p> <p>I fully agree with the scientists that have advised you that limits should be placed on mid-frequency sonar testing (2-10 kHz). Is it not enough that whales have to contend with ever-increasing ship noise and boat-strikes? (300,000 ferry sailings alone were made on the Salish Sea in 2018). Surely sonar knowledge is now advanced enough to avoid the damage we are doing to these beautiful animals? Sadly it would seem that it is not.</p> <p>Current whale detection and protection measures are quite frankly poor. Often the Navy are unable to detect whales within the distances in which noise mitigation is required (1000 yards in the U.S. & 4000 yards in Canada) due to the somewhat outdated passive acoustic listening and visual surveillance methods being relied upon to establish their whereabouts.</p> <p>When noise mitigation is applied, even Canada's more generous 4,000 yard limit is nowhere near enough distance to protect whales from being mentally and/or physically scarred.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Once again, unprecedented sightings of whales in Discovery Bay leads to the conclusion that they were present and distressed enough to leave San Juan Islands on Monday, Feb. 6, just 18 hours after a Canadian frigate, the HMCS Ottawa, transmitted loud pings throughout the area. This is unacceptable. Every deaf, soon-to-be dead whale is an avoidable tragedy. Please stop carrying out all sonar testing in the Salish Sea immediately until you have the technology to avoid all damage to these endangered animals. The Southern Resident Killer Whales are facing numerous threats but if they cannot hear, they cannot hunt and they cannot eat. Their recovery depends on you. I await your response with the utmost concern.	
Gomez-1	Hello, my concern is for the whales, dolphins, turtles and any sea life that uses their hearing to exist underwater. They will be impacted tremendously and severely with the NAVY testing/training. I am not a scholar or scientist. But I do know that species will be maimed, injured, tortured and killed (beaching themselves) with the NAVY OPERATIONS. I BESEECH AND EVEN BEG that these operations are shelved in that the natural environment of sea life will suffer and that is something we cannot afford. The Southern Resident Orca population currently is imperiled and will be extinct at any time! The food source they require is disappearing and their feeding areas are becoming poisoned with pesticides and ships that dump into their waters. Adding this program could be the death knell to mothers, calves, matriarchs and fathers. THEY NEED TO SURVIVE!! Please...spare our sea life ..this is their home and WE MUST PROTECT THEM AT ANY COST. "If THE OCEAN DIES, WE DIE"...Capt. Paul Wilson - Sea Shepherd...WE OWE FUTURE GENERATIONS A HEALTHY, CLEAN OCEAN!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Gonzalez L-1	What's the purpose of basically killing all kinds of animals? You're a disgrace to flag and country.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Gonzalez M-1	Igal we know this Can harm dolphins and whales wich are very important to environment test with sonar shouldnt be legal its time humans understand that part of being rational and have a conciuous its for using it, our job is protect animals and mother nature and find a way to live this way	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Good-1	We go to the islands and the Olympic Peninsula to find peace and quiet. We oppose military expansion in these areas not just for people, but for the wildlife.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Gopalakrishnan-1	Please save the orcas and stop the insensitive testing.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Gordan A-1	<p>Although i appreciate testing equipment, I have to speak up regarding testing equipment when endangered species are at risk, as well as testing among populated areas. When studying the navy's intended places, it appears the Tacoma commencement Bay area which is surrounded by millions of people. The proposal states : The Navy also plans for more training than it typically needs.</p> <p>In addition, use of the 'rail' gun using' both ' explosive and non explosives,, is disruptive to not only sea mammals, but again in populated areas, to the people. The effect of Populated areas such as commencement bay, needs more analysis, that is: what happens to people when sudden 'explosive'</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	sounds happen, or growlers over head? The term 'electronic war games' and secretive activities, again in populated areas has not sufficiently been analyzed regarding the impacts on the health of human being. The proposed hearing loss damage, and potential dead of marine life needs reconsideration.	
Gordon C-1	I am strongly opposed to any additional noise that affects the orcas. Please stop the sonic testing and training in their habitat. Thank you	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Goretski-1	Please do not conduct tests in orca waters we are about to lose this iconic and essential species. These are endangered animal and as such you would be harming the protection of orcas which is illegal. Instead of having lawsuits thrown at you cease and desist this harmful practice so money and time can be invested into solutions not lawsuits.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Gorman-1	I do not agree with this. You are helping kill our wildlife and it makes me sick	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Gould-1	I do not intend to argue legalese here, so much as implore you not to continue to maim and kill ocean animals with your tests. Where is your humanity? While the ocean's fish and whale populations are dramatically declining, it is disastrous, callous, short-sighted and counter to human survival to continue to wreak havoc with ear-drum destroying noise pollution and toxins. What is it our military plans to defend if there is no life left here?	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Gouveia-1	I am completely against the proposed sonar testing by the US Navy in the Salish Sea. Such testing is very harmful to the endangered resident orcas.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Grabee-1	Please no growler flights over the olympic national park, wilderness areas, or protected seashores as they interfere with peaceful human recreation and natural activities of protected species in these areas. Fund studies to address the true impact of this noise pollution before proceeding	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Graber-1	Please do not conduct these flights over and near the olympic national park, forest, wilderness and seashore areas. The noise pollution produced is disruptive and detrimental to human recreation in these protected areas as well as protected wildlife, including marine life. Unless valid studies can prove the noise pollution is not harmful to the wilderness, animal and marine life, such activities would be reckless.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Gracia-1	What you guys are doing is wrong. You are killing our oceans!! As if the global climate situation and mass extinction wasn't bad enough. PLEASE STOP!!!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Grad-1	Growler jets flying within the boundaries of Olympic National Park is unacceptable. The disruption caused by the noise detracts from the natural experience and defeats the purpose of setting these areas aside. The Navy can conduct operations over populated areas where the noise levels are already intolerable. Leave Olympic National Parks as a place of refuge.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Graham A-1	Please end the sonar testing in our seas. Please consider the threat to the Washington state, J-Pod, endangered Orcas and the brand new baby born a few short weeks ago. This is so sad. Seeing thousands of these beautiful creatures being killed in the oceans around the world because of sonar testing. It's their home the sea not ours to destroy.!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Graham G-1	NO TESTING IN THE PNW!! this is cruel torture to our ocean residents, mainly the southern resident orcas. this is an unnecessary act and must not be implemented.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Graham J-1	Please stop sonar testing, its the right and decent thing, thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Graham M-1	<p>For years the Navy has been using the same trick. To avoid accountability, public scrutiny and opposition to its plans to unnecessarily bomb, destroy and kill marine life and its habitat the Navy has been holding public meetings in small cities far away from population centers. For example the ONLY two scheduled open house public meetings in Northern California on the post card that you sent me are tonight (May 2, 2019) in Eureka and tomorrow night in Fort Bragg. These are both small cities far away from population centers.</p> <p>The Navy's proposal will affect a resource that belongs to all Americans, not just those living in Eureka and Fort Bragg and a couple of small cities in Washington, Oregon, and Southeastern Alaska. There are millions of Americans living in San Francisco and in the San Francisco Bay Area and the peninsula. The Navy ought to hold at least one open house public meeting in San Francisco and at least one in the Bay Area or the peninsula. That way your meetings would be accessible to a far greater number of Americans, including a far greater number who are interested in your proposals.</p> <p>Besides shutting out the public the Navy effectively limits its own ability to learn from members of the community who might attend its meetings. Of course anyone can file comments on line but obviously there is some value in a public meeting that does not come from filing comments on line. Such as the ability of community members to hear from and learn from each other and the ability to have an interactive conversation with the Navy's representative (or your consultant whom you have hired). These are not possible when filing comments on line. Obviously even the Navy recognizes that there are advantages to attending a public meeting and this is shown in the Navy's decision to hold public meetings.</p> <p>As far as content the Navy needs to re-evaluate the actual necessity of doing more and more testing, whether the same amount or more of it, whether in the same already enormous NWTT area or an expansion of it. Is it really necessary?! All the Navy has submitted in support of the argument that all this "testing" is really necessary is its allegation that it is. That is not proof or evidence.</p>	<p>Because of the large size of the NWTT Study Area for this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, it is not feasible to hold a public meeting in every location where there may be public interest. Generally, the Navy has tried to locate public meetings in locations central to training or testing areas and potentially affected communities. Meeting locations were also identified based partially on suggestions received from the public, feedback from elected officials and other stakeholders, attendance levels of previous public meetings for similar projects, and the number of public comments received during the scoping phase.</p> <p>Previous Navy experience with other Northwest projects is that meetings held in larger population centers are often poorly attended. The Navy held one public meeting for this project in a large population center (Everett, Washington, near Seattle), and that meeting was one of the two least attended of the seven public meetings held in Washington, Oregon, and California. In addition to the meeting venues, the public could download and review the document, and make comments to it, on the website, which is available throughout the world.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The Navy should consider an alternative to do only one half (1/2) of the proposed amount of testing (better known as bombing, destroying habitat and killing marine life) and another alternative to do only 1/4 of what is proposed.</p> <p>Also, the Navy has already done this testing year after year not only in the NWTT but in other areas on the coast of the United States, for several decades. By now you should know that your equipment works and your employees are capable of operating it. You are wasting all the experience and knowledge that you get each year from more and more rounds of "testing."</p> <p>Please reply with your substantive replies to this message.</p>	
Graney-1	See attached file	See responses below.
Graney-2	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on draft supplement to the 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS/OEIS to reassess the potential environmental impacts associated with conducting proposed ongoing and future military readiness activities within the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area. I think public input should be a key element in the Navy's decision-making, especially given the large scope of the Navy's activities in the Northwest and the impact of those activities to the people and wildlife that live here.</p> <p>While I have looked at the entire document, I have chosen to focus my comments on issues specifically related to the impacts of the growing number of EA-18G Growlers and associated number of sorties for EW training, primarily over the Olympic MOAs. I have organized my comments by Supplemental EIS/OEIS section.</p> <p>Section 1.5 Overview and Strategic Importance of Existing Range Complexes and Testing Ranges</p> <p>My comments in this section relate specifically to EA-18G Growler EW training in the Northwest Training Area.</p> <p>"Importantly, we will need to be even more joint — advancing interdependence and integrating new capabilities." Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, 18th Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chairman's Strategic Direction to the Joint Force, 6 February 2012</p> <p>CJCSI 3500.01H of 25 April 2014 outlines the Joint training policy for the Armed Forces of the United States. In it, the criticality of training as we fight is emphasized and Collective Joint Training and Joint Functional Training being some of the critical means for that to occur. Under the Navy's "organize, train, and equip" responsibilities, they must ensure that deploying forces "are trained and ready for employment as joint capable</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Nevada are not reasonable. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>forces and prepared to meet the theater entry and operational requirements of the supported JZFC.” Specifically as relates to Electronic Warfare (EW) training and exercise, DoDD 3222.04, Electronic Warfare Policy, there is a policy statement to “Incorporate EW capabilities, tactics, techniques, and procedures into joint exercises and training regimes to the maximum extent possible.</p> <p>As effectively the only Service with an airborne EW capability, it behooves the Navy to conduct airborne EW training, not only as a single Service, but also Joint training and exercise. In past years, each active NAS Whidbey Squadron has conducted training and certification in the Owyhee and Jarbridge MOAs at Mountain Home AFB in Idaho, working with their Air Force counterparts. Similarly, the Navy has supported AF fighter squadrons at Joint Base Elmendorf- Richardson in Alaska, providing key adversarial EW support that provides as close to realworld conditions as possible for them to hone their tactics. Now the intent seems to be to consolidate EW training over the Olympic EW range (perhaps with growth in the Okanogan and Roosevelt MOAs), thus potentially shrinking the instances of joint training and exercise — at a time when the EW (and cyber) threat to US Forces is growing.</p> <p>Section 1.5 (Overview and Strategic Importance of Existing Range Complexes and Testing Ranges) of the Supplemental correctly points out that “Fuel is saved and equipment is exposed to less wear and tear when ranges are near where the platforms are based.” It also makes the case that Sailors and Marines “do not need to spend unnecessary time away from their families during the training cycle.” For most naval warfare categories, this is obviously true — navies train and fight at sea and staying relatively close to homeport provide cost and morale benefits. But this is not necessarily so for aircraft. The Navy has stated that they will save the government and taxpayers \$5 million each year, as well as reducing fuel emissions, aircraft wear-and-tear, etc. by consolidating training closer to where they are based. Relative to the overall O&M budget, \$5 million is a very small percent and, at the cost of diminished joint training opportunities, money poorly saved.</p> <p>Section 2 Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives My comments in this section relate specifically to EA-18G Growler EW training in the Northwest Training Area.</p> <p>2.2.3 Electronic Warfare Clearly, there is an imperative to conduct training, test, and exercise of the Navy’s EW capabilities by platform, and across platforms. EW training as</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>currently envisioned would appear to meet all Service-specific EW training requirements. However, as effectively the only Service with an airborne EW capability, the question is whether this mission statement is sufficient to address the Navy's role in Joint EW Training. Given the Navy's decision to consolidate all VAQ squadrons at Whidbey Island NAS and the further decision to consolidate the bulk of EA-18G Growler EW training in the Olympic MOAs (perhaps with growth in the Okanogan and Roosevelt MOAs), it would seem that the amount of joint training and exercise is actually declining. Since we fight jointly, it would seem that we would want to increase joint EW test, training, and exercise evolutions. Previous use of the MOAs at Mountain Home AFB provided some opportunities for joint engagement in addition to the annually scheduled exercises (e.g., Red Flag). Similarly, consolidation places an undue burden on the Olympic Peninsula (including the Olympic National Park), placing further stress on the residents and wildlife that live there — as well as tourists who visit this UNESCO World Heritage Site.</p> <p>2.4.1.1 Alternative Training and Testing Locations</p> <p>The consolidation of Navy Airborne EW Training and exercise in the Olympic MOA effectively ignores other extant training areas that don't negatively impact highly populated areas or pristine wilderness areas to the same extent as those in the Northwest Training area. Once again, to use a Growler jet noise example, EW training could be expanded at Mountain Home AFB beyond the intermediate- level EW training for certification that has traditionally occurred there. In the Pacific Northwest EW Range EA, it was stated (Section 2.2.2.1) that the alternative location of the Fallon Training Range Complex was eliminated because "it failed to meet several of the selection criteria." But the Navy didn't create an alternative that called for expansion of training at Mountain Home AFB, where (as stated in the EA No Action Alternative [section 2.2.3.1]), the Navy has done intermediate-level EW training for certification. In addition, Mountain Home AFB is a full 1/3 shorter distance from Whidbey Island than the Fallon Training Range Complex (530 versus 800 miles). Based on the stated desire for "reduction of costs, and reduction of fossil fuel consumption," it would seem that considering Mountain Home AFB (that the Navy has already used for training) would be a reasonable alternative to be considered. And to that point, what sort of cost/benefit analysis was performed on the fuel and cost savings against the negative impacts of noise on the local economy (e.g., degraded visitor experience, potential</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	reduction in tourism). In considering these decisions, it is easy to get lost in the data and miss the bigger picture impacts.	
Graney-3	<p>Appendix J Airspace Noise Analysis for the Military Operations Areas My comments in this section relate specifically to EA-18G Growler EW training in the Northwest Training Area. 3.0.3 Identification of Stressors for Analysis 3.0.3.1 Acoustic Stressors, 3.0.3.1.3 Aircraft Noise Appendix J Airspace Noise Analysis for the Military Operations Areas 3.4.1.7.4 Noise This section correctly identifies aircraft noise as an acoustic stressor within the Components of Stress for Physical Resources and then promptly dismisses it when putting together its source classification bins. There is then a depiction of “representative” sound pressure levels (both inwater and airborne) that were calculated using models to assess the impact on the Olympic MOAs. These data are then further expanded in Appendix J under a variety of aircraft operational scenarios, altitudes, etc. In addition, the results of a 2016 National Park Service Study are presented — all of which concludes that for most visitors, aircraft noise will be tolerable, and certainly not much worse than has traditionally been there. In addition, the NPS study was conducted before the increase in aircraft and sorties that have taken place since the time period of the study. Recent real world studies (Impact of military flights on Olympic Peninsula Landscapes, Initial Summary of Findings, June 4, 2019; Lauren Kuehne, University of Washington’s College of the Environment) have added significant new data based on collection at multiple locations across (and beyond) the MOAs that appears to present a less positive view of the noise impacts. More importantly, the author has proposed a real world monitoring and mitigation approach that should be pursued. The Supplemental should not be completed or approved before there is reconciliation between the Navy’s model-driven data and recent real world studies/ measurements. Additionally, while mentioning in-water acoustic stressors, there are no further measurements other than presented in Table 3.0-4 and no assessment.</p>	<p>The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was released to the public before the Kuehne report was made available. The Navy has considered this report in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS (see Section 3.12 and Appendix J). The Navy will continue to use the best available science in its analyses of impacts.</p> <p>DoD’s position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD’s position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015. ² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Graney-4	<p>Section 3.4.1.7.4 Noise As noted, in Table 3.0-4 there was a recognition of aircraft-produced in-water stressors, but no further discussion of impacts, or any analysis similar</p>	<p>The analysis of impacts from noise was contained in Section 3.4.2 (Environmental Consequences) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Impacts</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>to Appendix J for in-water noise effects. Instead, in this section there is an extensive discussion on noise impacts on marine mammals — largely focused on the noise caused by shipping. In fact, there is even mention of the Washington State Governor’s Southern Resident Orca Task Force and the efforts they are undertaking to save the critically stressed Southern Resident Killer Whales (SRKW) in our area. Having said that, there is no further discussion of aircraft noise on marine mammals — in particular, the impact of the Growlers on our SRKWs. There is precedent for including such analyses as part of EAs/EISs (e.g., the Eglin Gulf Test and Training Range EA http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/permits/egttr_ea-draft.pdf). In addition, studies have shown aircraft noise can result in an acoustic signature at depth (e.g., https://scripps.ucsd.edu/labs/buckingham/wp-content/uploads/sites/60/2015/04/aircraft2002.pdf). It appears that a new study will soon be starting that will measure this acoustic signature at a variety of depths associated with Growler takeoffs and landings at Whidbey Island NAS. This data, when combined with previous study results on the effects of vessel noise on killer whale behavior, energetics, communications, and foraging should provide some useful insights. The Navy should include results of this impending study (and extrapolations thereof), as well as other relevant studies that have looked at the impacts of aircraft noise as “best available science” in determining future sortie rates for the Growlers over the Olympic MOAs.</p> <p>Section 3.12.3.2 Airborne Acoustics</p> <p>As noted earlier, recent real world studies (Impact of military flights on Olympic Peninsula Landscapes, Initial Summary of Findings, June 4, 2019; Lauren Kuehne, University of Washington’s College of the Environment) have added significant new data based on collection at multiple locations across (and beyond) the MOAs that appears to present a less positive view of the noise impacts. In addition, the noise impacts on tourists extend beyond the borders of the Olympic MOAs. In fact, data received by the National Parks Conservation Association’s Growler Tracker app that has been downloaded by several tourists visiting the Olympic National Park and environs tend to correlate quite closely to the data in Lauren Kuehne’s study. The impacts within Olympic National Park are particularly egregious because of what visitors are expecting when they visit it — a UNESCO World Heritage Site and world-class wilderness area that includes what heretofore had been recognized as one of the three quietest places in the country, including Gordon Hempton’s “One Square Inch of Silence.” Many visitors come for the quiet — it is a place for therapy and spiritualism. As</p>	<p>from aircraft noise is specically analyzed in Section 3.4.2.1.4 (Impacts from Aircraft Noise).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	been reported recently, several servicemen suffering PTSD have used the park in this manner and have been negatively impacted by the growing number of Growler flights. The Supplemental should not be completed or approved before there is reconciliation between the Navy's model-driven noise data and recent real world studies/measurements. In addition, if additional training sites could be re-introduced (e.g., Mountain Home AFB), it would behoove the Navy to work with the National Park Service and local community leaders to analyze peak visitation periods and try to optimize training deployments to minimize the impacts on tourism.	
Gray A-1	Your sonar tests are putting the already critically endangered Southern Residents at great risk. They are dying off and this practice is part of the problem. Please stop doing this in their habitat, you are fully aware of the damage these tests do to marine life.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Gray D-1	I am opposed to the Navy's plans to test sonar and other devices of war in the ocean generally, and specifically off the coast of Mendocino. Dead and compromised marine life on the shores of Mendocino county's beaches is bad for business, and an affront to life. My personal feelings are we should have a department of peace if we also have a department of war. But as business and land owner, my interests are in keeping tourism robust on our coast. The pristine beauty of our beaches will most certainly be compromised by beached and dead marine life washing ashore. Dead whales are bad for business. Please don't test your war machines. But if you must, do it elsewhere.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/• The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org• The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr• The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology• The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Gray S-1	I can understand the necessity of training and testing in the actual ocean and in the real environments in which you may have to operate during a conflict. My biggest concern is for the marine life and the stress placed on	The Draft and Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS documents, as well as other supporting information, can be found on the project website at: http://nwtteis.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	it. The Pacific Ocean is already under a lot of stress from rising levels of acidity and warming, which might have wiped out all the sunflower sea stars along the California coastline or might have created the perfect environment for their wasting disease, and reduced the amount of bull kelp (also due to the unchecked population growth of the purple urchin). Nonetheless, I'd like you to send me a report on the impact that your testing will have had.	
Green-1	For the public record I have grave concerns about the impact of the proposed level of sonar testing on the marine mammals of Puget Sound and the other Washington State coastal areas that are part of the proposed testing zones. I think this level of testing is very irresponsible given the fragile state of the Puget Sound resident Orca whale population. This testing is projected to have even more damaging effects on the harbor porpoise residents as well as many other species who live there. We are so fortunate to live in an extremely beautiful and unique environment that is ours to care for in good stewardship. If this kind of testing "needs" to be done I think it should be at levels far below those proposed and done well outside of Washington state waters. These beautiful places belong to us all and it is not okay for one group to impact the marine species of Puget Sound so severely that it could cause this level of potential damage. Please think ahead about how your actions are going to affect all of these species and please act responsibly.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Greenbaum-1	This damages and hurts marine animals.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Greene-1	Stay away from the entire west coast! Your war games are a killing machine affecting our precious sea life! Now that the glaciers are melting take it up or down there.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Greenleaf-1	<p>Using studies conducted as far back as 1984 as source material for your EIS/OEIS draft is wholly unacceptable. So far this year, 70 gray whales washed ashore on the west coast, five times the average rate. NOAA has declared a wildlife emergency. The SEIS at 3.4.282 states that "military expended materials will sink to the ocean floor". At 3.4.302 the SEIS states that "for the most part," this material will be ingested by bottom feeders, Gray whales are bottom feeders. The SEIS needs to take into account the already stressed gray whale population. Scientific studies have shown that explosives and SONAR are detrimental to marine animals. For whales and dolphins, listening is the way they see and communicate and is integral to their survival. Under these circumstances, will the Navy provide updated studies in the OEIS reflecting the current crisis? Until NOAA's study on the die-off on the Gray Whales is complete, shouldn't any disruption of the ocean by sonar and explosive activity be halted?</p> <p>https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/gray-whales-stranded-west-coast-1.5119056</p> <p>https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533</p> <p>The economic considerations are well-stated in the letter of opposition to sonar testing off the coast of Mendocino County by the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors in their letter to you dated April 21, 2019. To paraphrase: sonar and explosive testing off the Mendocino coast is detrimental to the fragile oceanic ecosystem on which we rely. The wide</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy uses the most current marine mammal population data available from the National Marine Fisheries Service. The 2008 and 2010 references cited in the comment were not used by the Navy to determine current populations.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>variety of sea life is a key economic source for our county and must not be damaged in any way.</p> <p>Will you please slow down this process to allow enough time for current scientific data to be added to your SEIS? This is the path the whales follow twice a year. We must protect it and keep it safe for them.</p>	
Grennan-1	<p>Orca are getting lost through sonar sounds. It makes them confused as they use sonar to communicate. Please do not use this method. They end up miles from there home and fishing territories ending in death and starvation.</p> <p>Rethink the testing and please take note of our pleas. The ocean is precious and everything that swims in it.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Gretz-1	<p>While I am very well aware of the need to keep our naval forces up-to-date, this enormous amount of training/practicing in the sensitive habitats of so many marine mammals, of which many species are endangered, is way over the top. It is well known that the sonar and blasting harms and kills marine mammals. You cannot possibly know that none are nearby, and you do know that those very loud sounds travel great distances, so marine mammals certainly could be well within the range and suffer without your explicit knowledge.</p> <p>You need to come up with plans that are reasonable but take much better account for the lives of marine mammals.</p> <p>If another Southern Resident Killer Whale is found dead from blast trauma (like L112 some years ago), the Navy will be held responsible for contributing to this unique and precious population's demise. If even one is not found, we can be sure that the Navy contributed to their overall problems, one of which is excessive noise in their habitat.</p> <p>Please be very very cautious, and use the precautionary principle as your guide. Thank you.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The National Marine Fisheries Service investigated the stranding of Southern Resident killer whale L-112 (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-133). No U.S. Navy training activities involving sonar or explosives were conducted between February 1 and 11, 2012, in the Northwest Training Range Complex (which includes Washington, Oregon, and northern California). Other anthropogenic activity, including other U.S. military, Royal Canadian Navy, fishing, or construction activities, were also ruled out as potential causes of the observed injuries.</p>
Grice-1	<p>The distressing scene of a grieving mother Orca carrying her dead baby for 21 days in the straits of Georgia should be a turning point on how humans interact with the Salish sea and surrounding water ways. The underlying causes of the ongoing demise of the Southern Resident Orcas may be Multifaceted but one human action stands out as a telling sign of a major contributor to this deepened worrying likelihood of extinction is the NAVY</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>SONAR Testing and its detrimental side effects to these Orcas and other ocean mammals. Should we as an advanced human race not embrace our progress and step away from these repeated acts of inflicting suffering to the inhabitants of the waters when evidence has shown the destruction of our actions? We oppose this Sonar Testing in the Salish seas and surrounding waters so the endangered Orcas can have a chance to overcome the many other challenges which they face with a hope of survival!</p> <p>Navy Technology should improve like in other industry to reduce and eliminate the detrimental impacts to our Sea Mammals in general! So end this Sonar testing now!</p>	<p>populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Griffin-1	<p>I am very concerned about the impact on wildlife and on the environment in the ocean and Puget Sound. My reading about the proposed testing indicates that the potential for this to have a deleterious effect on whales and dolphins and other marine life is significant. While I understand the need to protect our country and use our Naval resources in order to do so, I do not understand why this can not be done in a way that serves to protect our wildlife as well, in particular our endangered southern resident orcas. Please look for less impactful ways to test and train.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Grinnell-1	<p>Any testing of sonar results in destruction to sea life, human life and earth's fragile ecosystem. Just as early chemotherapy destroyed the body, you are destroying a vast amount of the ocean body. Your testing is unnecessary, irresponsible and proves nothing that will promote global harmony. Do you have children? Grandchildren? How can you as guardians, continue to ignore the destruction you cause?</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Griswold-1	<p>These training exercises are not necessary. And certainly not necessary along the coast. They must be reduced immediately for the sake of all communities.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Gronseth-1	My husband and I fully support the Growler's training area in the Forks and surrounding areas ! I have lived in the Forks area for over 45 years. My husband grew up in Forks with his parents owning Ruby Beach Resort in the late 1940's. We both worked in the Seattle area but moved to Forks in 1974 to return to when he grew up. The people who are opposing this are grossly over reacting to the somewhat "noise" they make and the effects that it has to our "peacefulness". They make it sound like it is a "constant and irritating" noise. IT IS NOT ! It is NOT daily; it is NOT for extended periods o time; it is NOT destroying habitat, animals, or oneself. They DO NOT represent the majority of the citizens of this area... they are just the vocal ones.... the ones that are part of Folks For Change...whereas they either have come from other areas and want to impose and change everything in Forks that has been the history of Forks. WE LOVE THE GROWLERS !!! We LOVE the sound of the jets and respect the men who are flying them to gain the training in order to protect America, our "peaceful" coastline, and to give us the chance to look up and know that U.S. Naval Air Station Whidbey Island is there for us ! In this unstable political situation, that is a comforting feeling. We thoroughly support our military and Armed Forces ! Thank you, and KEEP ON FLYING the Olympic Peninsula !	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Grosinger-1	Based on reports of the impacts both to human health, as well as wildlife, I strongly oppose the increase in growler training flights.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Grouci-1	A 100% contre les tests sonars en mer il s agit encore une fois une forme de cruautés envers les animaux aquatiques baleines orques dauphins requins etc...	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Grundhoefer-1	SAVE THE WHALES	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Gua-1	Sonar testing by the Navy generate rolling sound waves that can top at 235 decibels. A rock band at its loudest can produce 130 decibels. This sonar testing can affect whales like orcas, changing rapidly their routes to avoid sonar and even beach themselves. Please stop sonar testing in areas where there is rich marine life like in the Pacific Northwest. We need to save the orcas as they are endangered.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Guastavino-1	<p>I am worried the Navy did not adequately analyze the impact of its activities on marine wildlife.</p> <p>In order to protect marine wildlife, The Navy should stop its Northwest Training and Testing EIS.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Guerin-1	I do not agree with the US navy using sonar in the Salish sea or in any waters as the sonar has a devastating impact on whales and dolphins and I'm sure many other marine mammals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Guerlac-1	I oppose naval sonar on our coast as research indicates its role in killing and beaching whales. Autopsies of beached whales indicate a stress response to the excruciating sound of the sonar. The force of this research is confirmed by the 2004 decision to place a moratorium on use of MFAS around the Canary Islands. We need to be protecting marine life and all life on this planet. Please respect local comments and responses - we life on this coast.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Guerra-1	I'm completely 100% gainst underwater sonar testing	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Gulick-1	I am writing to urge you to select the No Action Alternative: no Navy training and testing activities at sea or in the airspace associated with the proposed action within the study area. The impacts are too great and too damaging for both people and wildlife. Specifically: 1) Noise pollution: current Navy activities in the area are already causing	All of the issues raised in the comment are addressed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) and Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts).

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>great human suffering. The new Growler jets are unbearably loud, with measured decibel levels exceeding those deemed safe for human health. Disruptions to daily activities caused by the Growler jet noise and frequency have proven to have detrimental impacts to human health. Sleep disruption, concentration loss, increased stress levels, and hearing loss have already occurred where Navy training takes place.</p> <p>2) Impacts to wildlife: the studies conducted are insufficient. What impacts will noise, air, and ground pollution as a result of Navy activities have on wild salmon populations?</p> <p>3) Cumulative impacts of increased carbon emissions: this has not been properly analyzed and must be. How will the increased carbon emissions from Navy activities affect global climate change? The Navy claims to be very concerned about the impacts of climate change as it relates to national security, so why would the Navy conduct activities that could exacerbate climate change?</p> <p>4) Economic loss: the economies of communities in the proposed area for Navy activities rely on tourism to a large extent. Visitors come to the area to experience its quiet natural surroundings. Current Navy activities are already disrupting the quiet natural surroundings that visitors expect to experience. An increase in activities will only serve to drive more visitors away, thus contributing to economic loss.</p> <p>Please select the No Action Alternative, and keep the proposed study area free of additional noise, air, ground, and light pollution. There are few places left in the world where people can go to experience quiet natural beauty. Let's not destroy what little remains.</p>	
Gulsen-1	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Please stop sonar testing. By research it has been proven to harm marine mammals and it is even banned by governments and in some specific areas. Please stop this!</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Gunderman-1	<p>I understand the importance of military testing in order to keep our citizens safe in case of turmoil. However we must question how vital it is when water sonar tests are harming not only an endangered population, but countless marine mammal species. The studies have been done, and the</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	damaging impacts of noise pollution have been proven. While making sure we stay prepared for a conflict that could happen, the southern resident killer whales are dying NOW, currently, and need immediate attention. The world does not belong to humans, and what are we if we can't even take a dying species into consideration over military growth? Thank you for your time.	EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Gunduz-1	Orcas are already in great danger. Ocean life is facing a big extinction. This is unacceptable. Please stop harming ocean animals. Orcas and all.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marin-species-monitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Gupta G-1	Please let the orcas and other sea animals be in their natural habitat that is the the ocean and not captured in small tanks for the purpose of human entertainment. They live a life of suffocation in these places such as the sea world and in the process they also get separated from their family members. It's really unfair on our part to abuse animals so ruthlessly just for entertainment. They're not here to serve that purpose. Please realize this and set them free. Let them live the life they deserve.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marin-species-monitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Gupta G-2	Please don't carry on with this, have mercy on the sea animals	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Gupta S-1	<p>Please spare the sea animals, all of them deserve the kind of life they have been born to live.</p> <p>Please be considerate enough towards beings of a different species</p> <p>After all, we need to address the humanity aspect of human nature</p> <p>We can't be ignorant towards the needs and rights of the voiceless.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Gurney-1	<p>The Navy has requested the public to provide “public review and substantive comments” on its continuing use of the Northeast Pacific Ocean for training and testing of modern naval warfare, and the effects these activities will have on the mammals, birds, fish and invertebrates that inhabit these waters. In an effort to justify these activities, the Navy has funded scientific institutions and public relations firms to the tune of tens of millions of dollars per year to produce a lengthy EIS in 2015, revised this year, contending that military activity will have little or no effect on the marine environment. Further, in its PR campaign, the Navy has through its promotional materials, contended that the Navy is somehow a “steward” of the marine environment that is “protecting the seas through science.” The Navy has emphasized that it will respond only to substantive comments, yet the essence and substance of the Navy’s EIS campaign is to gain permits to allow these activities, by the use of willful disinformation. It is therefore difficult to provide substantive comments, when the substance of what you’re commenting on is genuine, unmitigated <i>[expletive deleted]</i>. By now it is common knowledge and accepted science that military sonar causes mass strandings of marine mammals. These creatures have no defense against the lethal and debilitating effects from major underwater blasts of active sonar and explosives, and no amount of corrupt, paid-off “scientific data” will alter this fact. In 2015, the Navy cynically asserted in its EIS that their activities will have zero mortality effects on marine mammals. The current EIS reasserts these claims, with minor changes. The proponents of these claims should be in court, facing charges of fraud. The closest the Navy comes to admitting harm, in all its efforts to whitewash the truth, is to admit on page 14 of its “Marine Species Monitoring Program” brochure, signed by the Commander of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, saying that “some stranding incidents have been coincident to naval training with sonar and explosives, which is of great concern to the Navy.” I cannot blame the U.S. Navy for trying to protect the American people from foreign adversaries. Of course, it is not the role of the military to turn the tide of humanity away from competitive nationalism, mutual distrust, and war. But the Navy could have a primary role in enforcing an international treaty to ban submarine warfare, and by extension, nuclear weapons. The Navy could also take an active role in combating climate change, and doing something about the large quantities of plastic that are choking the life from our oceans. In my opinion, this is what needs to be done if humanity is going to survive, much less the marine species that are the inevitable “collateral damage” of mankind’s never-ending quest for</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>military superiority.</p> <p>I believe the Navy needs to reverse course 180 degrees, and fight for the survival of humans and the ocean in the face of these challenges – with international cooperation instead of antagonism. Whether or not our political leaders worldwide will have the wisdom to provide this direction to their navies remains to be seen. As for now, my recommendation is the No Action Alternative, to deny the U.S. Navy permission to conduct warfare training and testing activities off the Northwest Coast of the United States.</p>	
Gustafson-1	<p>Noise from the Growler jets is destroying the quality of life in the Northwest, an area known and cherished for its pristine natural environments from the mountains to the sea. Much of our economy depends on preserviing this state of being. Even in the Edmonds-Lynnwood area, the jets have flown over 2 times in the past couple of weeks, and when they pass, all else has to stop. One cannot even carry on a conversation. I was pushed out of Ft Ebey campground a couple of years ago due to the horrible noise that continued even after midnight. The experience disturbed my peace of mind when I was looking for peace and quiet to destress. I can't imagine how this is effecting the wildlife. I believe that our National Parks and Wildlife refuges should be exempt from this type of intrusion. They are far from being just 'wastelands' that are not being 'used'...these lands are essential ecosystems critical to the well-being of all of us...I believe far more important than some man-made 'protection'...we need to protect our natural environment from all intruders. Thank you for your attention and consideration.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Gustavsson-1	<p>What you are doing is unacceptable. I have no words.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
H		
Haas-1	<p>I live in Port Townsend and travel around the Peninsula for work. I travel up through Whidbey Island to visit family in Bellingham. Recently, I stopped at Deception Pass to take a nature walk but was significantly disrupted by the very loud, directly overhead growler planes</p> <p>As a pediatric occupational therapist I have studied the sensory systems and their impact the nervous system and development. Unexpected and/or sustained loud noise causes stress which has a negative impact on the</p>	<p>The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). In this section the Navy found, in part, that “The aggregate impact on public health and safety would not observably differ.” Thus, based on the analysis done by the Navy, the increase in Navy activities proposed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS is not expected to have any noticeable effects on public health and safety.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	whole body. When the stress response is activated humans become irritated, emotionally reactive and less able to access the higher/executive functions of the brain for focused attention, reasoning, problem solving and language. I was very dismayed when I learned that the planes were being flown over the heads of children at their school and over residential areas. The noise I heard was deafening and that level of noise will definitely have a significant impact on people's quality of life and I am also concerned about the impact on wildlife. Although not as loud here in Port Townsend or Forks it is certainly not pleasant to have your evening disrupted by the droning of growlers. In addition, I am a hiker and lover of nature. I spend time in nature for my own well being and as part of my spirituality. I am upset to have the natural beauty and nature's orchestra on the Olympic Peninsula and National Parks be disrupted by aircraft. I am also concerned about the additional pollution and impact on the environment. I urge the Navy to be a good neighbor and NOT increase the number of flights.	The Navy is not proposing a significant increase in Growler activity. A minor increase in training flights in the Olympic MOA is projected over the next several years; increasing by approximately 300 total flights per year by 2023; approximately 1 additional flight per day.
Habbouche-1	Stop sonar testing.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hagerty, Jett	Are there concerns on biological resources concerning Porpoises and if so is there mitigation that the Navy will do for this damage?	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Haglund-1	Please stop the navy sonar testing immediately it hurts whales and dolphins!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marine-species-monitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Halager-1	I'm writing this letter to inform the Navy that I'm against sonar testing in the oceans. They have proven to killing mammals, reptiles and some fish. There are many critically endangered animals that live in the ocean and it is our job to protect them. Extinction is forever, remember that! Sea turtles, orca whales, right whales, vanquita, sharks and many more are on the verge of extinction! We can and must do better to ensure our children and their children don't have to just read about these animals! Sonar testing is not necessary and extremely harmful! Please don't do it! Thank you!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hale-1	At what point is the well being of our ecosystem, livelihoods and general health of ocean, marine life and humankind more important than Navy testing? I oppose this testing. As someone who's family is and has been in our military and Navy, I think this is above and beyond what is needed for our security. I realize we have bombed everywhere else, and this is our own front yard, but we dont need more bombs, sonar testing, etc. We need to start investing in life, and sustaining it on the bone planet we call home. NO	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>TESTING OFF OUR COAST. our local economy depends on fishing, whale watching tours, charter boats. This is the main economic driver for the coastal communities. FERC WOULD NOT ALLOW WAVE ENERGY, because of this ruling our economy. Why would we destroy what we have left when we are among the poorest counties in the state. This can never be mitigated.</p>	<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hall-Ricciardi-1	<p>Researchers Have Identified How Naval Sonar Is Killing And Beaching Whales</p> <p>We have known for a long time that naval sonar has devastating effects on marine life but just exactly how it leads to sickness and death was a mystery till now. In new research published in the Proceedings of the Royal Society B, they discovered that the sound emitted by sonar is so intense that marine mammals will swim hundreds of miles, dive deep into the abyss or even beach themselves to flee from the sounds that are literally unbearable to them.</p> <p>In particular, beaked whales are one of the marine mammals that are often found beached due to sonar testing. Prior to the 1960s, beaked whale strandings were extremely rare. But once the 60s rolled around, the Navy started to use mid-frequency active sonar (MFAS) to detect submarines. And from the 60s onwards, whales washing up on beachings became a very common occurrence. The paper recently published is a summary of what was discussed at a 2017 meeting of beaked whale experts in the Canary Islands and revealed that sonar distresses beaked whales so much that the marine mammals ends up with nitrogen bubbles in their blood very similar to what divers would call decompression sickness or the bends. The nitrogen can cause hemorrhaging and damage to whales vital organs. The big question that was brought up was how an animal that lives in the ocean and is adapted to perform deep water dives for hours at a time can obtain decompression sickness? Well simply, the sonar is so powerful, the animals dive deep too quickly causing the sickness.</p> <p>"In the presence of sonar they are stressed and swim vigorously away from the sound source, changing their diving pattern," lead author Yara Bernaldo de Quiros told AFP.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, and the "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June 2017)" (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>“The stress response, in other words, overrides the diving response, which makes the animals accumulate nitrogen. It’s like an adrenalin shot.”</p> <p>The conclusions are drawn from autopsies of dead whales, although a handful of animals were killed by other threats inflicted by humans, such as collisions with ships or entanglement in fishing nets, as well as disease. The authors note that to mitigate the impacts of sonar on beaked whales, we must ban its use in areas where they’re found. A moratorium on the use of MFAS around the Canary Islands in 2004 shows just how well this works – no atypical strandings have been seen since. The researchers urge other countries where sonar is deployed, such as the US, Greece, Italy, and Japan, to follow suit.</p>	
Hamilton L-1	<p>Land and marine mammals utilize vocalizations and vibrations to communicate within their species. Many species depend on auditory and/or vibrational cues in hunting for prey or protecting themselves from predators. While there are many natural disruptions that occur to confuse these animals, those caused by human activities have been increasingly impactful. The level of noise and vibration caused by the FA-18 jets is higher than most natural or human caused events. Jet pilots wear ear protection; land and marine animals do not.</p> <p>The regular flights of the FA - 18 jets over the Olympic Peninsula and Puget Sound region are disruptive to the peaceful lives of both humans and animals. The proposed increase in the number of flights over the region will affect many species by affecting their senses, increasing stress, and limiting their abilities to cope with danger and normal hunting patterns, both on the land and on and under the sea.</p> <p>Humans must steward land and seas with care to all species. The training in warfare techniques that is occurring in the Pacific Northwest must be not be continued ; the number of jet flights must not be increased, they must be reduced and/or eliminated.</p>	<p>All of the issues raised in the comment are addressed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences).</p>
Hamilton S-1	<p>First I want to say I support the Military and want you to have the finest training grounds and equipment. I signed a noise document when I purchased my house in ~1996 which at that time the sounds were not a problem and I assumed the impact on my ears would continue at that level. Then the “planes” became Growlers and started coming over my house. I reported that and showed you the flight pattern from the EIS which did not have planes going over my house. I believe that has been addressed and I no longer see them over my house. I thank you for that.</p> <p>I used to walk my dog on Driftwood beach almost everyday. Now I have to check the flight schedule because one day I was out there and had to run</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>back to the Jeep it was so loud.</p> <p>This has had a great impact on our community. I'm the lead for Nextdoor.com and encourage civil communication, but it's a challenge. Just the mention of "Jet noise" incites emotions either for or against the military. People ask me to please remove "jet noise" conversations because it's upsetting to hear. (I can't of course unless someone goes against the Nextdoor communication guidelines). People are selling their homes because they feel they are in harms way living near OLF. It's just sad as there is a cost to moving and I haven't heard 1 military person who suggested they "just move" say they will at least help them pack.</p> <p>Today I received an Island County property assessment change for 2020. My house value increased. I believe it increased in preparation for a decrease as more Growlers come to Coupeville.</p> <p>I'm sorry I wasn't able to be more substantive as it's hard to document how loud the Growlers are. It's just a sad situation and I'm not seeing that covered in the EIS.</p>	
Hamilton S-2	<p>My 2nd comment.</p> <p>Growler Engine Changed post EIS.</p> <p>Has there been a new noise level assessment since the engine changed?</p> <p>Source: https://www.defensenews.com/air/2017/03/30/us-navy-awards-114m-order-for-new-hornet-engines/ WASHINGTON –The U.S. Navy has awarded General Electric a \$114.8 million contract to install new turbofan jet engines on the branch's F/A-18 and EA-18G Hornet aircraft, according to the Department of Defense. Naval Air Systems Command of Patuxent River, Maryland, is overseeing the project, which is expected to be completed in February 2019."</p>	<p>The engines used for the noise model were the F414-GE-400 engines, which are the current engines installed in the F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft. Appendix J has been revised to include the engine type modeled for the EA-18G aircraft. The GE F414-400 enhanced engine is currently only in a research phase for the Navy, and is not installed in any aircraft, nor are there plans to purchase or install it. If this engine were to be introduced to the fleet of F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft, the Navy would measure the noise emissions from this new engine.</p>
Hand-1	<p>Please stop this testing that is harmful to Orcas and dolphins and causes them to not be able to communicate.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Hanks-1	Sonar is harmful to orcas. The endangered SRW have a new calf, the first since 2016. Please do not conduct sonar testing when the whales are present. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hanley-1	I travelled to the Hoh Rainforest to experience this World Heritage Site for its quiet beauty. There are many places you might do this testing where it will not impact the tourism that brings so many people to this state. These are sacred places of refuge and the noise is incompatible with them.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Hansen R-1	A National Park is a place set aside for all living creatures within to live free of exploitation. I see the Park also as a place for people to visit, to live briefly and learn and listen in the silence of these scared places and then to leave it as we found it. It occurs to me that the Navy behavior is very disrespectful of the Park and all creatures and life forms within and of the people from all over the US and the world who come to enjoy the solitude and incredible beauty and silence of this Park. That means your Growler jets which fly over the park and and do training along the coast.. Please stop this insanity. Would you please listen from your hearts rather than your "rational heads". National Parks and Navy jet training overhead do not make a lick of sense. Please stop this harassment of the people and living critters and creatures with your war games. Please stop this now.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year. When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context: 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>averaged over a 365-day year).</p> <p>3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day.</p> <p>4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.</p>
Hansen S-1	Please stop sonar testing as it's harming the southern resident orcas and they don't need to be exposed to this at all	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Hansen S-2	No sonar testing at all	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.mil/speciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Hanson L-1	I strongly oppose the plan to dump heavy metals and nuclear waste in Puget Sound. Our resident orca population has been in decline for several years due to a variety of reasons including pollution. Our human population, especially the indigenous people, eats seafood that comes from	<p>The Navy does not propose to "dump heavy metals and nuclear waste in Puget Sound." Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Puget Sound. Please find a less environmentally destructive method to handle this waste.	<p>in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.</p> <p>The analysis of impacts of the Navy's activities on water quality can be found in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Hanson T-1	I would ask that there be absolutely no US Navy testing in the Salish Sea. The critically endangered Southern Resident Orcas and all Salish Sea marine inhabitants are in harm's way from these dangerous and harmful sonar practices. It is time to protect sea life, not add more danger to their existence. The sea is their home. Please respect their needs for survival.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Harasimowitz -1	Support and save the orcas!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Hardy-1	There are enough problems in the environment for these animals to deal with let alone stressing them with sound as well. Stop please. What is the point of these tests around animals.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hare-1	Please stop sonar testing in the Salish Sea. You are harming the orcas which are a treasure. The ocean is not yours; it belongs to us all. You've done so much harm to these animals already, despite warning from the experts. Please don't persist.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Harper C-1	<p>I am opposed to the Navy's plan to increase Growler flights and Electromagnetic Warfare Training on the North Olympic Peninsula. Olympic National Park and Olympic National Forest are priceless ecological treasures that would be seriously jeopardized by increased Electromagnetic Warfare Training. Olympic National Park is home to twenty-four plant and animal species that are found nowhere else on Earth. This region is home to several endangered species, including the Marbled Murrelet. It is crucial that one of "last best places on Earth" be protected to the fullest extent possible.</p> <p>In addition to the sanctity of Olympic National Park and Olympic National Forest, the local economies are dependent upon the tourists and hikers who visit this region. Outdoor recreation brings in an estimated \$21 billion</p>	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	dollars and is responsible for creating approximately 199,000 jobs. I strongly request that the Navy either reduce the Growler flights and/or move their training operations to other areas where they have already trained, e.g. central Washington or Mountain Home, Idaho. Future generations are counting on us to save this priceless environment. Thank you for considering this comment.	The alternatives carried forward meet the Navy's purpose and need to ensure that it can fulfill its obligation under U.S.C. Title 10. As explained in Section 2.5 (Alternatives Development) of the EIS/OEIS, the range of alternatives considered by the Navy must be reasonable alternatives. To be reasonable, an alternative must meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. A curtailment or reduction in the number of training and testing activities would not meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, and would therefore be unreasonable.
Harper T-1	I am opposed to the Navy's plan to increase Growler flights and Electromagnetic Warfare Training on the North Olympic Peninsula. Olympic National Park and Olympic National Forest are priceless ecological treasures that can not be jeopardized by increased Electromagnetic Warfare Training. Olympic National Park is home to twenty-four plant and animal species that are found nowhere else on Earth. This region is home to several endangered species, including the Marbled Murrelet. In addition to the sanctity of Olympic National Park and Olympic National Forest, the local economies are dependent upon the tourists and hikers who visit this region. Outdoor recreation brings in an estimated \$21 billion dollars and is responsible for creating approximately 199,000 jobs. I strongly request that the Navy will either reduce the Growler flights and/or move their training operations to other areas where they have already trained, e.g. central Washington or Mountain Home, Idaho. Thank you for your consideration.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness. The alternatives carried forward meet the Navy's purpose and need to ensure that it can fulfill its obligation under U.S.C. Title 10. As explained in Section 2.5 (Alternatives Development) of the EIS/OEIS, the range of alternatives considered by the Navy must be reasonable alternatives. To be reasonable, an alternative must meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. A curtailment or reduction in the number of training and testing activities would not meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, and would therefore be unreasonable.
Harrington-1	I am a Navy Seabee Vet who has tinnitus, and listening to the sonar on the hydrophone made me jump out of my skin, I wanted to rip my ears off my head. This is unreasonable and harmful to all sea mammals to use echolocation to communicate and hunt, not to mention drives them crazy. Please come up with better technologies and policies with these mammals in mind!!! One team, one fight, this includes everything in the ocean and seas that we are honored to protect!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Harris-1	I am writing to ask that the Navy stops use of active sonar and explosives in our ocean. I ask this because research indicates that it causes considerable harm to wildlife. Many marine animals rely on sound to communicate, locate food, avoid predators and navigate. Exposure to sound at these decibels could change their behavior, cause hearing damage and death. There has already been much research done by the navy and these animals already stressed. The Navy should have the protection of our natural heritage at the forefront of their activities.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Harrison J-1	thank you for this window to comment. the first time I was driving from the south end of Whidbey island to oak harbor and had 'an encounter' with the jets flying over the highway, I almost ran off of the road. it was so loud, it made me jump in my car seat. I thought something like an earthquake was happening. and another time, I had visiting relatives and we were walking ebey's landing.....it was so loud and obnoxious when the jets flew over, it just ruined the whole experience of being in such a beautiful area. I have experienced it many times now and it continues to scare me as i'm driving and I now consider not even taking friends and visitors to the mid and north end of the island anymore....basically I feel tourism is being greatly effected, let alone the reasons we love it here, the beauty, the quiet, the animal life have all been ruined for us. I have had this conversation with so many community members. it is sad. I will never camp or picnic again on north Whidbey island. I am not the only one saying this.	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Harrison K-1	I 100% do not support the Navy's sonar testing given its confirmed negative impact on the resident and transient orca whale populations.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hart-1	The sonar testing in the Salish Sea is totally unacceptable, critically damaging/lethal to the creatures which live in it and totally unacceptable to the land and inhabitants around it. I am asking you - as a concerned	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	person for the welfare of these dwindling species of the oceans and for the people in the areas - to cease this damaging testing. For the inhabitants living around this sea/area there is ultimately a very real danger for their health and the health of the land. Why are any of the above being subjected to this threat and damage...? If you deem it to be so safe (and it is not) then test it in your own backyard. Do not make guinea pigs out of the environment, the people and animals - regardless of where they live. Stop this deadly action NOW.....	Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hartley-1	It is important to curtail testing, at least during peacetime, or at the very least ramp up testing gradually to give marine wildlife a better chance to flee affected areas. So many scholarly peer reviewed published articles the document the deadly impact of sonar on marine wildlife. Even at low levels sonar and sonar testing causes harm by changing animal behavior. Environmental laws should apply to the all branches of the government and military including the Navy and Navy contractors.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. In Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy considered ramp-up procedures as described in the comment. As described in that section, research found that active sonar ramp-up was not an effective method for reducing impacts to some species. The Navy determined that ramp-up would be an ineffective mitigation measure for the active sonar activities analyzed in this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Hartman-1	It has been proven that your underwater sonar experiments are harmful to sea life - whales, porpoises, etc. why on earth would you or anyone else consider staying on that path?! Please stop the use of this sonar testing. I'm sure if you put your mind to it you will find other, non-destructive, ways to accomplish your goals. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hartwig-1	It has been proven that underwater sonar practices are incredibly harmful especially for marine mammals who rely on sound for their survival. The endangered Southern Resident killer whales are already struggling to find enough food to survive. Hearing loss resulting from the Navy's practices	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	would further interfere with their ability to forage, likely ensuring that this population never recovers. Sonar practices by the Navy in or near the Salish Sea will be absolutely devastating to the Southern Residents- and they are just one of many species within the fragile ecosystem of our Salish Sea to suffer from severe impacts. This is unacceptable- I am 100 percent against underwater sonar testing.	EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Harveson-1	I fully support the training needs of the US Navy. My backyard looks directly at the New Dungeness Lighthouse and then directly at Victoria BC. Therefore I look over the Strait of Juan de Fuca and hear/see Navy operations. You used to transfer personnel from the largest Navy subs to the sub tender right behind our house. Now unfortunately you moved the operations west to Port Angeles so we do not get to see Navy operations here anymore. We love the "Sounds of Freedom" as you train WHEREVER!! We fully support the US Navy's training requirements wherever you need. The Draft EIS is fine as written. Thank you for your service.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Harvey-1	Underwater sonar testing has been proven to be harmful to marine animals and can result in severe injuries or death to whales, dolphins, and many other species who are already endangered. We are opposed to the U.S. Navy's use of underwater sonar testing and/or use of underwater sonar weapons and ask that the Navy find other ways to defend our nation without harming animals that are facing extinction.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Haschak Ja-1	I guess I'll just rephrase what I was saying. My question to the Navy was I understand that their purpose is to protect the citizens of our country, and I would like to know what country poses a greater threat than the destruction of our planet. And that was it. Thank you.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Haschak Jo-1	I'm on the board of supervisors, John Haschak, and this is what the Board of Supervisors of Mendocino County approved unanimously. I just want that letter to get into the record. (Letter submitted with no additional public comment.)	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Hasko-Young C-1	I oppose the Navy's sonar testing because it interferes with marine animals' echolocation. The endangered orcas in the Salish Sea are already starving because of a lack of Chinook salmon, and the noise emitted by sonar interferes with their way of locating prey. Other dolphin and whale species that use echolocation will also be negatively affected, which may disrupt the ecosystems in the Pacific Northwest.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hasse-1	Dear Naval Facilities Engineering Command Northwest, I am writing to urge you not to extend the permit for Growler training over our Olympic National Forest and Park. Training missions that broadcast the frighteningly loud, low frequency vibrations of the F-18 Growlers threaten the health and well being of all life on the coast, and they ruin the quiet, peaceful refuge of the unspoiled natural environment of the Olympic Peninsula. Overflights up to 16 hours a day, 260 days a year, destroy what's essential and elemental to living on or visiting the Olympic Peninsula and adversely affect our way of life and our economy. Please move Growler training to an area designated for warfare training.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Hastings A-1	STOP IT	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Hastings M-1	The Navy reneged on its original agreement about the number of Growler flights annually. This four fold increase is untenable. This is damaging to public relations: the Navy comes off as a bully. If it is important to quadruple the number of flights, why not fly to an unpopulated area? At	The Navy is not proposing to increase Growler activity by 400 percent.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	the speed of those jets, it would take 20 mins to reach an area where the noise levels are not damaging humans. This truly is an egregious breach of public relations.	
Haupka-1	Wtf is wrong with you, that it is still not understood? Horrible people.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Haviland-1	<p>I am a native Washingtonian, and have a great love for the environment of my birth state. I oppose your plan and the only alternative in the EIS acceptable to me is the NO ACTION Alternative. Alternates 1 & 2 would cause deplorable damage to the Olympic National Park, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. I oppose the EIS that will establish and electronic warfare training area on the Olympic Peninsula because I want to preserve the birds and wildlife on the peninsula. I also want to protect the sea life and mammals in the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. These unique and to date protected areas should not be warfare training ground.</p> <p>There is plenty of research to support the damage inflicted on human and wildlife by the noise that would be generated, along with the environmental pollutants.</p> <p>There is nothing positive for the environment or the human landscape in regard to the proposed plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hawa-1	I think that it will harm orcas which is not worth it. Please consider doing these tests in an area that will not affect precious wildlife.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hawn-1	<p>These harmful military practices are unacceptable.</p> <p>A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas.</p> <p>"For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival," Calambokidis said.</p> <p>Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations.</p> <p>Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Haye-1	<p>I oppose the U.S. Navy's plans to expand war-training exercises in Northern CA near the path of the annual Gray Whale migration including sonar, explosions and the release of chemicals into the ocean. Gray Whales will travel through this environment two times a year. Therefore, we would like a 100-mile wide test-free corridor along the Pacific coast to be considered at a minimum to reduce the impacts on the animals who call this area home, as we do.</p>	<p>The Navy's mitigation involves numerous distance-from-shore restrictions for active sonar, explosive, and non-explosive training and testing activities. For example, the Navy will not conduct explosive training or explosive testing (except explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing) 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures, including development a new mitigation area known as the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. It would not be practical for the Navy to prohibit all training or testing activities within 100 miles from shore for the reasons described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), Chapter 5 (Mitigation), and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Hayes-1	<p>There is very little left here for people to make a living from now that forestry has been shut down. Go somewhere else and leave the fisheries alone.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marin-species-monitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hays G-1	Navy sonar testing is a severe hazard to the Southern Resident Orca Pod. This pod is endangered and at risk of extinction. The pod just added a new baby Orca, to allow Sonar testing in the Puget Sound is disregarding the United States which includes Orcas you are sworn to protect. Our environment is quintessential for the sustainable future of our children. With advancements in technology this testing is not needed and the idea of proceeding displays a horrendous disregard for our nation.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hays L-1	<p>NOISE ... EXTREMELY EXTRAORDINARILY LOUD BEYOND BELIEVING LOUD NOISE.</p> <p>In no way appropriate for environments with a human population, certainly not schools, hospitals & old age homes, not to mention just plain families. These planes need to be moved from this island & until they leave our airspace in the Salish Sea, they need to be grounded.</p> <p>Those of us living with this sound know about the loudness. apparently the Navy has grown deaf over time & cannot hear it themselves.</p> <p>The Navy needs to do what it's main mission is: protect the citizens of this country. That does not mean to torture the humans & animals living under this air traffic.</p> <p>We are losing income on this island, our inhabitants are moving away from farms generations old, tourists are staying away or running in fear when they have 'the experience' of these flights overhead.</p> <p>PLEASE SHOW YOUR HUMANITY</p> <p>PLEASE SHOW YOUR CONCERN</p> <p>PLEASE STOP THESE FLIGHTS & RELOCATE THE GROWLERS!</p>	The activities proposed in the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Hayward-1	<p>It is unacceptable that sonar is making large stretches of ocean uninhabitable for endangered killer whales.</p> <p>Whales have been observed leaving areas up 17 miles from the source of</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the sonar, with military grade devices having an even greater impact. Therefore, if out at sea, a minimum of 907 square miles surrounding each device (17 x 17 miles x 3.14) is potentially being made intolerable to whales.</p> <p>The noise is not just an annoyance - polluting their general environment - it interferes with their very being. Navigation, communication and subsequent feeding and mating are all adversely affected. Their primary prey - scarce salmon - involves a particularly targeted use of sonar to locate and catch them within a complex underwater terrain. In the long-term it can even destroy generational knowledge of safe feeding and breeding sites as vast areas start to be avoided (similar to that suffered by elephants and bison due to human encroachment and 'management'). Constant 'pings' can mentally impair them - much as a car alarm would do to us if we were forced to listen to it for long periods.</p> <p>In cases where naval sonar has been used in prime whale habitat, the whales have been located miles away in areas where they have not been seen in decades e.g. Haro Strait after sonar testing by the Canadian Naval frigate HMCS Ottawa made Victoria, B.C audibly uninhabitable.</p> <p>I fully agree with the scientists that have advised you that limits should be placed on mid-frequency sonar testing (2-10 kHz). Is it not enough that whales have to contend with ever-increasing ship noise and boat-strikes? (300,000 ferry sailings alone were made on the Salish Sea in 2018). Surely sonar knowledge is now advanced enough to avoid the damage we are doing to these beautiful animals? Sadly it would seem that it is not.</p> <p>Current whale detection and protection measures are quite frankly poor. Often the Navy are unable to detect whales within the distances in which noise mitigation is required (1000 yards in the U.S. & 4000 yards in Canada) due to the somewhat outdated passive acoustic listening and visual surveillance methods being relied upon to establish their whereabouts.</p> <p>When noise mitigation is applied, even Canada's more generous 4,000 yard limit is nowhere near enough distance to protect whales from being mentally and/or physically scarred.</p> <p>Once again, unprecedented sightings of whales in Discovery Bay leads to the conclusion that they were present and distressed enough to leave San Juan Islands on Monday, Feb. 6, just 18 hours after a Canadian frigate, the HMCS Ottawa, transmitted loud pings throughout the area.</p> <p>This is unacceptable. Every deaf, soon-to-be dead whale is an avoidable tragedy. Please stop carrying out all sonar testing in the Salish Sea immediately until you have the technology to avoid all damage to these</p>	<p>Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	endangered animals. The Southern Resident Killer Whales are facing numerous threats but if they cannot hear, they cannot hunt and they cannot eat. Their recovery depends on you. I await your response with the utmost concern.	
Heagney-1	This is an unacceptable abuse of marine life!!!! Halt all sonar activity at once or prepare to tell your children why all the whales are extinct. Unbelievable animal abuse!!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Healion-1	Sonar testing can I have serious long lasting affects and the marine Mammals living in those waters. We have caused enough damage to our plant already. Their lives matter too.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Heath-1	Our state constitution provides that the military comply with the needs of Washingtonians. Please leave our state. If the health effects on citizens u r sworn to protect isn't enough for you, then u must know you are killing our vital tourism and real estate industries. Why would anyone want to live on an island where u cant even hear urself scream when talking? Try it. Sleep is also important. I am wakened more nights than not even living in north beach. We do not want your jungle warfare in our Olympic national forest. Find somewhere not pristine to ruin. Better yet, go to Fallon Nevada, a base and community that actually want you. Welcome to WA, please leave now. Thank you.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Nevada are not reasonable. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Heiermann-1	In the name of the ocean animals, please stop the seismographic actions	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Heinith-1	Comments on Northwest Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impacts Statement/Overseas Environmental Impacts Statement March 2019 Draft ES.5.2 Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative) As this commenter and others have stated before in the EIS comments on this proposed action on the Olympic Peninsula and environs, the Navy has other potential sites to increase military training other than the proposed action area that 1) are not located in the vicinity of a World Biosphere Park and 2) lack considerable human populations settlement. The Navy must consider the likely future growth of their own military needs that would be better placed in a more remote area now instead of later.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Heinith-2	Section 3.13 Public Health and Safety The amount of additional aircraft, sonar, explosives vessels and underwater discharges is not quantified/analyzed for either No Action or Alternative 1. The Supplemental EIS (SEIS) is seriously flawed and fails to meet the requirements of NEPA without this quantification because the comparative impacts on public health, safety and climate change between these alternatives is not analyzed/estimated. For example, how many more Growler flights will occur under these alternatives, when will they occur and what geographic areas for the proposed action will they affect? The quantification of effects and impacts from the no-action and preferred alternative 1 did not but must include: Air and water pollution from increased Growler activities over the proposed action area (i.e. metric tons of additional inputs). Greatly increased noise affects the health and well-being of residents in the proposed action area. As a resident of the Discovery Bay area, my family and neighbors have suffered from recent increased noise of Growler that occurs in all hours of the day and night. We have already experienced under the no-action alternative, Growlers flying almost at tree height right	The number and location of activities proposed under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, as well as the baseline of activities conducted can be found in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The impacts of these activities is analyzed in Chapter 3.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	over our residence, which is within the two mile radius of Port Townsend airport.	
Heinith-3	<p>ES.7.2 Mitigation There is no mitigation offered for the additional noise, human health impacts, pollution and socioeconomic losses to the non-Navy human population in the proposed action area for either Alternatives 1 or 2. The SEIS fails to account for increases in proposed project area non-military human population growth occurring now and in the future that Navy actions in Alternative 1 will highly impact. Loss of socio-economic opportunities from alternative 1 implementation in the proposed action area (loss of tourism, commercial activities in dollars/yr). and estimates of increased carbon/greenhouse gases from increased Growler flights and other proposed actions. These impacts are truly “irreversible” but are not addressed in the SEIS. The National Climate Assessment details the many negative, irreversible impacts of climate change if business as usual (RCP 8.5) projections continue to occur over the next decade. The preferred alternative will contribute to these impacts. No offsets to the impacts that would be caused by the preferred alternative have been offered as mitigation.</p> <p>ES.7.5 There is no indication in the SEIS that the Navy has adequately consulted with area county officials, city of Port Townsend officials, the Washington Departments of Ecology or Fish and Wildlife on impacts that would affect local residents, fish and wildlife and other resources in the proposed action site. The Navy makes a unilateral decision that Alternative 1 “...would not be expected (i.e. by the Navy) to result in any impacts that would reduce environmental productivity, permanently narrow the range of beneficial uses of the environment or pose long term risks to health safety or the general welfare of the public”. Yet as noted above, the Navy has failed to quantify these impacts among the alternatives proposed, and has chosen an alternative that has not been adequately examined as required by NEPA. As mentioned above, the SEIS failed to estimate the impact of increased Growler and other proposed Navy activities that will increase air and water pollution and accelerate climate change.</p> <p>The SEIS fails to fulfill the intent/requirements of NEPA by failing to produce and analyze the above mentioned quantitative, comparable estimates of impacts between the no-action alternative and the preferred alternative. The Navy either disregards these profound impacts or merely states that under the preferred alternative they will not or have little to no</p>	The analysis of the potential impacts described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>impact, without a reasonable analysis. Further, the SEIS has not included any additional information on meaningful consultations between the Navy and local and state authorities regarding impacts from the preferred alternative.</p> <p>In order to fulfil the NEPA requirements, the Navy must construct an SEIS that addresses these serious shortcomings, in full consultation with the public and state and local authorities.</p>	
Hekkers-1	<p>Do not use active sonar and explosives in known marine mammal areas like Behm Canal. It's disruptive to their hearing and comes at a time when humpback whale numbers in southeast Alaska are down. Other species like salmon are also down in southeast Alaska.</p>	<p>Neither explosives nor hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar are proposed to be used in the Behm Canal.</p>
Helenchild-1	<p>Dear Project Manager,</p> <p>So far this year, 70 gray whales have washed ashore on the west coast, five times the average rate. NOAA has declared a wildlife emergency. The SEIS at 3.4.282 states that "military expended materials will sink to the ocean floor".</p> <p>At 3.4.302 the SEIS states that "for the most part," this material will be ingested by bottom feeders, such as Gray whales. The SEIS fails to take into account the already stressed gray whale population. Scientific studies have shown that explosives and SONAR harm marine animals. Whales and dolphins "see" and communicate aurally. Their survival depends on their ability to hear.</p> <p>Using studies conducted as far back as 1984 as source material for your EIS/OEIS draft is wholly unacceptable. Under these circumstances, The Navy must provide updated studies in the OEIS to address the current crisis. Until NOAA's study on the die-off on the Gray Whales is complete, it would be irresponsible for the Navy to continue the disruption of the ocean by sonar and explosive activity.</p> <p>https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/gray-whales-stranded-west-coast-1.5119056</p> <p>https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533</p> <p>The economic considerations are addressed in the letter of opposition to sonar testing off the coast of Mendocino County by the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors in their letter to you dated April 21, 2019. To paraphrase: sonar and explosive testing off the Mendocino coast is detrimental to the fragile oceanic ecosystem on which we rely. The wide variety of sea life is a key economic source for our county and must not be damaged in any way.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy uses the most current marine mammal population data available from the National Marine Fisheries Service. The 2008 and 2010 references cited in the comment were not used by the Navy to determine current populations.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	I urge you to slow down this process to allow enough time for current scientific data to be added to your SEIS.	
Hellot-1	I am fully against underwater sonar testing in the Salish Sea. It has been proven to cause harm to marine mammals that utilize sound extensively. Limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival. The critically endangered Southern Resident Orcas and all Salish Sea marine inhabitants are in harm's way from these dangerous & harmful sonar practices.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Henderson B-1	Please stop sonar and any other noise, testing, and any other activities that harm marine animals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Henderson S-1	I don't understand why we continue to use government money to fund the destruction of our environment so that we can then attempt to repair the damage with more tax payer dollars. Please stop this.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Henry D-1	1. I find fault with the claim on page 9 of the EIS Pamphlet I picked up at the Navy's visit to the Elks Club in Port Angeles, WA. It averages out the noise levels over a 24 hour period. But that does nothing to protect my ears from the ear & hair damaging bursts of noise by the Navy's operations in the Olympic National Park. I base my opinion on info about NIHL from the website, www.hih.gov . 2. I go to the ONP to de-stress. The growler noise only raises my stress levels. I believe I am not alone in that reaction. Please stop flying over Olympic National Park!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Henry T-1	The damage that will be done to precious and endangered marine life (i.e. the Pacific northwest resident orcas) by this training plan is horrifying! Those orcas are already struggling and starving...we must put their needs FIRST this time! Please find a less precarious place to do your training!	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Hensley-1	I am against under water sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. We are killing our planet.....it's so heartbreaking....	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hernandez-1	Please stop with the sound tests at sea, you are hurting the Orcas and marine animals. Think if it would hurt you to have such a sharp permanent sound in your ears ... surely they would turn it off because it would be unbearable. stop please!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Herrera B-1	Under water sonar practices need to stop. It is hurting our marine life. Please care for our what is remaining of our beautiful orcas, whales and marine life we have left.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Herrera S-1	Dear Navy You must cease conducting these harmful so no experiments in the ocean. There is enough evidence to support the trauma you are inflicting in marine life. We do not support your underwater experiments that are killing marine life.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hess-Davis-1	President Eisenhower warned us against making the military too powerful and I'm afraid that we have ignored that warning. It was sad to see beautiful Indian Island taken over from it's settlers for military use. I feel that the military has been given way too much of our tax dollars because people are scared to death of dangers that are not necessarily real. The fact that the military can give Trump back all that money for his wall supports the fact that our military (and it's budget) is way too big. I do not appreciate the Growlers disturbing the peace in beautiful places like Sequim and the Rain Forest. It feels like they have the power to do anything they want despite how citizens feel. Why you are allowed to have bases in lovely areas of the country, I can not understand. When I go down to AZ I see signs everywhere warning about possible unexploded shells in the desert. It seems everywhere you go, you ruin the land. It makes me sad and angry.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Hewitt A-1	The worlds oceans the sea life are under enormous stress. Please do not add to the problem with sonar testing.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hewitt J-1	<p>1. It is hard to believe you did NOT bring any sound gear so we could hear anything you were saying! Deliberate attempt to confuse and obfuscate.</p> <p>2. The research you are operating with [illegible]</p> <p>3. The damage done by sonar at high volume is well documented, the need for this research is not obvious.</p> <p>4. I oppose all sonar testing & experimenting in areas where marine mammals & fishes live in any abundance. It is disruptive to these creatures.</p> <p>5. The millions of dollars spent by Navy would be much better spent by providing medical care.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hicks-1	Stop animal abuse!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Hieb M-1	<p>I am against sonar testing.</p> <p>The marine life have the birth right to be free and wild. Not to be bombarded with percussions of sound and harmful acts</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hieb O-1	Sonar hurts dolphin echolocation and causes death. I'm against sonar testing	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hieb T-1	Underwater sonar will cause unrepairable damage to marine life. I am 100% against this practice.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hilbach-Barger-1	<p>"Best available science" should include (integrate) Tribal Traditional Knowledge.</p> <p>You know what activities are "stressful" – if you wouldn't do it in your grandma's living room, it is stressful; if you wouldn't do it in your grandma's back yard, it's stressful; if you wouldn't do it where and when your child is sleeping it's stressful.</p> <p>Lack of observable population level effects does not constitute proof of "lack of harm."</p>	The Navy will continue to consult with the Tribes. Through Government-to-Government consultations, the Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.
Hill G-1	Dear US Navy, I'm writing to ask that you stop harmful testing practices such as sonar testing that interferes with and harms marine animals and mammals that communicate acoustically such as whales and dolphins. It's imperative that the US Navy stop acoustic practices such as sonar testing immediately in order to preserve threatened and endangered marine species ability to continue healthy and sustainable life cycles.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hill L-1	Save the whales Save the oceans Save HUMANITY!!!!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hill W-1	The noise and disturbance to all living things extend all over this place where a sizeable population can hear the rumble in the sky of the EA-18s now not only as we try to sleep but throughout the day. Thank our stars it's not every day. Those planes can go almost anywhere fast. Why not leave us peace-loving citizens in peace and practice where there aren't many people?	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Hilton K-1	Please stop harming the sea life	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hilton L-1	<p>I am concerned about the impacts of this testing on long-term behavior of whales, dolphins and other marine species. While current studies may show the impact of individual exposure of testing on marine life, there is no way to predict the cumulative impact of this testing. Several of the species that would be impacted are already struggling, and some groups—southern orcas in Puget Sound, for example—are in decline.</p> <p>"Whales are equipped with exquisitely sensitive hearing for using sound to follow their migratory routes, to locate one another over great distances, to find food and to care for their young," a NRDC report says. "Noise that undermines their ability to hear these critical sounds can threaten their ability to function and survive."</p> <p>At the very least, this testing should take place in the open seas, where animals have greater opportunities to avoid impacts.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Hinz-1	<p>Please stop the Test which you know harm mammals. They are already exposed to so many other Problems made by Human beings...</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hirsch-1	<p>I am a resident on Orcas Island who is opposed to the additional 44% more Growler jets on Whidbey Island and the increase of the number of practice flights in central Whidbey from 6,100 per year to 24,000 per year. This will dramatically increase the regional impact of the noise and pollution from the jets across all of NW Washington. Growler noise is already too loud and too often in my house! The windows shake!</p> <p>Also, the Olympic National Park, the quietest place in the country, should not be lost by the increase in Growlers – the loudest jets in the military. We are at peace time for goodness sakes.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hiser-1	<p>I am against your proposed Naval tree top training flights over the Olympic Peninsula. I am more than upset over what the Growlers have cost in fallen real estate prices and sales on Whidbey. Now, the Navy thinks the protected, one-of-kind Olympic rainforest environment can be wrecked as well with these proposed tree top flights. Tourism is the 4th largest industry in WA state. It generates \$21.4 billion in annual spending, and \$1.8 billion in state and local taxes. Much of these tourist dollars are specifically tied to what our beautiful Sound and Olympic Forest provide. Our state benefits from income from Cruise and boat viewing of Orcas, rentals for family retreats, local hotels and restaurants, property sales, backpacking and camping, hunting and fishing packages. The actions of these tree top flights and all that is tied to this proposal will devastate our way of life in the protected Olympic Peninsula, as well as, rob our state of much needed tourist dollars.</p>	<p>The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism and Recreation). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p>
Hiser-2	<p>I am against the Naval plan to increase its use of sonar and explosives underwater in any part of Puget Sound. As outlined in the Seattle Times article, the cruelty it will cause underwater mammals is unconscionable. The Navy war games will destroy the hearing of our mammal sea life including whales, and porpoises. There is no reason to be so callous by purposefully killing orcas from the impact of sonar and explosions on their</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	echolocation systems and their hearing. They won't be able to communicate, seek food, raise their young safely, or hear an oncoming barge or ship. Our Puget Sound and the islands have over the years become trashed by the Navy with the increase of the Growlers noise levels impacting humans personally, and the sea life, as well as, tourist and real estate dollars. The Navy is no longer something I have any respect for. My brother was an officer in the Navy, as was my fiancée years ago. Now, I see a military organization that is turning our rare and very special Puget Sound into a military operation without respect for the creatures who live in those waters.	populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hochmair-1	Freedom, destroying the seas, ruined the whole planet, extinction until humanity itself.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hoffman-1	Hello! I am 100% against sonar testing. It greatly affects marine life and in particular whales. These are sentient beings and they deserve protection and they cannot protect themselves and cannot turn the sound "off." Please stop this practice immediately. Thanks.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Hoffmann-1	I am shocked to see the Navy would be so reckless and knowingly harm the life of so many whales and dolphins. This needs to stop, we need to preserve our oceans.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hogan K-1	As a US citizen I find it appalling that my government is operating in such a callous and irresponsible manner by conducting sonar testing despite knowing the detrimental effects on marine life. The Navy should be working to protect the earth's environment, including non human life, rather than harming innocent beings.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hogan R-1	If you know that your testing harms our wild creatures, why do you do it? We love our sea life and do not want to see them throwing themselves on the beaches because you are blasting them out of the water! Please stop this testing! Please help save our sea life!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Holladay-1	You have likely heard many comments about injury to cetaceans, both physically and mentally from sonar in their environment. My comment is simple...the oceans are their homes and all lives deserve respect.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Holland-1	I oppose sonar testing as it will hurt wildlife.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Holman-1	Sonar and seismic testing is unacceptable to me for one main reason: the ability of marine mammals such as whales, dolphins and porpoises is severely impaired by the unacceptable levels of noise generated by these tests. These species rely on sound to find food, to breed and to locate each other, e.g, the ability of a calf to find its mother can be made impossible by the incessant, ultra-loud testing. With marine species' struggle for survival being made more challenging daily by the increasing pollution of the oceans via traffic and human waste, this additional and severe intrusion into their habitat is not sustainable and must end.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Holmes J-1	I am deeply concerned about the effect our military is having on the planet itself and it's inhabitants--human and non-human. Studies have repeatedly shown the negative effects that sonar has on ocean mammals physically, mentally, and emotionally. It is unconscionable to further destroy the shrinking populations. It has been decades since America's military has needed to defend the citizens of America. Instead, our military, our sons and daughters, have been used to further certain economic interests by whatever means necessary! Millions and millions have been killed--human and non-human--	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	and now our planet is dying, too, so a few unkind people can feel powerful. We should be ashamed. We should stop NOW!	EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Holmes R-1	Navy Sonar testing is proven to cause injury in marine animals. The southern resident orcas are critically endangered, and on the verge of extinction. They need protection, and sonar testing would prove to be the opposite of that. I encourage the Navy to reconsider their current plans of sonar testing in the Pacific North West.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Holroyd-1	We have a new baby orca just born to the southern resident orca pod, an endangered group of marine animals. We must do our part to protect this species.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Holtorf-1	We as residents of the San Juan Islands do not want navy testing over our islands or in the surrounding waters. There are endangered Orca whales who rely on sound to hunt. Sound echos in the islands and carries across the water. The vibrations of growlers shake my cabin on Blakely to the point of scaring my kids. Imagine how this sounds to our aquatic neighbors. The San Juan Islands are a tourist destination and a natural treasure, they need to be preserved for the peace and tranquility they are meant to provide. Navy testing should be done in an area less fragile and vulnerable to its effects.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Honeycutt-1	Please discontinue any activity that will pose threat to the creatures which inhabit our oceans!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Hopkins-1	Marine mammals rely on their hearing. Knowingly damaging their ears is unconscionable.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hopkinson-1	Stop sonar testing in Pacific Northwest waters! It is home to the critically endangered southern resident orca population and countless other marine	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	species that will suffer hearing loss or death as a result of this testing. STOP IT.	and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Horan-1	<p>I moved to Whidbey Island thirteen years ago for its pristine beauty, natural open spaces for hiking and silence. I am a writer who counts on quiet to get my work done. I have experienced the excessively loud decibels of noise created by Navy plane landings when in Coupeville and feel deeply sorry for the people who are subjected to the noise on a regular basis. It it nerve shattering and undoubtedly affects animals in the area as much as the humans with homes there.</p> <p>I am also deeply concerned about the water supply that has been polluted by firefighting chemicals. Is the wildlife in the area getting bottled water? Why doesn't the Navy use an unpopulated island for its exercises? We have one precious aquifer that supplies all of us. Ebey's Landing draws thousands of hikers and tourists for its quiet beauty and wildlife sightings. Why despoil this magical place with noise and harmful chemicals?</p>	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Horeth-1	<p>I live on Whidbey Island and the Navy taking over our area has been disastrous. They have been insensitive and unresponsive to the community concerns. They have poisoned our drinking water and continue to threaten our lifestyle on our once peaceful island. They change the game and rules whenever they wish with no accountability. They are paid for with our taxes but they are not serving us well. They like our president have become bullies, not good neighbors.</p> <p>We are not at war so I ask why the continued huge expense for the military? No, I do not want them to change the "peacefulness" of the Olympics or anywhere else nature resides. There are not enough unspoiled areas in the world and fewer here in the US. Money, greed and military whims seem to go hand in hand.</p> <p>The future is in flight simulation training. Keep the pilots safe and the environment happy. We can not bring back what they destroyed. Nor can we know the full impact of all these training missions and noisy jets.</p> <p>I know the impact on our own lives. 7 friends have moved away already as we all fear... what will our homes and lives be worth when the Navy TAKES OVER?</p>	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Horne-1	<p>I am writing to express concern regarding the use of low and mid frequency active sonar in the coastal waters of the west coast of the U.S., in particular because of the detrimental effect this is known to have on marine mammals such as whales.</p> <p>I would like to propose a different alternative to the use of active sonar for training, testing and detecting enemy submarines. Given that the new, quieter diesel-electric submarines can approach more closely, and that this is an international issue, the Navy should advocate an international ban on submarines that can operate so quietly, and they should also participate in an international ban on the use of active sonar. Since whales and other marine mammals use their auditory abilities for navigation, group communication, feeding and other vital functions, it is unacceptable to fill the world's oceans with loud sounds that will harass and disturb these animals, making them less healthy and killing many of them. We must look at the big picture and find a different solution.</p> <p>New information has emerged in the last month that necessitates further study before extending the Navy's permit to use active sonar. Seventy grey whales have been found stranded or dead on west coast beaches since the beginning of 2019. This is five times as many as the annual average, and it is likely that 600-700 grey whales may have died in total during this time, considering that most would not have landed on beaches but rather sunk to the ocean floor. NOAA has declared this unusual die-off a "wildlife emergency" and has called for further study to determine the cause of these deaths. The Navy's Northwest Training and Testing Supplemental EIS identifies sound as one of the causes of strandings of marine mammals (Section 3.4.1.7 "General Threats"). There is also speculation that warmer arctic waters may have reduced the food available for whales, since many that have beached show signs of malnourishment. Warming waters contribute to changes in the migration patterns and feeding grounds for whales. The changing ocean conditions mean that past studies will be quickly outdated. What is causing this unusual number of deaths among grey whales? Is LFA sonar a factor in these deaths? Further study is needed. In the last month, we have also had an unusual die-off in our region of the common murre (Fort Bragg Advocate News, May 24, 2019). More than 300 have been found dead on local beaches, which would be just 10% to 20% of the total number that have probably died and not been found. What is causing this die off? Is Navy Testing and Training a factor?</p> <p>Level B Harassment is defined in the Navy report as something that "disturbs or is likely to disturb a marine mammal's natural behavioral</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities. The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>patterns, such as migration, surfacing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering, to a point where patterns are abandoned or significantly altered." Level A Harassment is defined as a direct injury. The Navy stresses that 99.84% of all estimated takes are related to Level B Harassment, but I would like to point out that Level B Harassment can kill a marine mammal over time. If any of the vital functions described (migration, surfacing, nursing, breeding, feeding, sheltering) are abandoned, this leads to death, or in the case of breeding, the inability to reproduce.</p> <p>In addition to my concern for the well-being of marine mammals and other sea creatures, I am concerned about the negative impact that Naval testing and training has on Native American spiritual practices, since the Pacific ocean is vital to many West Coast tribes' beliefs and practices. Traditional knowledge about the ecosystem, developed over thousands of years of living in this place, is valuable and should be taken into account, alongside scientific data. What is the Navy doing to take into account the traditional knowledge and spiritual practices of Native Americans?</p> <p>As someone who lives in the town of Fort Bragg, California, in Mendocino, California, I am concerned about the negative impact that naval Training and Testing will have on our local economy, which is dependent on tourism and fishing as primary industries. Tourists flock to our coastal region to witness the annual grey whale migration, and while they are here they patronize our local restaurants, shops and hotels. If Navy training and testing reduces the migrating whales, the town of Fort Bragg and other coastal towns in the region will suffer economically. How will the Navy compensate us for that loss? Local residents have seen far fewer grey whale mothers and calves swimming close to shore this year. Further study is required to understand the scope and cause of the 2019 grey whale die-off.</p>	
Horne-2	<p>I'm going to be writing a letter with more substantial comments about the issues at stake. I wanted to make a statement today, though, about the format of this event. The format of this event is a disgrace. This event has been designed to prevent the community from hearing each other's questions and hearing the Navy's answer to those questions. This booth format only allows people to speak one-on-one to the Navy, but we as a community need to hear from other members of our community, some of whom are very informed about the issues at stake and can share important questions. You know, not all of us have studied this topic, and we want to hear from those among us who have studied it more. And we want to, you know, share our local concerns and our community concerns. I am shocked</p>	<p>The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	that the Navy doesn't provide a microphone and does not set this event up so that there can be a true dialogue. It seems to me that they have intentionally created an event that prevents community dialogue. I am extremely disappointed, and I, with many of my fellow citizens, will be taking action to try to prevent this testing in our local waters.	members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.
Horner-1	The testing your doing is causing damage to our marine life and their hearing. Please change the way you do testing if you know they are in the area don't do testing they are an endangered species! Your testing is part of the problem	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Houts-Hussey-1	Increasing Growlers flying, at Whidbey Island Naval Outlying Landing Field with touch and go's from 6000 to 24000 by Inexperienced pilots is a SAFETY RISK, for the people, families, children below And the pilots. We are experiencing first hand erratic and dangerous patterns, and turns, and low altitudes which can end in a disastrous and potentially fatal crash. There's too many in the air which does not have a tower to control them. Someone, many can get hurt/killed. These Growlers must train in other less populated area like Joint Base Lewis McCord which has similar sea level elevation.	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Howard K-1	I am concerned about the harm you will do to the marine life in the Pacific Northwest. Many of those mammals are struggling due to our noise and toxin pollutants that your "games" are just one more nail in their coffin.	The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Howard R-1	I totally disagree with and protest against this training plan for sonar testing by the navy in the pacific northwest. The harm to animals has been well documented. Leave the environment free of war games	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Howard S-1	Testing that is known to harm or that has the potential to harm marine wildlife should not be conducted. The wildlife are already struggling with pollution and climate change derived from human actions. The risk of loss of biodiversity is far too great.	The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hreha-1	Please stop the sonar testing! These noises cause major stress and suffering to marine mammals! Southern resident killer whales are already critically endangered, facing numerous threats to their survival, and this adds to it tremendously! Please stop doing this and causing harm to these beautiful creatures.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hubley-1	Save our whales, and save our planet!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Hudson-1	<p>I went to Seattle and Victoria, Canada. I went on a whale watching tour for hours on a zodiac boat. We were unable to see an orca.</p> <p>The resident pods as well as transient pods are negatively impacted by sonar testing. Sonar is loud and causes hearing loss. It impacts the orca's ability to hunt and to communicate.</p> <p>Because of human activity such as sonar testing, tourism to see these beautiful creatures can cause frustration like in my personal experience. It is best for us, for the marine mammals, and for the economy to stop sonar testing.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Huenke-1	<p>"This Supplemental (EIS) does consider the cumulative impacts from these three projects as well as other past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future actions in Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts)" [NAVY EIS p. I-9].</p> <p>NO, it doesn't! The EIS assumes if there is no study, then none is needed. There is a list of activities that could be cumulative; the list is far from complete.</p> <p>Only the No Action Alternative is acceptable to the Olympic Peninsula's environment.</p> <p>The comment period should be extended to a total of 90 days, so more people have time to understand and comment.</p>	<p>The Navy has taken a hard look at the cumulative effects of the incremental impact of its proposed actions when added to other past present and future actions, against the appropriate resources and regulatory baselines. The Navy used the best available science and a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop its Cumulative Impacts analysis. As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis is commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental consequences). The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS considered its activities alongside other actions in the region when those impacts are cumulatively significant. Past and present actions are also included in the analytical process as part of the affected environment baseline conditions presented in Chapter 3. The Navy has done so in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality 1997 guidance. Per the guidance, a qualitative approach and best professional judgment are appropriate where precise measurements are not available. Where precise measurements and/or methodologies were available they were used. Guidance from the Council on Environmental Quality states it "is not practical to analyze cumulative effects of an action on the universe; the list of environmental effects must focus on those that are truly meaningful." The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p>
Huffman J-1	<p>Sonar testing has been proven to destroy sea life, including endangered mammals and their young offspring.</p> <p>Please do the right thing and ban any further sonar testing and protect whales, dolphins, sea life and their families. Sonar is a life threatening and torturous assault, we look to you to protect the voiceless.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Huffman S-1	Please stop sonar testing! You are slowly destroying many marine species some of which are endangered.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hummel-1	<p>I am writing to urge the US Navy to avoid all use of sonar and electromagnetic underwater testing and even the use of these technologies during wartime. US security is much bigger than just the immediate (or potentially immediate) security of our human populations, but depends upon the complex web of life that keep us all alive. To ignore that is extremely shortsighted and will "shoot us all in the foot"--possibly sooner than any potential attack on the US from which these tests are supposed to protect us.</p> <p>Increased sonar and electromagnetic underwater testing has the potential to interfere or injure marine mammals' ability to navigate and communicate. The Navy itself predicts that there would be more than 500,000 instances of marine mammal behavioral impacts, harassment, and injuries over five years, including 275,000 instances of temporary hearing loss, and more than 600 instances of permanent hearing loss.</p> <p>Vessel strikes from increased water traffic will increase marine mammal death rate. We have already seen the loss of nine grey whales in the San Francisco Bay area in the last six weeks from malnourishment and vessel strikes. The western North Pacific population of grey whales is estimated to include fewer than 200 individuals. We cannot afford to put these animals in greater danger.</p> <p>Risks to marine mammals, fish, and birds from entanglement in wires, cables, and parachutes, and ingestion of expended military materials and toxic debris will increase. The Navy holds no responsibility to clean up their spent munitions and debris.</p> <p>In addition, the Navy's training and testing harmfully impact the cultural and spiritual significance of marine species and habitat for the Tribes of the</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>West Coast.</p> <p>Again, I urge the Navy to rethink it's priorities around sonar, electromagnetic, and other technologies which substantially harm marine and other wildlife. We are entering a new era of awareness around the sanctity and fragility of life in the face of our modern technologies. It is time for the Navy to join the majority of Americans in prioritizing the protection of our lives from pollution and ecological collapse, which is a very real threat to our country.</p>	
Hunkler-1	<p>Please stop and do not Selsmic blasting! It harms wildlife and interferes with marine life such as whales, dolphins, seals and many other animals that communicate under water. Blasting every 10 seconds or even every few minutes is too much. We need to find alternative fuel and energy sources that do not harm life and the planet!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Hunt-1	<p>Whales flee from the loud military sonar used by navies to hunt submarines, new research has proven for the first time. The studies provide a missing link in the puzzle that has connected naval exercises around the world to unusual mass strandings of whales and dolphins. Beaked whales, the most common casualty of the strandings, were shown to be highly sensitive to sonar. But the research also revealed unexpectedly that blue whales, the largest animals on Earth and whose population has plummeted by 95% in the last century, also abandoned feeding and swam rapidly away from sonar noise.</p> <p>The strong response observed in the beaked whales occurred at noise levels well below those allowed for US navy exercises. "This result has to be taken into consideration by regulators and those planning naval exercises," said Stacy DeRuiter, at the University of St Andrews in Scotland, who led one of the teams.</p> <p>Please STOP SONAR TESTING!!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Hunter-1	<p>I am extremely opposed to the Navy during testing in the waters of the Puget Sound. This testing will interrupt the sonar communications of the marine mammals living in our region. We are already having a crisis in the residential orca whale population and cannot risk further decline in their population. Please do not allow this to happen.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hurd-1	The science is in regards how sonar disrupts whales and dolphins. It causes such panic they swim till they get the bends. STOP ALL SONAR Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Huth-1	Both the US and Canadian government have recently taken steps to protect marine life in the Salish Sea and you want to test knowingly harmful underwater sonar in the same local? Not only is that working against each other, but to knowingly harm these mammals in their own protected habitat is verging on a criminal act. Enough damage has been done, perhaps your efforts would be better serving to assist those that have had their habitat damaged and their numbers decimated.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hyland-1	Please stop underwater sonar. Our planet needs all the help it can get. This is something we can instantly easily change with a large impact.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Hysko-1	I am opposed to the growler training flights over the Olympic peninsula. The growlers are loud and disturb both residential areas and wilderness areas. It was claimed that flights have not increased from previous years, but then they increased. It has been claimed that flights are at high altitude and do not cause noise. I have heard them many times both at home and in	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the mountains, they are very loud and disruptive, especially in wilderness areas.</p> <p>I am opposed to the Navy expanding operations through multiple front while claiming each front is unique and not related to the others, when it is clear they are.</p> <p>I am also concerned about Navy tests disturbing marine life.</p>	<p>minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
I		
Ibanez-1	<p>You're harming marine life with your sonars. We've already seen many animals injured or killed by human neglect. We should not continue to abuse power and harm animals.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Ibrahim-1	<p>Naval sonar used to locate silent submarines can kill marine mammals which violates the Marine Mammals Protection Act.</p> <p>Exceptions should not be made because this sonar if deployed in multiple locations and used constantly will end up killing many marine mammals which is contrary to the spirit of the law that inspired the MMPA.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Ihara-1	<p>I would like to address the purpose and need statement of the draft supplement EIS/OEIS and a layperson's understanding of the deleterious effects of sonar and explosives on marine animals.</p> <p>The Congressional direction in section 8062 of Title 10 is not specific in how to attain combat readiness. While Congress delegates to the Navy the responsibility of maintain, training and equipping combat-ready naval forces, it is Navy personnel that must determine how to do this.</p> <p>Unfortunately Naval personnel have developed a plan that is extremely harmful and, at times, fatal to marine life. The Congressional direction found in section 8062 of Title 10 does not prescribe such an outcome.</p> <p>The deleterious effects of sonar and explosive on marine animals is known by laypeople such as myself so assuredly is well-documented in Navy</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	literature and research. It is shocking to me, as a layperson, that knowledgeable, creative, technically savvy people, of whom there must be many in the Navy, cannot devise ways to maintain, train and equip combat-ready naval forces that don't do irreparable harm to the creatures of our ocean.	
Ingalsbe-1	DOD Needs to stop this crap. You know, admitted it is harmful deadly to SRKW... So just stop this NOW!!! J31 has a new baby J56, let them all survive from your deadly, useless USN antiquated crap.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ireland-1	Thank you for training to protect our freedom and keep our pilots' skills sharp. This training will reduce the danger of plane crashes, thus reducing potential damage to the environment and the danger of injuries and/or loss of life for the aviators and for people on the ground. The "Growlers" present no real or substantive threat or damage to our quality of life or biological resources. The Navy's Draft EIS/OSIS is fully adequate.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Irvin-1	Sonar testing is harmful to ALL animals — this practice is inhumane and needs to stop.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Irwin-1	Increased sonar and electromagnetic underwater testing is threatening to injure marine mammals' ability to navigate and communicate. Navy ocean training and testing on the Northwest Coast is up for review. The Navy is proposing to increase the volume and types of maneuvers that they conduct. Their Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement is now open for #publiccomment. For The Wild stands alongside our allies with the InterTribal Sinkyone	The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Wilderness Council is strongly opposing the Navy's proposed actions. The Navy's training and testing harmfully impact the cultural and spiritual significance of #marinespecies and habitat, for the Tribes of the #WestCoast.</p> <p>The Navy predicts that there would be more than 500,000 instances of marine mammal behavioral impacts, harassment, and injuries over five years, including 275,000 instances of temporary hearing loss, and more than 600 instances of permanent hearing loss.</p> <p>Vessel strikes from increased water traffic will increase marine mammal death rate. We have already seen the loss of nine #greywhales in the San Francisco Bay area in the last six weeks. The western North Pacific population of grey whales is estimated to include fewer than 200 individuals. We cannot afford to put these animals in greater danger.</p> <p>Risks to #marinemammals, fish, and birds from entanglement in wires, cables, and parachutes, and ingestion of expended military materials and toxic debris will increase. The Navy holds no responsibility to clean up their spent munitions and debris.</p>	
Iwasaki-1	<p>Dumping heavy metals and depleted uranium into the ocean or Puget Sound is not only irresponsible but an attack on the people that live here. We don't need more metals in our environment, which is not only sickening the earth and environment but poisoning the people/families and wildlife living here. Dispose of your waste properly and safely no matter the monetary cost or stop producing waste.</p>	<p>The Navy does not propose any activities that would include dumping heavy metals or depleted uranium. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.</p>
Izquierdo-1	<p>The Salish Sea is home to resident orcas that are already highly under stress due to other environmental impacts. Unlike transient orcas, they only live here, and feed off a very specific diet of Chinook salmon. Sonar is known to have deafened whales, and I'm very concerned about the impact to this population, since they have no where else to go. Please reconsider the decision to test here, so we can create the conditions to coexist with this very special, and local species. Thank you.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
J		
Jackson-1	The majority of these training exercises do not have to be conducted along our shoreline and could instead be conducted far from shore minimizing the impact on birds, fish, marine mammals, other wildlife and communities. There is no evaluation for other locations which could significantly reduce the harmful impacts of these exercises. Training around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas could be avoided.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTS Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft and ships are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Jaffurs-1	Navy and military are ruining this earth and destroying all life trying to live on it. Please stop harming the marine life immediately, it is not right to harm them in there own natural habitat for your own wonders! Harming other living creatures is not right especially if they have no way of fighting back!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.mil/speciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Janes-1	The proposal for testing military equipment is dangerous to humans and wildlife. Sound waves move very quickly in water, dolphins, fish, our remaining Wales, seals will be effected. There will be death consistently and at a much higher scale than the hemilitary alludes to in their proposal. Human health and well-being is not taken into consideration. Noise pollution is a very real issue with military testing and effects human health. Lack of sleep creates less productivity and invokes depression. Testing over our parks impacts the health of wildlife which our parks exist for plant and wildlife preservation. We don't have much left when it comes to wild places to flyover these places is an invasion of air space impacting flight Patterson birds and again extreme noise impacting birth, livelihood and health of wild animals. Military testing must stop. I do not support the current plans or proposals which put human and natural communities at a very high risk for life, health and wellbeing.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.mil/speciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Jankelow-1	That this should be even entertained knowing the crisis the Southern Resident Orcas are experiencing is truly beyond humane. Other species of whales, dolphins, turtles that call the ocean home will experience sounds and tremors that will be shocking if not fatal. Already there are unusual high deaths in California strandings of Grey Whales. I urge you please not to do this.	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Jansen-1	I am 100% against underwater sonar testing as it has been proven to harm marine mammals and affects their welfare and living. I hope you can take this seriously and take action and protect the animals living in our ocean.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Janson-1	I am urging not only "no new flights and no new jets", but a dramatic reduction of existing flights. As a frequent visitor to Whidbey Island and a lover of our natural resources and wildlife, the increased noise levels and frequency of flights are harmful to our orcas, tourism, full and part time residents, students (teachers cannot be heard over flight noise), and long term impacts will be detrimental to anything in the flight path.	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Your support to move Growler flight training to another, preferably sparsely inhabited locale, would be greatly appreciated.	http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
January-1	I am opposing the US Navy's increasing use of sonar off the northwest coast of the US. The noise the sonar causes will interfere with the ways whales and dolphins navigate and communicate. This kind of training maneuver is not wanted or appreciated. Please do not cause more harm in the oceans.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Janzen-1	<p>I think only a marine biologist who has a lot of time would really be able to give you substantive comments on your huge EIS.</p> <p>Since I am a lay person, I can only give you my opinions. I support No Action Alternative as I don't think we should be spending endless amounts of our tax dollars on the military industrial complex, and I don't like that there are so many environmental and marine animal issues associated with your testing procedures around WA state waterways. Marine mammals already have a difficult time surviving due to pollution, climate chaos, loss of food, etc. so having to endure the Navy's sonar and explosives is just another stressor they shouldn't have to put up with.</p> <p>I went to Appendix E Estimated Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Impacts from Exposure to Acoustic and Explosive Stressors Under Navy Training and Testing Activities TTS-PTS and was confused as to what TTS and PTS even mean. Looking at the many tables, it looks as though thousands of dolphins and seals are negatively affected by your actions. If TTS and PTS means they are seriously injured or die, then I am even more opposed to your training activities in and around WA state. I think the Navy says they take precautions to prevent marine mammal deaths, but I think in reality they do whatever they want since nobody really can stop them. I think hurting/killing marine mammals for the sake of security is wrong. If you can perform your training without hurting the animals, then I would be ok with it on a limited basis.</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Jarvis-1	Why not fly over unpopulated man&animal spaces? We all know the noise is hazardous to both.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft and ships are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Jäverfelt-1	Stop abusing animals, it's their environment, not ours	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Jenkins-1	I am 100% AGAINST the navy sonar testing, it is too harmful to our already extremely hurting marine eco system. This testing effects the remaining 75 Southern Resident Orcas as well as all the other whales and marine life that live here or frequent the area. No testing is worth loosing what precious bit of this ecosystem we have left, we are trying to protect and heal it, not scar and destroy it forever.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Jenny-1	<p>Imagine every time you knock off work to shop for dinner, there is loud, shrill humming in your ears while you select your frozen fish dinner!</p> <p>Imagine when you jump in your car to head home, the same noise makes it hard to concentrate on traffic and hazards!</p> <p>Imagine getting home and when you walk in the front door a shrill, ear piercing noise starts and stops as you put your shopping away, greet the dog that's going mad with the noise and trying to hide under the bed to escape to no avail!</p> <p>Imagine your kids begging 'dad, make the horrible noise stop, our ears are hurting and we're getting sick but you can't as you have no idea where the noise is coming from or what's causing it, day in, day out!</p> <p>Imagine you cook and eat dinner dreading the next minute in case the</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>noise starts, finally you go to bed exhausted from trying to block it out, you put your ear plugs in and ear muffs over those to try and get some sleep but still the noise penetrates just enough to wake you through the night till you wake exhausted and just want to scream, run or jump off a bridge because the noise never stops night after night!</p> <p>Orcas don't have ear plugs and you inflict that life on them and their friends and families as they try to get on with their lives, swim, catch dinner, play, rest, while you are earning a living at work driving them insane with the noise! They can't just hop in a Ford and drive out of the Ocean to escape the sonars you operate with no side effects apart from the odd yawn! Have mercy on the intelligent whales and orcas and dolphins, they would never dream of using ray guns on you!.</p> <p>Let them live without harmful, totally unnecessary human noise pollution while you think about what you're having for dinner in peace and quiet I assume.</p>	
Jensen E-1	<p>I do not support sonar testing in the waters of the Salish Sea/ Puget Sound. It is directly harmful to the marine life, especially the critically endangered Southern Resident Orcas. By refraining from using or testing sonar near the whales, they will have a better chance at survival. This is important to the health of our ocean and community.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Jensen J-1	<p>There must be a more humane, less destructive means to accomplish whatever it is the Navy is doing with sonic blasts. Our neighbors on this planet have suffered enough at our hands, we are killing too many as it is. As a citizen of this country, I absolutely abhor the use of these devices. It must stop!!!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Jessup-1	<p>We know that sonar is harmful to marine mammals - damaging their hearing and inhibiting their communication. Additionally increased marine vessel traffic results in collision deaths- especially for gray whales and other whales that call our waters home. Please consider their lives - there are</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	fewer than 200 gray whales left in the area and our resident orcas are facing numerous challenges to survival, let's not add more harm.	EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Jhueck-1	I have never felt angry about the Navy in the twenty years I have lived on Whidbey Island. But now, the arrogant way in which our environmental concerns have been ignored (and I know no one who believes this comment process is well intended and will actually change anything) and the stunning noise from the jet take offs, landings, and fly overs makes me fully invested in finding a way for this entire base to close. Everyone I talk with feels that you are destroying this beautiful island. The 'price of freedom' is a joke. YOU are making my home unlivable, not some distant enemy.	The activities proposed in the NWTTS Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Jodoin-1	Please Stop sonar in our Oceans. You are diminishing our sea life, our mammals, our water way, because once they are gone so are our children and their children. This has to stop now in order to save some kind of life for our families. Please please Stop!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Johannis-1	Dear audience. I come from Indonesia which is an archipelago country. Our fishermen get many help from our dolphin friends. They live happily in the ocean (some of them also live in our river). I would give my big protest if you want to use any device that can damage their hearing capabilities and ruin their happiness to live freely in their home. You should consider other way to do your job and consider other creatures too. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Johns-1	I find it mind blowing that people even have to write in a public forum about this issue. Navy sonar testing is a terrible practice that harms so many animals. How can you knowingly do such a thing and not have any reservations about it? These aren't just open waters to play in. These are	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	their homes. They have no place else to go. Please, stop sonar testing in Washington.	Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Johnson B-1	The negative impact to me personally from the noise produced by war training is untenable. I have lived on the Kitsap and Olympic Peninsula Since 1980, The impact of flights over and into the Olympic National Park destroys the meaning of Park.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Johnson D-1	Please do not release 20,000 tons of environmental “stressors,” including heavy metals, depleted uranium, and explosives, into the coastal waters of the U.S. Pacific Northwest or in any body of water. In Seattle region, Puget Sound has too much environmental degradation already as shown by many whales dying of starvation, fewer salmon, oysters having trouble growing shells, and starfish wasting disease. Please dispose of your garbage responsibly on land. Thank you.	The Navy does not propose the use of or release of heavy metals or depleted uranium. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals. The analysis of impacts of the Navy’s activities on water quality can be found in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Johnson J-1	I have owned my home in Port Townsend for 27 years. Over this period of time I have heard the Navy jets from time to time and dealt with it. Now the new Growler jets and the increase in activity and proposed additional flight activity gives me pause to think about living here for the rest of my life. I came here for the beauty and tranquility 28 years ago. Today I cannot think of the the increased disruption to my life. The impact of my personal life is hard to handle, but the impact on our environment is impossible to comprehend. The attitude of the Navy as was said directly to me "we were here first, close your windows and get a white noise machine". I know there are alternatives to the maneuvers currently being done on Whidbey. The Navy has even stated that there were options to locations for the training, but it would take some extra flying time and the Navy decided to stay with current operations. I am more fortunate than those closer to OLF and I cannot conceive of the impact on US citizens on Whidbey in the flight	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft and ships are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>path of the OLF.</p> <p>Where is the Navy's humanity and concern? None to be seen or heard. I would suggest that those in the Navy that make these critical decisions should try living in homes and study in schools that are so highly impacted by my their current training operations.</p>	
Johnson O-1	<p>The Navy should look at other places to expand its electronic warfare training for EA-18G jet flights other than the Olympic Peninsula, the Hoh Rain Forest and Olympic National Park.</p> <p>I hike and camp and recreate in national parks and wilderness areas, in large part, to escape incessant man made noise and to enjoy nature's solitude. I ask that the U.S. Navy find alternative places to fly these jets such as the high desert east of the Cascades.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Johnson R-1	<p>Being subjected to the miserable noise of the awful flights at the OLF, I have to believe there must be some areas where the defenseless birds and animals can be protected from the Navy. The Navy can go anywhere, why must they pollute the few remaining pristine areas of the Olympic Peninsula. The only thing I can think of it is convenient and the critters don't vote, plus it saves gas.</p> <p>Send the Navy out to sea; is that not where they are supposed to be?</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comment, and the rationale in my statement.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Johnson T-1	<p>I am 100% Against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals.</p> <p>A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas.</p> <p>"For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival," Calambokidis said.</p> <p>Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations.</p> <p>Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times.</p> <p>Please take care of the oceans! Be stewards of care not intervention of natural processes.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Johnston A-1	<p>I am a fifth generation resident of Mendocino County California. Mendocino County is a large area with a small population, the entire county has fewer people than most cities in California and we are often depicted as a bunch of uneducated, marijuana growing potheads. That is a broad generalization of a small subculture of our population. It is often felt as though the rest of the state and country thinks that Mendocino County is insignificant and therefore doesn't matter.</p> <p>Mendocino County is in crisis. Our main industries, lumber and fishing, have become practically non-existent. In the last few decades our wood mills have closed and our fishing industry has faced many hardships. Our main local financial life line is tourism.</p> <p>While many will write about the suffering the marine life would have to endure if the US Navy is allowed to do weapon testing 12 miles off the coast, but the human members of this community and our local economy would suffer as well since tourism is all that is left.</p> <p>Dead whales stink! About 10 years ago a Blue whale washed up on shore about 12 miles south of town. Even in Fort Bragg we could smell it. The low lying fog keeps it cool in the summer, but it also causes the smell of the beach to permeate the whole coast. Usually, it is a pleasant smell, especially after a storm, but a dead sea lion, just outside town can stink up the whole place. Marine scientists have determined that the use of sonar in naval testing off our coast would mess with sea mammals echolocation and increase the number of dead animals washing up on shore. The memory of one dead whale on a beach 12 miles south of town a decade ago still triggers a gag reflex. To have to endure that regularly for 7 years? That's cruel and unusual punishment. Tourists do not want to visit beaches that smell like rotting sea life.</p> <p>The tourist season has already been reduced by two months because of the closure of abalone season. The North Coast of California is currently suffering from a sea star wasting disease. As the sea stars die off, their chosen prey, the purple sea urchin, are undergoing a population explosion, which has left the kelp forest bare due to over feeding. The red abalone also feed on the kelp forest so their numbers are down, resulting in the closure of abalone season. Abalone season starts April first. Tourists usually start coming to town in April; this year we didn't see them until Memorial Day. The current stresses on our ocean, for whatever reason has effected numerous species, including tourists.</p> <p>If the death of one species due to ocean stress has caused such an ecological crisis in our ocean, it is unimaginable what seven years of human</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>imposed stress would have.</p> <p>Finally, the stress of a military presence close to such a peaceful community would be very stressful on our population. People who live here are much more sensitive to such things as planes flying overhead, and large ships on the horizon than people who live in cities realize. This community is so small that when the local hospital transfers a patient by helicopter all the lines at Safeway are a buzz with rumors.</p> <p>Working at a high school in Sonoma County, bomb threats were common place around midterm exams. The students would stand in the field and complain about needing to use the bathroom or the delay to lunch it would cause. The first time there was bomb threat working at Mendocino High School, students were crying, sobbing and hugging each other, genuinely fearful. Violence, or threat of violence in such a small quiet community is quite a bit more stressful than it is to people in cities who dismiss it as part of "the way things are."</p> <p>The benefits that Naval testing off the coast of Mendocino County are far outweighed by the hardships that would be endured by the marine and human population of Mendocino County, not a community of disengaged potheads, but a peace loving haven where the inland people flock to, to escape the summer heat or smoke from wild fires. Please, don't disturb this peaceful place with weapons testing. This is my home.</p> <p>Amy Johnston, daughter of Andy Johnston, son of Clifford Johnston, son of Charlotte Gray-Johnston daughter of Prince W. Gray son of Leonard Leballister Gray who moved here from New York, so we could have a better life.</p>	
Johnston P-1	<p>Sonar testing in the Pacific is extremely harmful to the water animals. They are already harmed by malnutrition, getting hit by ships, swallowing too much trash in the ocean. To render them deaf, is a death sentence. Please reconsider how and where you test.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Jones De-1	I listened to the public express their concern, and watched as Navy employees discarded these comments and questions. They don't seem to take responsibilities for their actions, skimming past their own research and not taking climate change into account. They are basically holding a blow horn into their ears and asking them to go about their life, like how can they? How could anyone? These animals, in result to the Navy's actions are dying. Their own studies are there to prove it. The Navy is in denial.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Jones Di-1	I don't appreciate our state being a military training area. I don't enjoy going to a wildlife viewing area in Okanogan county only to be bombarded by growler jet noise. Or Jefferson County. I don't trust the that military to safe guard the environment be it water pollution, underwater noise, etc. They have a very poor reputation.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Jones Ke-1	The Navy should not be allowed to destroy the sanctity of wilderness. It is unconscionable that the Navy be allowed "incidental takes of threatened and endangered marine species" by moving their operation to the Olympic wilderness when they already have training areas that do not threaten endangered species. The Navy should not be allowed to move their Growler jet training to the Olympic peninsula, to destroy wilderness tranquility, to "take" endangered species. The Navy must select the "No Action Alternative" in the Environmental Impact Statement.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Jones Ki-1	I am fully against the underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. It's critical we don't expose the endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales to these practices. I urge you to please put a stop to this!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Jones M-1	Please refrain from your sonar drills. My family is planning a big trip to Canada to see Orca's in the wild so please if you want tourists please stop harming the wildlife. Thank you	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Jones N-1	We do not need to add any additional strain on our extremely endangered Southern Resident Orca population. No sonar testing should be completed at this time, for that sake.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Jones P-1	I am 100% Against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. The Southern Resident Orcas and all Salish Sea marine inhabitants are in harms way from the U.S. Navy. This video shows Southern Resident Orcas literally swimming away from the Navy 's dangerous & harmful sonar practices. This is 100% unacceptable. Call to Action! A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas. "For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival," Calambokidis said. Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations. Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times.	
Jones S-1	Do the navy really need to do this test after it has found to be so harmful to the wildlife in our oceans. Scientists tell us we are constantly abusing this planet and if we carry on with this abuse we are paving our own path to the extinction of the human race. Please reconsider if this is truly needed. Thank you	The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Jonker-1	I'd like to express my concern regarding the testing and training proposal in the Pacific Northwest oceans and the effects that this testing will have on marine wildlife. As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, the suffering and damage that these tests will have on animals are too great. As a scientist and technologist, I value and respect the need to push the edge of technological development, and I support the navy and the incredible work that they do to protect our country. However, scientists can be exceptionally creative in developing new methods for testing in the face of challenges and restrictions. It is my strong opinion that the costs to marine life, as highlighted in a recent Seattle Times article, are too high and that the navy should reconsider new methods for providing greater protections to the sea. https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/navy-plans-testing-of-futuristic-technology-sonar-harm-to-mammals-in-pacific-northwest/?utm_source=marketingcloud&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=TSA_052419214231+Navy+sonar+and+explosives+could+harm+marine+animals_5_24_2019&utm_term=Active%20subscriber#comments	The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Jonsson-1	Videos shows Southern Resident Orcas literally swimming away from the Navy 's dangerous & harmful sonar practices. This is 100% unacceptable. I am 100% Against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>“For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival,” Calambokidis said.</p> <p>Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy’s calculations.</p> <p>Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a “behavioral reaction” (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times.</p> <p>I do not support this and urge you to stop this. Be a force of good, not evil, in this world.</p>	<p>EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Jory-1	<p>Please consider the safety and health of the marine ecosystem as affected by your anti-submarine warfare sonar testing- we support the Intertribal Sinkyoue Wilderness Council. We have only one earth, and the marine creatures who inhabit it are vital to the earth’s biodiversity!!!</p> <p>We only have 1 planet <3</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Joseph-1	<p>I suggest the Navy send infrared thermal imaging drones over their exercise areas, so that the exercises may be rerouted if a given number of animals are found below. If the resolution of the thermal images is enough to determine which species are below, it could determine if it's an endangered species and therefore to be avoided. The damage to all animals below would be avoided.</p>	<p>Analysis of the potential for thermal detection systems as a mitigation tool was presented in Section 5.5.4 (Thermal Detection Systems and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles). The Office of Naval Research Marine Mammals and Biology program recently funded a project to test the thermal limits of infrared based automatic whale detection technology (Principal Investigators: Olaf Boebel and Daniel Zitterbart). This project is focused on (1) capturing whale spouts at two different locations featuring subtropical and tropical water temperatures, (2) optimizing detector/classifier performance on the collected data, and (3) testing system performance by comparing system detections with concurrent visual observations. In addition, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has funded six initial studies to test and evaluate current technologies and algorithms to automatically detect marine mammals (IR thermal detection being one of the technologies) on an unmanned surface vehicle. The Navy plans to continue researching thermal detection systems to determine their effectiveness and compatibility with Navy applications. If the technology matures to the state where thermal detection is determined to be an effective mitigation tool during training and testing, the Navy will assess</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the practicability of using the technology during training and testing events and retrofitting its observation platforms with thermal detection devices.
Jovi-1	No sonar you <i>[expletive deleted]</i> idiots!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Judd-1	<p>The ocean along the western coast of California is a migration route for several species of whales. Often whales are migrating with their babies. The tests the Navy proposes to perform kill uncountable numbers of creatures, including whales, that live or pass through this area. I oppose the continued use of sonar along the Mendocino coast for these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) This year there have been an unusually high number of whale deaths along the migration route. Scientists do not yet know why so many are dying. 2) The death from sonar must be excruciating, with burst eardrums, and the shocks going through the water injuring the entire bodies of the creatures living there. 3) Marine creatures have no way to protest these killing tests, so we must speak for them. <p>The Navy should move the tests away from migration routes, farther out to sea. There is no sane reason why the Navy must conduct deadly tests in areas where there so many protected areas, birthing areas, and homes for zillions of animals. Going farther out to sea away from crucial areas for wildlife might be more inconvenient, but that is not a tradeoff for the terrible toll the tests take.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Juliet-1	I am 100% against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to harm marine animals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Jung-1	Please Just Stop You're Killing numerous Whales and other Ocean Animals. Have a Heart.	The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Justice-1	Dear US Navy, please stop doing seismic testing in areas populated by lots of marine life. This is very detrimental to their well-being. The ocean is so vast and certainly we can find places to do the important testing without disturbing marine wildlife. We all have to live together on this planet. Thank you for your consideration.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
K		
Kaczorowski-1	My background includes: A Bachelor of Arts degree in Public Policy from Mills College in Oakland CA with a concentration in Natural Resource Systems, and a Masters in Theological Studies focusing on Ethical Traditions and Environmental Studies (Pacific School of Religion and cross studies at U.C. Berkeley). I also attended the Academy for International Conflict Management and Peacebuilding, sponsored by George Mason University, The Institute for Defense Analysis, The Department of Defense, and the United States	See responses below.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Institute of Peace, Washington DC where I was awarded a Certificate for completion of the Interagency SENSE Simulation: The Strategic Economic Needs and Security Exercise, 2011 and I attended the Lorry I. Lokey Graduate School of Business, Mills College, Oakland CA: MBA Studies, 2010.</p> <p>I reside along the Pacific Coast in Fort Bragg, California and our coastal communities depend on Ocean protections for our fisheries, recreational, cultural tourism, and eco –tourism industries. The NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project as proposed will impact our economy that is heavily dependent upon already compromised ocean and fisheries resources. Our area Native American Indigenous Tribes will also be significantly impacted by the Navy’s training and testing activities conducted within the same Study Area beyond 2020.</p> <p>Please find attached my public comments document that support a NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE in which the Marine Mammal Protection Act and NMFS authorization would not be issued; therefore, proposed training and testing activities would not be conducted.”</p> <p>The Navy’s training and testing analysis has not utilized the best available scientific information and has not acknowledged the economic and cultural hardships that will occur due to the harm within our complex ocean ecosystems and upon the species that habitat these proposed areas for exercises and testing. Species are on the move and cannot be counted on to stay in place in a specific zone. I also present the case for Virtual Training as an alternative. Virtual Training in the U.S. Navy & Military is well known and well established. Thus, these exercises and trainings are not necessary for hands-on training in realistic or diverse conditions. By 2022, as much as \$11 billion will go to virtual training, augmented and mixed reality training systems, with virtual reality becoming a primary focus of military innovation.</p>	
Kaczorowski-2	<p>I also present the case for Virtual Training as an alternative. Virtual Training in the U.S. Navy & Military is well known and well established. Thus, these exercises and trainings are not necessary for hands-on training in realistic or diverse conditions. By 2022, as much as \$11 billion will go to virtual training, augmented and mixed reality training systems, with virtual reality becoming a primary focus of military innovation.</p> <p>“Within the Department of Defense, the impact of VR and AR has fundamentally changed major functions over the course of 30 years. It has opened countless doors to new uses that are now commonplace throughout the armed services. Training and Future Operations</p>	<p>The Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, see the discussion in Section 2.4.1.4 (Simulated Training and Testing Only) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that discusses the need for live training specifically for aircrews.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The Fleet Integrated Synthetic Training/Testing Facility, or FIST2FAC, was created in response to urgency for a more inexpensive and portable way for ships to train in any given operating area. The latest iteration of the U.S. Navy's simulator training technology blends live-action exercises with virtual reality. For example, sailors operate a 50-caliber machine gun on a ship, wearing augmented reality glasses, enabling them to see virtual enemy combatants within a live physical setting." ... "The Battlespace Exploitation of Mixed Reality, or BEMR Lab, is also developing inexpensive, cutting edge technology for the U.S. Navy by combining virtual and augmented reality in San Diego. Sponsored by the Office of Naval Research, the BEMR Lab hopes to provide training that could allow virtual reality simulations such as being able to walk the decks of a ship, helping sailors in getting to know the details before ever arriving at the actual vessel. Or, simulating live-fire exercises for a variety of crews, as well as finding a multitude of solutions using advanced technology for many fleet challenges." (Source: https://arpost.co/2018/10/12/us-navy-virtual-augmented-reality-cutting-edge-training-recruitment/)</p>	
Kaczorowski-3	<p>Proposed training and testing activities are generally inconsistent with current data and research and contradicts the Department of Navy's findings and data in the 2015 Final EIS/OEIS and in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>How do the proposed tempo and types of training and testing activities, account for and supersede existing verifiable scientific data as I have presented below?</p> <p>The meta-analysis across species, locations and contexts to determine when and where it may be possible to group species and where they should be treated separately is complex and difficult at best especially with fast moving change in ocean temperatures due to global warming where many marine species are moving in response to ocean warming, disrupting fisheries around the world. Navy Testing and exercises adds to this problem that we are facing in protecting our economically important fisheries.</p> <p>The following study: entitled " Climate change to shift many fish species north, disrupting fisheries" states that</p> <p>"Climate change will force hundreds of ocean fish and invertebrate species, including some of the most economically important to the United States, to move northward, disrupting fisheries in the United States and Canada, a Rutgers University-led study reports. The study, published today in the journal PLOS ONE, covers the North American continental shelves on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts. Previous studies have been global or regional,</p>	<p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>thus being too large or too small to get a clear picture of the future for North America's fisheries. The species surveyed include finfish, sharks and rays, crustaceans, and squid. Among those most affected are Pacific rockfishes, Atlantic cod and black sea bass.</p> <p>Fish are sensitive to the temperatures of the water where they live, and as it becomes too warm, populations often shift to where the water temperature is right for them. This process has already begun, though at different rates in different places. As climate change continues and the oceans warm up, the study shows, more species of fish will move north to where the temperature range is habitable for them.</p> <p>"We've already seen that shifts of a couple of hundred miles in a species' range can disrupt fisheries," said lead author James Morley, a former postdoctoral researcher at Rutgers-New Brunswick. "This study shows that such dislocations will happen all over the continent and on both coasts throughout the 21st century."</p> <p>"For commercial fishers, this often means longer trips and higher fuel costs," said co-author Malin Pinsky, a professor of ecology, evolution and natural resources at the School of Environmental and Biological Sciences at Rutgers University-New Brunswick. "Some species along the U.S. and Canadian Pacific coasts will move as much as 900 miles north from their current habitats."</p> <p>The researchers used 16 different climate models, each with both a low level of greenhouse gas emissions and a high level, to develop projections for future ocean temperatures around North America. The lower-level emissions scenario is in line with goals set by the Paris Accords, from which President Trump withdrew the United States earlier this year. These climate projections were combined with statistical models of species temperature preference, which were based on bottom-trawl survey data from around the continent. While both high and low emission scenarios project some northward shift, the shifts in species habitat will be two to three times greater under a high emissions future.</p> <p>Among the northward moving species is the Alaskan king crab. "People in that fishery already travel a long way to catch crabs—many from as far away as Seattle—so this may not make a big difference to them in the short term," Pinsky said. "But if you're based in North Carolina, fishing for black sea bass, and you have to travel 300 or 400 extra miles to do it, that's a real problem."</p> <p>More information: Morley JW, Selden RL, Latour RJ, Frölicher TL, Seagraves RJ, Pinsky ML (2018) Projecting shifts in thermal habitat for 686 species on</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	the North American continental shelf. PLoS ONE 13(5): e0196127. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0196127	
Kaczorowski-4	<p>U.S. Navy training exercises in the Pacific Ocean could kill, injure, or harass whales, dolphins and other marine mammals 12.5 million times over the next five years.</p> <p>The permits as requested anticipate injuries to 3,346 marine mammals, including three endangered blue whales, 20 humpback whales, 10 minke whales, 93 California long-beaked dolphins, 46 Risso's dolphins, three critically endangered Hawaiian monk seals and 480 northern elephant seals.</p> <p>Ocean mammals depend on hearing for navigation, feeding and reproduction. Scientists have linked military sonar and live-fire activities to mass whale beaching, exploded eardrums and even death. In 2004, during war games near Hawaii, the Navy's sonar was implicated in a mass stranding of up to 200 melon-headed whales in Hanalei Bay, Kauai.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Kaczorowski-5	<p>Many marine animals rely on sound for survival that enable them to communicate, protect themselves, locate food, navigate underwater, and/or understand their environment. They may both produce sounds and listen to the sounds around them.</p> <p>The NWTTEIS /OEIS States That " Most mid-frequency sonar is not heard by marine invertebrates and most marine species (Figure 5 Fish Hearing Group and Navy Bin Frequency Ranges). Fish species known to detect mid-frequencies have their best sensitivities outside the range of operational sonars." This and the other Navy's emphasis that sonar and explosives and military expended materials will not significantly affect habitats, invertebrates or fishes in or near the vicinity of such activities is not supported by independent peer reviewed studies and ignores the complexities of marine species behaviors and physiology.</p> <p>How do marine animals use sound? See: https://dosits.org/animals/use-of-sound/how-do-marine-animals-use-sound (Copyright 2019 University of Rhode Island and Inner Space Center).</p> <p>"Sounds are particularly useful for communication because they can be used to convey a great deal of information quickly and over long distances. Changes in rate, pitch, and/or structure of sounds communicate different messages. In particular, fishes and marine mammals use sound for communications associated with reproduction and territoriality. Some marine mammals also use sound for the maintenance of group structure. Similar to sonar systems on ships, some whales use sound to detect, localize, and characterize objects. By emitting clicks, or short pulses of</p>	<p>The Navy's analysis in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS uses the best available science. There is no information in this comment that disputes any specific analysis in the EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>sound, these marine mammals can listen for echoes and detect objects underwater. This is called echolocation. Some whales and dolphins use echolocation to locate food. They send out pulsed sounds that are reflected back when they strike a target. The analysis of the echoes helps the animals determine the size and shape of an object, its location, whether it is moving, and how far away it is. Echolocation is an effective way to locate prey and also helps whales and dolphins analyze their environment.</p> <p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radford, C. A., Stanley, J. A., Simpson, S. D., & Jeffs, A. G. (2011). Juvenile coral reef fish use sound to locate habitats. <i>Coral Reefs</i>, 30(2), 295–305. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-010-0710-6 • Radford, C., Stanley, J., Tindle, C., Montgomery, J., & Jeffs, A. (2010). Localised coastal habitats have distinct underwater sound signatures. <i>Marine Ecology Progress Series</i>, 401, 21–29. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08451 • Simpson, S. D., Meekan, M. G., Jeffs, A., Montgomery, J. C., & McCauley, R. D. (2008). Settlement-stage coral reef fish prefer the higher-frequency invertebrate-generated audible component of reef noise. <i>Animal Behaviour</i>, 75(6), 1861–1868. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2007.11.004 • Simpson, S. D., Radford, A. N., Tickle, E. J., Meekan, M. G., & Jeffs, A. G. (2011). Adaptive avoidance of reef noise. <i>PLoS ONE</i>, 6(2), e16625. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0016625 <p>The Navy's NWTT Species Dive Distribution and Group Size Parameters Technical Report 29 October 2018 (Distribution and Group Size Parameters for Marine Species Occurring in the U.S. Navy's Northwest Training and Testing Study Area) states:</p> <p>"The recommended static depth distributions are provided for 31 marine animal species or guilds occurring within the NWTT Study Area. These distributions, especially those that rely on surrogates, should be updated periodically as new data become available. Also, for most species, only a single depth distribution is presented; ideally, each species should have multiple distributions available, depending on the behavior and age/sex class of the animals being modeled, as well as the geographic location and season in which the simulation occurs. More detailed depth distribution data will permit improved realism for the scenarios being modeled."</p> <p>The Navy's models and data in the above referenced report and other reports that comprise this 2015 Final EIS/OEIS and in the Supplemental</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	EIS/OEIS are outdated and biased toward supporting naval operations and do not protect noise-sensitive endangered species.	
Kaczorowski-6	<p>The Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973 provides for the conservation of species that are endangered or threatened throughout all or a significant portion of their range, and the conservation of the ecosystems on which they depend.</p> <p>The Navy's Study predicted that there would be a "take" of 500,000 marine mammals, "not necessarily a kill number but would involve behavioral impact, injury or harassment."</p> <p>Any type of take of any endangered species by the U.S. Navy should be prohibited for any take is a violation of the ESA.</p> <p>NOAA Fisheries has listed 22 species of marine mammals under the Endangered Species Act, where 8 of those species are from the West Coast. NOAA manages 7 different species of cetaceans (listed below) and Guadalupe fur seals. NOAA Fisheries' Alaska Region manages Steller sea lions.</p> <p>Blue Whales Fin Whales Guadalupe Fur Seals Central America Humpback Whale DPS * change in status, endangered as of October 2016 Mexico Humpback Whale DPS * change in status, threatened as of October 2016 Northern Pacific Right Whales Western North Pacific Gray Whales Sei Whales Southern Resident Killer Whales Sperm Whales</p> <p>According to NOAA (see https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/gray-whale):</p> <p>"The western population of Gray Whales remains very low, around 200 individuals, and is listed as endangered under the ESA and depleted under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Gray whales are known for their curiosity toward boats and are the focus of whale watching and ecotourism along the west coast of North America. They thus face threats from vessel strikes and disturbance on their migration route. Gray whales make one of the longest annual migrations of any mammal, traveling about 10,000 miles round-trip."</p> <p>"Behavior and Diet"</p>	<p>The Navy has consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service and obtained a permit for takes resulting from the Navy's activities, in accordance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>The Navy considered the information provided in the comment in its analysis of impacts to marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>"Gray whales are frequently observed traveling alone or in small, unstable groups, although large aggregations may be seen in feeding and breeding grounds. Like other baleen whales, long-term bonds between individuals are thought to be rare.</p> <p>They are primarily bottom feeders that consume a wide range of benthic (sea floor) and epibenthic (above the sea floor) invertebrates, such as amphipods. Gray whales suck sediment and food from the sea floor by rolling on their sides and swimming slowly along, filtering their food through 130 to 180 coarse baleen plates on each side of their upper jaw. In doing so, they often leave long trails of mud behind them and "feeding pits" in the sea floor."</p> <p>"Ocean Noise"</p> <p>"Underwater noise threatens whale populations, interrupting their normal behavior and driving them away from areas important to their survival. Increasing evidence suggests that exposure to intense underwater sound in some settings may cause some whales to strand and ultimately die."</p> <p>I am submitting as evidence the following video on the effects of Navy sonar training on marine mammals available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O9gDk29Y_YY This video shows how Navy sonar harms whales and dolphins.</p> <p>In addition, please see the following articles and data that I have included in my public comments as submitted:</p> <p>Advances in research on the impacts of anti-submarine sonar on beaked whales (BW)</p> <p>https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/pdf/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533</p> <p>Section 10. of the Report states:</p> <p>What information is there on beaked whales' reaction to naval exercises where mid-frequency active sonar was used?</p> <p>To assess the behavioural response of BWs to operational Navy MFAS on a Navy training range in southern California, 16 dive reporting satellite tags were attached to Cuvier's BWs [77]. Animals were exposed to two different types of MFAS signal: mid-source level helicopter deployed sonar (217 dB re1mPa @ 1 m), and the ship-based sonar (235 dB re 1mPa @1 m) implicated in most stranding events to date [78]. Although there was variation in response, tagged whales generally increased their time between foraging dives in the presence of sonar, with foraging disruption increasing in duration as the distance to sonar decreased.</p> <p>Unexpectedly, tagged whales responded to ship and helicopter sonar at roughly the same distances, which, given the significantly different source</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>levels, suggests that range to source, source type and/or context may play a large role in response to sonar, at least within a population that is regularly exposed [77]. Large-scale passive acoustic recording arrays have also been used to study changes in vocal patterns of BWs around navy ranges. A cessation of clicking was documented in the presence of sonar, indicating a reduction in foraging effort and/or spatial displacement of whales [79, 80].</p> <p>In the same paper entitled Advances in research on the impacts of anti-submarine sonar on beaked whales (BW) found at https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/pdf/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533</p> <p>The findings outlined in section 13 contradict the Department of Navy's insistence that mitigation would result in minimal take of species as stated in the Department of Navy's Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT) Final Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) in 2015 and the Supplemental NWTT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS (for 2015 -2020).</p> <p>Again, the Navy's Study predicted that there would be a "take" of 500,000 marine mammals, "not necessarily a kill number but would involve behavioral impact, injury or harassment."</p> <p>The above paper also states:</p> <p>"The physiological changes experienced by BWs during MFAS exposure remain unknown and merit further investigation. However, the behavioural response described by DeRuiter et al. [76] and the live strandings of BWs associated with MFAS suggest that these animals are most likely to have experienced a 'flight or fight' response to escape the sonar. The flight response may override the dive response, as the exercise response can [56,59]. We suggest that if these changes are severe, they could drive the animals with individual risk factors to a non-reversible condition, leading to death. Since the physiological responses and health risk factors probably vary among individuals, this variability, and potential differences in exposure level, might explain why not all individuals in a local population strand or perish at the same time and location, as in typical mass stranding".</p> <p>Any harassment or behavioral impact or harm or even deaths upon marine species cannot be immediately seen or justified by the Navy during or after training exercises. Therefore the Navy's arguments are moot and Sonar and Explosives testing cannot be done along the Pacific Coast or migration paths of marine organisms species that depend upon acoustical (sound or vibration) for navigation, feeding, breeding, or communication.</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The Navy's research or their cited data or model simulations as presented cannot prove or claim that their actions as described in this EIS/OEIS that the anatomy, physiology, and pathophysiology is understood or that issues such as the development of decompression-like sickness in whales, and physiological responses of free-swimming marine species will be avoided or mitigated.</p> <p>As indicated in numerous research such as Noise in the Sea and Its Impacts on Marine Organisms and as published in the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2015 Oct; 12(10): 12304–12323. (Published online 2015 Sep 30. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4626970/ doi: 10.3390/ijerph121012304 Noise in the Sea and Its Impacts on Marine Organisms</p> <p>Chao Peng, Xinguo Zhao, and Guangxu Liu*William E. Hawkins, Academic Editor)</p> <p>(The authors of this study declare no conflict of interest)</p> <p>"Studies showed that anthropogenic noise can cause auditory masking, leading to cochlear damage, changes in individual and social behavior, altered metabolisms, hampered population recruitment, and can subsequently affect the health and service functions of marine ecosystems. However, since different sampling methodologies and unstandardized measurements were used and the effects of noise on marine organisms are dependent on the characteristics of the species and noise investigated, it is difficult to compare the reported results. Moreover, the scarcity of studies carried out with other species and with larval or juvenile individuals severely constrains the present understanding of noise pollution. In addition, further studies are needed to reveal in detail the causes for the detected impacts.</p> <p>The French documentary The Silent World, co-directed by the famous French oceanographer Jacques-Yves Cousteau and director Louis Malle in 1956, presented a multi-colored and wonderful undersea world full of life and energy that satisfied the curiosity of audiences at the time. However, with the deepening of the investigation of this "world," the reality has proven not to be as silent as was initially thought. In fact, sound plays a vital role in the lives of many marine organisms in this undersea world. Without doubt, anthropogenic sound from cargo ships, sonar, seismic testing, drilling, pile drivers, recreational holiday ships, and etc. has continued to grow in the last century [1,2,3,4,5]. Consequently, the level of underwater background noise worldwide has increased correspondingly</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>due to increased anthropogenic activities, which gives rise to a new kind of pollution: noise pollution [6].</p> <p>Noise may cause stress in animals, increase the risk of mortality by unbalancing predator-prey interaction, and interfere with sound-based orientation and communication, especially in reproductive contexts [7].</p> <p>There is growing international concern regarding the impact of anthropogenic noise on marine organisms [8]. A number of studies have shown that the effects of anthropogenic sound on marine organisms can range from no influence to immediate death depending on the differences in the intensity and frequency of the noise and the distance from the noise source. However, the mechanisms underlying these effects are still poorly understood [3,9,10,11]."</p> <p>References</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Andrew R.K., Howe B.M., Mercer J.A., Dzieciuch M.A. Ocean ambient sound: Comparing the 1960s with the 1990s for a receiver off the California coast. <i>Acoust. Res. Lett.</i> 2002;3:65–70. doi: 10.1121/1.1461915. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar] 2. Buscaino G., Filiciotto F., Buffa G., Bellante A., di Stefano V., Assenza A., Fazio F., Caola G., Mazzola S. Impact of an acoustic stimulus on the motility and blood parameters of European sea bass (<i>Dicentrarchus labrax</i> L.) and gilthead sea bream (<i>Sparus aurata</i> L.) <i>Mar. Environ. Res.</i> 2010;69:136–142. doi: 10.1016/j.marenvres.2009.09.004. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar] 3. Johansson K. Impact of Anthropogenic Noise on Fish Behaviour and Ecology. 2011. [(accessed on 11 July 2015)]. Available online: http://pub.epsilon.slu.se/8366/1/Johansson_K_111013.pdf. 4. Slotte A., Hansen K., Dalen J., Ona E. Acoustic mapping of pelagic fish distribution and abundance in relation to a seismic shooting area off the Norwegian west coast. <i>Fish. Res.</i> 2004;67:143–150. doi: 10.1016/j.fishres.2003.09.046. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar] 5. Tyack P.L. Implications for marine mammals of large-scale changes in the marine acoustic environment. <i>J. Mammal.</i> 2008;89:549–558. doi: 10.1644/07-MAMM-S-307R.1. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar] 6. Kastelein R.A., Heul S., Verboom W.C., Jennings N., Veen J., de Haan D. Startle response of captive North Sea fish species to underwater tones between 0.1 and 64 kHz. <i>Mar. Environ. Res.</i> 2008;65:369–377. doi: 10.1016/j.marenvres.2008.01.001. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar] 7. Codarin A., Wysocki L.E., Ladich F., Picciulin M. Effects of ambient and boat noise on hearing and communication in three fish species living in a 	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>marine protected area (Miramare, Italy) Mar. Pollut. Bull. 2009;58:1880–1887. doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2009.07.011. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>8. André M. The sperm whale sonar: Monitoring and use in mitigation of anthropogenic noise effects in the marine environment. Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. Sect. A. 2009;602:262–267. doi: 10.1016/j.nima.2008.12.223. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>9. Kight C.R., Swaddle J.P. How and why environmental noise impacts animals: An integrative, mechanistic review. Ecol. Lett. 2011;14:1052–1061. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01664.x. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>10. Popper A.N., Hastings M.C. The effects of human-generated sound on fish. Integr. Zool. 2009;4:43–52. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-4877.2008.00134.x. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>11. Slabbekoorn H., Bouton N., van Opzeeland I., Coers A., Cate C., Popper A.N. A noisy spring: The impact of globally rising underwater sound levels on fish. Trends Ecol. Evolut. 2010;25:419–427. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2010.04.005. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>12. Conservation and Development Problem Solving Team. Anthropogenic Noise in the Marine Environment: Potential Impacts on the Marine Resources and Stellwagen Bank and Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuaries. University of Maryland; Maryland, MD, USA: 2000. pp. 18–19. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>13. Rogers P.H., Cox H. Underwater sound as a biological stimulus. In: Atema J., Fay R.R., Popper A.N., editors. Sensory Biology of Aquatic Animals. Springer-Verlag; New York, NY, USA: 1988. pp. 131–149. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>14. Pitcher T.J. Behaviour of Teleost Fishes. 2nd ed. Chapman & Hall; London, UK: 1992. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>15. Simmonds J., MacLennan D.N. Fisheries Acoustics: Theory and Practice. 2nd ed. Blackwell Publishing; Oxford, UK: 2005. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>16. Helfman G., Collette B.B., Facey D.E., Bowen B.W. The Diversity of Fishes: Biology, Evolution and Ecology. 2nd ed. Wiley-Blackwell; Chichester, UK: 2009. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>17. Hawkins A., Rasmussen K.J. The calls of gadoid fish. J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. UK. 1978;58:891–911. doi: 10.1017/S0025315400056848. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>18. Everest F.A., Young R.W., Johnson M.W. Acoustical characteristics of noise produced by snapping shrimp. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 2005;20:137–142.</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>doi: 10.1121/1.1906355. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>19. Ladich F., Yan H. Correlation between auditory sensitivity and vocalization in anabantoid fishes. J. Comp. Physiol. A. 1998;182:737–746. doi: 10.1007/s003590050218. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>20. Popper A.N., Fay R.R., Platt C., Sand O. Sound detection mechanisms and capabilities of teleost fishes. In: Collins S.P., Marshall N.J., editors. Sensory Processing in Aquatic Environments. Springer-Verlag; New York, NY, USA: 2003. pp. 3–38. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>21. Urlick R.J. Principles of Underwater Sound. 3rd ed. McGraw-Hill; New York, NY, USA: 1983. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>22. McDonald M.A., Hildebrand J.A., Wiggins S.M. Increases in deep ocean ambient noise in the Northeast Pacific west of San Nicolas Island, California. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 2006;120:711–718. doi: 10.1121/1.2216565. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>23. Ross D. Ship sources of ambient noise. IEEE J. Ocean. Eng. 2005;30:257–261. doi: 10.1109/JOE.2005.850879. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>24. Buck E.H. Acoustic Thermometry of Ocean Climate: Marine Mammal Issues. Congressional Research Service; Washington, DC, USA: 1995. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>25. Gisiner R., Cudahy E., Frisk G., Gentry R., Hofman R., Popper A., Richardson W.J. Proceedings: Workshop on the Effects of Anthropogenic Noise in the Marine Environment. Office of Naval Research; Arlington, VA, USA: 1998. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>26. Richardson W.J., Finley K.J., Miller G.W., Davis R.A., Koski W.R. Feeding, social and migration behavior of bowhead whales, Balaena mysticetus, in Baffin Bay vs. the Beaufort Sea—Regions with different amount of human activity. Mar. Mammal Sci. 1995;11:1–45. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-7692.1995.tb00272.x. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>27. Simard Y., Lepage R., Gervaise C. Anthropogenic sound exposure of marine mammals from seaways: Estimates for Lower St. Lawrence Seaway, eastern Canada. Appl. Acoust. 2010;71:1093–1098. doi: 10.1016/j.apacoust.2010.05.012. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>28. Amoser S., Wysocki L.E., Ladich F. Noise emission during the first powerboat race in an Alpine lake and potential impact on fish communities. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 2004;116:3789–3797. doi: 10.1121/1.1808219. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>29. Bregman A.S. Auditory Scene Analysis: The Perceptual Organization of Sound. MIT Press; Cambridge, MA, USA: 1994. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>30. Popper A.N., Hastings M.C. The effects of anthropogenic sources of</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>sound on fishes. J. Fish Biol. 2009;75:455–489. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-8649.2009.02319.x. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>31. Southall B.L., Bowles A.E., Ellison W.T., Finneran J.J., Gentry R.L., Greene C.R., Kastak D., Ketten D.R., Miller J.H., Nachtigall P.E., et al. Marine mammal noise-exposure criteria: Initial scientific recommendations. Bioacoustics. 2008;17:273–275. doi: 10.1080/09524622.2008.9753846. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>32. Brawn V.M. Sound production by the cod (Gadus callarias L.) Behaviour. 1961;18:239–255. doi: 10.1163/156853961X00150. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>33. Schwarz A.L. The behavior of fishes in their acoustic environment. Environ. Biol. Fishes. 1985;13:3–15. doi: 10.1007/BF00004851. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>34. Scholik A.R., Yan H.Y. The effects of noise on the auditory sensitivity of the bluegill sunfish, Lepomis macrochirus. Comp. Biochem. Physiol. Part A. 2002;133:43–52. doi: 10.1016/S1095-6433(02)00108-3. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>35. Lagardère J. Effects of noise on growth and reproduction of Crangon crangon in rearing tanks. Mar. Biol. 1982;71:177–185. doi: 10.1007/BF00394627. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>36. Løkkeborg S., Soldal A.V. The influence of seismic exploration with airguns on cod (Gadus morhua) behaviour and catch rates. ICES J. Mar. Sci. Symp. 1993;196:62–67. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>37. McCauley R.D., Fewtrell J., Popper A.N. High intensity anthropogenic sound damages fish ears. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 2003;113:638–642. doi: 10.1121/1.1527962. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>38. Schwarz A.L., Greer G.L. Responses of Pacific herring, Clupea harengus pallasi, to some underwater sounds. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 1984;41:1183–1192. doi: 10.1139/f84-140. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>39. Aguilar de Soto N., Delorme N., Atkins J., Howard S., Williams J., Johnson M. Anthropogenic noise causes body malformations and delays development in marine larvae. Sci. Rep. 2013;3:2831–2835. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>40. Engås A. The effects of trawl performance and fish behaviour on the catching efficiency of demersal sampling trawls. In: Ferno A., Olsen S., editors. Marine Fish Behaviour in Capture and Abundance Estimation. Fishing News Books; Oxford, UK: 1994. pp. 45–68. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>41. Engås A., Løkkeborg S., Ona E., Soldal A.V. Effects of seismic shooting on local abundance and catch rates of cod (Gadus morhua) and haddock</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>(<i>Melanogrammus aeglefinus</i>) Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 1996;53:2238–2249. doi: 10.1139/f96-177. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>42. Nicholson M., Rackham B., Mitson R. Measuring the effect of underwater radiated noise on trawl catches; Proceedings of the ICES FTFB and FAST Joint Working Group Meeting; Bergen, Norway. 16 June 1992. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>43. Skalski J.R., Pearson W.H., Malme C.I. Effects of sounds from a geophysical survey device on catch-per-unit-effort in a hook-and-line fishery for rockfish (<i>Sebastes</i> spp.) Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 1992;49:1357–1365. doi: 10.1139/f92-151. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>44. Clark C.W., Ellison W.T., Southall B.L., Hatch L., Parijs S.M., Frankel A., Ponirakis D. Acoustic masking in marine ecosystems: Intuitions, analysis, and implication. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 2009;395:201–222. doi: 10.3354/meps08402. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>45. Southall B.L., Schusterman R.J., Kastak D. Acoustic communication ranges for northern elephant seals (<i>Mirounga angustirostris</i>) Aquat. Mammal. 2003;29:202–213. doi: 10.1578/016754203101024158. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>46. Vasconcelos R.O., Amorim M.C., Ladich F. Effects of ship noise on the detectability of communication signals in the Lusitanian toadfish. J. Exp. Biol. 2007;210:2104–2112. doi: 10.1242/jeb.004317. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>47. Aguilar de Soto N., Johnson M., Madsen P.T.M., Tyack P.L., Bocconcelli A., Borsani F. Dose intense ship noise disrupt foraging in deep-diving Cuvier’s beaked whales (<i>Ziphius cavirostris</i>)? Mar. Mammal Sci. 2006;22:690–699. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-7692.2006.00044.x. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>48. Lucke K., Siebert U., Lepper P.A., Blanchet M.A. Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds in a harbor porpoise (<i>Phocoena phocoena</i>) after exposure to seismic airgun stimuli. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 2009;125:4060–4070. doi: 10.1121/1.3117443. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>49. Nachtigall P.E., Supin A.Y., Pawloski J., Au W.W. Temporary threshold shifts after noise exposure in the bottlenose dolphin (<i>Tursiops truncatus</i>) measured using evoked auditory potentials. Mar. Mammal Sci. 2004;20:673–687. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-7692.2004.tb01187.x. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>50. Popper A.N., Smith M.E., Cott P.A., Hanna B.W., MacGillivray A.O., Austin M.E., Mann D.A. Effects of exposure to seismic airgun use on hearing of three fish species. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 2005;117:3958–3971. doi:</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>10.1121/1.1904386. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>51. Scholik A.R., Yan H.Y. Effects of underwater noise on auditory sensitivity of a cyprinid fish. <i>Hear. Res.</i> 2001;152:17–24. doi: 10.1016/S0378-5955(00)00213-6. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>52. André M., Solé M., Lenoir M., Durfort M., Quero C., Mas A., Lombarte A., van der Schaar M., López-Bejar M., Morell M., et al. Low-frequency sounds induce acoustic trauma in cephalopods. <i>Front. Ecol. Environ.</i> 2011;9:489–493. doi: 10.1890/100124. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>53. Guerra Á., González Á.F., Pascual S., Dawe E.G. The giant squid <i>Architeuthis</i>: An emblematic invertebrate that can represent concern for the conservation of marine biodiversity. <i>Biol. Conserv.</i> 2011;144:1989–1997. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>54. Fewtrell J.L., McCauley R.D. Impact of air gun noise on the behaviour of marine fish and squid. <i>Mar. Pollut. Bull.</i> 2012;64:984–993. doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2012.02.009. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>55. Tyack P.L., Zimmer W.M., Moretti D., Southall B.L., Claridge D.E., Durban J.W., Clark C.W., D’Amico A., DiMarzio N., Jarvis S., et al. Beaked whales respond to simulated and actual navy sonar. <i>PLoS ONE.</i> 2011;6 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0017009. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>56. DeRuiter S., Larbi Doukare K. Loggerhead turtles dive in response to airgun sound exposure. <i>Endanger. Species Res.</i> 2012;16:55–63. doi: 10.3354/esr00396. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>57. Picciulin M., Sebastianutto L., Codarin A., Farina A., Ferrero E.A. In situ behavioural responses to boat noise exposure of <i>Gobius cruentatus</i> (Gmelin, 1789; fam. Gobiidae) and <i>Chromis chromis</i> (Linnaeus, 1758; fam. Pomacentridae) living in a Marine Protected Area. <i>J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.</i> 2010;386:125–132. doi: 10.1016/j.jembe.2010.02.012. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>58. Bruintjes R., Radford A.N. Context-dependent impacts of anthropogenic noise on individual and social behaviour in a cooperatively breeding fish. <i>Anim. Behav.</i> 2013;85:1343–1349. doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.03.025. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>59. Purser J., Radford A.N. Acoustic noise induces attention shifts and reduces foraging performance in three-spined sticklebacks (<i>Gasterosteus aculeatus</i>) <i>PLoS ONE.</i> 2011;6 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0017478. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>60. Chan A.A., Giraldo-Perez P., Smith S., Blumstein D.T. Anthropogenic noise affects risk assessment and attention: The distracted prey hypothesis.</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Biol. Lett. 2010;6:458–461. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2009.1081. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>61. Wale M.A., Simpson S.D., Radford A.N. Noise negatively affects foraging and antipredator behaviour in shore crabs. Anim. Behav. 2013;86:111–118. doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.05.001. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>62. David J.A. Likely sensitivity of bottlenose dolphins to pile-driving noise. Water Environ. J. 2006;20:48–54. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-6593.2005.00023.x. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>63. Miller P.J., Biassoni N., Samuels A., Tyack P.L. Whale songs lengthen in response to sonar. Nature. 2000;405:903–903. doi: 10.1038/35016148. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>64. Parks S.E., Clark C.W., Tyack P.L. Short- and long-term changes in right whale calling behavior: The potential effects of noise on acoustic communication. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 2007;122:3725–3731. doi: 10.1121/1.2799904. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>65. Frankel A., Clark C. Behavioral responses of humpback whales (Megaptera novaeangliae) to full-scale ATOC signals. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 2000;108:1930–1937. doi: 10.1121/1.1289668. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>66. Bailey H., Senior B., Simmons D., Rusin J., Picken G., Thompson P.M. Assessing underwater noise levels during pile-driving at an offshore windfarm and its potential effects on marine mammals. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 2010;60:888–897. doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.01.003. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>67. Wardle C., Carter T., Urquhart G., Johnstone A., Ziolkowski A., Hampson G., Mackie D. Effects of seismic air guns on marine fish. Cont. Shelf Res. 2001;21:1005–1027. doi: 10.1016/S0278-4343(00)00122-9. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>68. Frantz A. Does acoustic testing strand whales? Nature. 1998;392 doi: 10.1038/32068. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>69. Klima E.F., Gitschlag G.R., Renaud M.L. Impacts of the explosive removal of offshore petroleum on sea turtles and dolphins. Mar. Fish. Rev. 1988;50:33–42. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>70. Cox T.M., Ragen T.J., Read A.J., Vos E., Baird R.W., Balcomb K., Barlow J., Caldwell J., Cranford T., Crum L., et al. Understanding the impacts of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. J. Cetacean Res. Manag. 2006;7:177–187. [Google Scholar]</p> <p>71. Fernández A., Edwards J.F., Rodríguez F., Espinosa de los Monteros A., Herráez P., Castro P., Jaber J.R., Martín V., Arbelo M. “Gas and fat embolic</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>syndrome” involving a mass stranding of beaked whales (family Ziphiidae) exposed to anthropogenic sonar signals. Vet. Pathol. 2005;42:446–457. doi: 10.1354/vp.42-4-446. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>72. Jepson P.D., Arbelo M., Deaville R., Patterson I.A.P., Castro P., Baker J.R., Degollada E., Ross H.M., Herráez P., Pocknell A.M., et al. Gas-bubble lesions in stranded cetaceans: Was sonar responsible for a spate of whale deaths after an Atlantic military exercise? Nature. 2003;425:575–576. doi: 10.1038/425575a. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>73. Morton A. Displacement of Orcinus orca (L.) by high amplitude sound in British Columbia, Canada. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 2002;59:71–80. doi: 10.1006/jmsc.2001.1136. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>74. Carstensen J., Henriksen O.D., Teilmann J. Impacts of offshore wind farm construction on harbour porpoises: Acoustic monitoring of echolocation activity using porpoise detectors (T-PODs) Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 2006;321:295–308. doi: 10.3354/meps321295. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>75. Thompson P.M., Lusseau D., Barton T., Simmons D., Rusin J., Bailey H. Assessing the responses of coastal cetaceans to the construction of offshore wind turbines. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 2010;60:1200–1208. doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.03.030. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>76. Engås A., Løkkeborg S. Effects of seismic shooting and vessel-generated noise on fish behaviour and catch rates. Bioacoustics. 2002;12:313–316. doi: 10.1080/09524622.2002.9753733. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>77. Parry G.D., Gason A. The effect of seismic surveys on catch rates of rock lobsters in western Victoria, Australia. Fish. Res. 2006;79:272–284. doi: 10.1016/j.fishres.2006.03.023. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>78. Wilhelmsson D., Malm T., Ohman M. The influence of offshore windpower on demersal fish. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 2006;63:775–784. doi: 10.1016/j.icesjms.2006.02.001. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>79. Pearson W.H., Skalski J.R., Sulkin S.D., Malme C.I. Effects of seismic energy releases on the survival and development of zoeal larvae of dungeness crab (Cancer magister) Mar. Environ. Res. 1994;38:93–113. doi: 10.1016/0141-1136(94)90003-5. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>80. Pine M.K., Jeffs A.G., Radford C.A. Turbine sound may influence the metamorphosis behaviour of estuarine crab megalopae. PLoS ONE. 2012;7 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0051790. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>81. Romano T.A., Keogh M.J., Kelly C., Feng P., Berk L., Schlundt C.E., Carder D.A., Finneran J.J. Anthropogenic sound and marine mammal health:</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Measures of the nervous and immune systems before and after intense sound exposure. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2004;61:1124–1134. doi: 10.1139/f04-055. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>82. Wale M.A., Simpson S.D., Radford A.N. Size-dependent physiological responses of shore crabs to single and repeated playback of ship noise. Biol. Lett. 2013;9 doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2012.1194. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>83. Anderson P.A., Berzins I.K., Fogarty F., Hamlin H.J., Guillet L.J. Sound, stress, and seahorses: The consequences of a noisy environment to animal health. Aquaculture. 2011;311:129–138. doi: 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2010.11.013. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>84. Santulli A., Modica A., Messina C., Ceffa L., Curatolo A., Rivas G., Fabi G., D’amelio V. Biochemical responses of European sea bass (<i>Dicentrarchus labrax</i> L.) to the stress induced by off shore experimental seismic prospecting. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 1999;38:1105–1114. doi: 10.1016/S0025-326X(99)00136-8. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>85. Casper B.M., Halvorsen M.B., Matthews F., Carlson T.J., Pooper A.N. Recovery of barotraumas injuries resulting from exposure to pile driving sound in two sizes of hybrid striped bass. PLoS ONE. 2013;8 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0073844. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>86. Lyamin O.I., Korneva S.M., Rozhnov V.V., Mukhametov L.M. Cardiorespiratory changes in beluga in response to acoustic noise. Dokl. Biol. Sci. 2011;440:257–258. doi: 10.1134/S0012496611050218. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>87. Celi M., Filiciotto F., Vazzana M., Arizza V., Maccarrone V., Ceraulo M., Mazzola S., Buscaino G. Shipping noise affecting immune responses of European spiny lobster (<i>Palinurus elephas</i>) Can. J. Zool. 2014;93:113–121. doi: 10.1139/cjz-2014-0219. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>88. Filiciotto F., Giacalone V.M., Fazio F., Buffa G., Piccione G., Maccarrone V., di Stefano V., Mazzola S., Buscaino G. Effect of acoustic environment on gilthead sea bream (<i>Sparus aurata</i>): Sea and onshore aquaculture background noise. Aquaculture. 2013;414:36–45. doi: 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2013.07.042. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p> <p>89. Papoutsoglou S.E., Karakatsouli N., Batzina A., Papoutsoglou E.S., Tsopelakos A. Effect of music stimulus on gilthead seabream <i>Sparus aurata</i> physiology under different light intensity in a re-circulating water system. J. Fish Biol. 2008;73:980–1004. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-8649.2008.02001.x. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Kaczorowski-7	<p>Here is another article that disputes the Navy’s arguments that takings of marine species is based on best available science: Does Military Sonar Kill Marine Wildlife? © 2019 Scientific American, a Division of Springer Nature America, Inc. Title of Article: “The frequency used in military testing could be harmful to some animals” Dear EarthTalk: Is it true that military sonar exercises actually kill marine wildlife? -- John Slocum, Newport, RI</p> <p>Unfortunately for many whales, dolphins and other marine life, the use of underwater sonar (short for sound navigation and ranging) can lead to injury and even death. Sonar systems—first developed by the U.S. Navy to detect enemy submarines—generate slow-rolling sound waves topping out at around 235 decibels; the world’s loudest rock bands top out at only 130. These sound waves can travel for hundreds of miles under water, and can retain an intensity of 140 decibels as far as 300 miles from their source. These rolling walls of noise are no doubt too much for some marine wildlife. While little is known about any direct physiological effects of sonar waves on marine species, evidence shows that whales will swim hundreds of miles, rapidly change their depth (sometime leading to bleeding from the eyes and ears), and even beach themselves to get away from the sounds of sonar.</p> <p>In January 2005, 34 whales of three different species became stranded and died along North Carolina’s Outer Banks during nearby offshore Navy sonar training. Other sad examples around the coast of the U.S. and elsewhere abound, notably in recent years with more sonar testing going on than ever before. According to the nonprofit Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), which has campaigned vigorously to ban use of the technology in waters rich in marine wildlife, recent cases of whale strandings likely represent a small fraction of sonar’s toll, given that severely injured animals rarely make it to shore.</p> <p>In 2003, NRDC spearheaded a successful lawsuit against the Navy to restrict the use of low-frequency sonar off the coast of California. Two years later a coalition of green groups led by NRDC and including the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), the League for Coastal Protection, Cetacean Society International, and Ocean Futures Society upped the ante, asking the federal courts to also restrict testing of more intense, harmful and far ranging mid-frequency types of sonar off Southern California’s coastline. In filing their brief, the groups cited Navy documents which estimated that</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, and the “Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June 2017)” (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>such testing would kill some 170,000 marine mammals and cause permanent injury to more than 500 whales, not to mention temporary deafness for at least 8,000 others. Coalition lawyers argued that the Navy's testing was in violation of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act. Two lower courts upheld NRDC's claims, but the Supreme Court ruled that the Navy should be allowed to continue the use of some mid-frequency sonar testing for the sake of national security. "The decision places marine mammals at greater risk of serious and needless harm," says NRDC's Joel Reynolds.</p> <p>Environmental groups are still fighting the battle against the sonar, lobbying the government to curtail testing, at least during peacetime, or to at least ramp up testing gradually to give marine wildlife a better chance to flee affected areas. "The U.S. Navy could use a number of proven methods to avoid harming whales when testing mid-frequency sonar," reports IFAW's Fred O'Regan. "Protecting whales and preserving national security are not mutually exclusive."</p> <p>And gain another article: Sonar Can Literally Scare Whales to Death, Study Finds By Mindy Weisberger, Senior Writer January 30, 2019 01:12pm ET (Live Science)</p> <p>Mindy Weisberger is a senior writer for Live Science covering general science topics, especially those relating to brains, bodies, and behaviors in humans and other animals — living and extinct. Mindy studied filmmaking at Columbia University; her videos about dinosaurs, biodiversity, human origins, evolution, and astrophysics appear in the American Museum of Natural History, on YouTube, and in museums and science centers worldwide.</p> <p>Scientists first noted a connection between mass strandings of Cuvier's beaked whales and naval exercises using sonar in the late 1980s, lead study author Yara Bernaldo de Quirós, a researcher at the Institute for Animal Health and Food Safety at the University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria in Spain, told Live Science in an email.</p> <p>That link strengthened after similar stranding events in Greece in 1996 and in the Bahamas in 2000, de Quirós added. And in September 2002, when 14 beaked whales stranded in the Canary Islands during a NATO naval exercise, veterinary pathologists discovered lesions in the animals that were "consistent with a decompression sickness," de Quirós said.</p> <p>Fight or flight</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>In 2017, biologists studying beaked whales gathered for a workshop to analyze findings about strandings from the past decades, looking at mass strandings that were linked to nearby naval exercises using sonar. Between 2002 and 2014, six mass strandings took place in Greece, the Canary Islands and Almería in southeastern Spain, but the dead whales did not appear to be malnourished or sick. However, they displayed "abundant gas bubbles" throughout their veins, blood clots in multiple organs and microscopic hemorrhages "of varying severity" in body tissues. Beached whales may have experienced "a fight or flight response" that overrode a key diving adaptation: the lowering of heart rate, which reduces oxygen consumption and prevents nitrogen accumulation. The result was hemorrhages and "massive bubble formation in their tissues," de Quirós explained.</p> <p>These symptoms of decompression sickness likely afflicted the whales after they were spooked by sonic blasts, according to the study.</p> <p>"The temporal and spatial association with naval exercises with use of sonar is very clear," de Quirós said in the email. What's more, behavioral studies have shown that whales that have never encountered sonar (or that have been exposed to it only occasionally) typically exhibit a stronger response than animals living near military outposts, she added.</p> <p>In 2004, Spain banned sonar in Canary Islands waters, a mass-strandings hotspot. No mass strandings have taken place since the ban was enacted, "proving the effectiveness of this mitigation," de Quirós said.</p> <p>Based on their findings, the study authors recommended more-widespread bans on military exercises using sonar across the Mediterranean Sea, where atypical mass strandings of beaked whales still take place. Further research will determine the long-term impact of mass strandings on beaked whale populations, the authors wrote in the study.</p> <p>The findings were published online Jan. 30 2019) in the journal Proceedings of the Royal Society B.</p>	
Kaczorowski-8	<p>The CASE for Alternative Navy Trainings: 1/25/2019 By Connie Lee Navy Turns to Simulators Following Deadly Collisions © 2019 National Defense Industrial Association Longer term plans include pursuing a new maritime skills training program that includes the installation of new simulation systems and instructors, Pennington said. The program will provide a "holistic approach" to training, Pennington noted.</p>	<p>The Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, see the discussion in Section 2.4.1.4 (Simulated Training and Testing Only) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that discusses the need for live training specifically for aircrews.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The Navy will deliver simulators to six locations in fiscal year 2021, which include Yokosuka, Japan; Sasebo, Japan; Pearl Harbor, Hawaii; Everett, Washington; San Diego; and Mayport, Florida. Simulators will be delivered to Norfolk, Virginia; Rota, Spain; and Bahrain in fiscal years 2022 and 2023, the statement said.</p> <p>“The technology that we’re going to bring ... is going to be outstanding,” Pennington said. “In the interim, we’re going to try to get as much capability to the left [of schedule] to modify the existing NSSTs to ensure that we have that integrated training.” Future simulation tools will also have an improved playback capability to allow students to see their performance after completing training exercises. He envisioned having a separate room dedicated to conducting debriefings. This format would allow instructors to point out specific mistakes made during the exercise on a screen rather than rely on memory and notes, he said.</p> <p>“A lot of times, what we have found is that during the debriefs, the watchstanders [would say,] ‘No, I didn’t do that.’ ... We used to have these debates, and it was always a bad feeling at the end,” he said. “As an instructor, I could never prove to that watchstander, ‘No you really did.’”</p> <p>Navy to Open New Facility for Live-Virtual-Constructive Training Technology (UPDATED) http://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/articles/2018/11/30/navy-to-open-new-facility-for-live-virtual-and-constructive-technology-work-11/30/2018 By Connie Lee ORLANDO, Fla. — The Navy is opening a new facility that will allow members of industry, government and academia to work on live-virtual-constructive training initiatives year-round. The facility will be like Operation Blended Warrior “on steroids,” Kent Gritton, LVC for training team lead at the Naval Air Warfare Center Training Systems Division, said Nov. 29 at the Interservice/Industry Training, Simulation and Education Conference in Orlando, Florida. Operation Blended Warrior is an annual event held at I/ITSEC that allows participants to work on a common network in a wargame-like environment. LVC training technologies include simulation and virtual reality products. The Future of War May Be Virtual The U.S. is investing billions into virtual reality training for the military by 2022. https://www.usnews.com/news/best-countries/articles/2018-03-20/the-us-military-wants-to-lead-the-innovation-game-in-vr</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Training military personnel to keep up with new technology has always been a challenging and expensive process and is long due for a change, say experts. By 2022, as much as \$11 billion will go to virtual, augmented and mixed reality training systems, with virtual reality becoming a primary focus of military innovation.</p> <p>While projections vary in this new industry, the virtual reality market is rapidly expanding worldwide. Overall the global VR market is expected to reach \$75 billion by 2021, with China's demand potentially surpassing 85 million units by 2021 and passing America's 68 million units forecast. With the consumer sector driving innovation and spending on the market, in countries such as the U.K., South Korea and Australia, platforms have also been developed for incorporating VR strategies in the government sector, such as the military.</p> <p>According to a brief sponsored by Samsung and put together by FedScoop, a media platform covering the federal government market, the U.S. Department of Defense has relied so far on live training sessions, simulating true-to-life battle scenarios, computers simulators or interaction with avatars in a so-called "synthetic environment." For "synthetic" digital training alone, the U.S. spends around \$14 billion a year, the brief shows. But as technology is making progress and mobile technology improves, so are the training methods for the troops.</p> <p>Thanks to courses and simulators that can now work on mobile devices with only VR gear attached, soldiers can now be trained anywhere in the world through cloud-shared content. They can simulate using new weapons, engage in new military strategies, even practice high-risk jumps from military planes. Additionally, veterans can immerse themselves in therapeutic environments to help them cope with their post-war anxiety.</p> <p>"The U.S. Department of Defense is leading the charts relative to immersive (technologies)", says Chris Balcik, vice president of federal government sales for Samsung, the electronics company that also produces technology for military use. "There is a lot of capability that we have just started to scratch the surface on where the needs can really go so that the use of virtual, augmented, mixed realities be a complement to that large footprint of that live, virtual, constructed space [currently used in military training]."</p>	
Kaczyk-1	<p>Growler training endangers the natural quiet in Olympic National Park, the quality of life for Kitsap and Olympic Peninsula residents, and the attractiveness of Whidbey Island and the Olympic Peninsula to tourism, which is an economic backbone of these communities.</p> <p>In particular, flying over Olympic National Park degrades one of our</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>countries quietest places – Olympic National Park – as well as surrounding communities and public lands.</p> <p>The Navy has alternative locations for these training missions which do not involve flying over Olympic National Park. While the Navy has other options, there is only one Olympic National Park, one of the most natural sounding places left in the contiguous United States, and the most visited national park in the Northwest. The Olympics should sound like a national park, not a Navy airbase.</p> <p>We emphatically state our opposition to increased Growler training and to urge the Navy to use other locations to meet its training needs.</p>	<p>Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Kadan-1	<p>This coastline of Northern CA is a major migration route for whales such as grays and humpbacks, as well as orcas and blue whales. While the plan is to test within 12 miles of the coastline, it seems to ignore the extent to which sound travels, underwater and through the air. Even 2 or 3 hundred miles from its source sonar can produce a sound as high as 140 decibels, which is many times the level known to alter the behavior of whales. This use of high intensity mid frequency sonar will be harmful to more than a dozen protected species of marine mammals. The use of sonar has been proven to have been linked to many cases in which beached whales that have died from baro- trauma following sonar exercises conducted by the U.S. Navy. Noise pollution negatively impacts not only whales. We also have dolphins and many species of fish off our coast which will be affected by the noise, Ocean mammals depend on their hearing for navigation, and live-fire activities and military sonar have been linked to mass beaching of whales, burst eardrums, and death.</p> <p>How will the Navy guarantee it will not disrupt life sustaining behaviors of marine mammals, which they are dependent upon for survival?</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Kal-1	<p>Horrible! That must be stopped. It is cruel and harmful.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Kaluhiokalani-1	<p>I believe the finalization of the Navy's suspension of North Coast testing should come with haste. The Tribes concerns should be heard out. The government-government negotiation should take the side of the tribes and the natural ecosystem being affected. From the basis of where we</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	developed sonar, marine mammals should be respected and harm against these all these species listed in the Draft EIS should be stopped.	<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Kamaruzaman-1	100% against harmful underwater sonar testing	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Kanieski-1	<p>I am suggesting an adaptive management approach be considered when considering impacts on southern resident orca whales, which are at critical levels of risk. This is an area where we have direct influence and these types of activities can be done with lower frequency or outside their range. Thank you.</p> <p>Overall, I believe we invest too many financial resources in military readiness for "war". The nature of conflict and risks to humanity have changed. Let's take military money and spend it on mitigating and adapting to global warming and environmental destruction.</p>	As described in Section 5.1.2.2.1.1 (Adaptive Management) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has been and will continue to be engaged in an adaptive management review process with the National Marine Fisheries Service the Marine Mammal Commission, and other experts in the scientific community.
Kanzell-1	<p>To all it may concern</p> <p>I just returned from 9 days on the lost coast of California</p> <p>It had been 20 years since I was last there and it seemed nothing had changed. The rugged beauty of the land evident.</p> <p>What was remarkable to me was the magnificent bio diversity I found in both marine life as well shore flora and fauna</p> <p>To see how, even with humans walking the shore each day, the respect of "leaving no trace " clearly honored</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	We have such limited resources such as these as the animals know that I urge all concerned to strongly consider this when thinking about the impact testing will and does have on the land and sea we all share Let us not take this all for granted Thank you	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinemonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Kapow-1	I am 100% in opposition to sonar testing!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Karki-1	To Whom this May Concern, I'm appalled that this testing and training is even a consideration knowing the potential damage on our marine life. It would be really great if the people making these decisions actually considered things like the environment, our children and grandchildren and even us in the time that we have left, and the fact that our country is not in danger, so these tests are a waste of money in addition to hurtful to the ecosystem. Please reconsider these unnecessary actions.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinemonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Karkruff-1	Gray Whales are stranding along our west coast in greater numbers than the past. Shipping lanes and coastal boating traffic are causing many	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>injuries. Plastic pollution is rupturing whale stomachs and blocking their digestive systems causing them to starve. Norwegian and Japanese whaling is ongoing. Adding military sonar that disrupts a whale's "vision" of its world will speed their demise. The ocean is already losing species, for example the coastal kelp forests which is nursery habitat for many lower level food species.</p> <p>Please listen to the Bioneers podcast, Whale Whisperers by James Nestor and read Seaweed Chronicles by Susan Hand Shetterly.</p>	<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Kaufman-1	<p>Please support our Orcas in the Salish Sea. Whales of all kinds are an inspiration and since I was young they have all brought me joy and peace, especially knowing they were out there and doing well. I grew up knowing and hearing the phrase "Save the whales". It has never left me. I don't want any danger caused by humans to interfere with their numbers. Right now is a hard time for our Orcas due to dwindling food supplies. Please stop the sonar testing. I'm asking that the needs of the Navy be stopped or be met elsewhere, not sure where, but not in the Salish Sea during this difficult time of dwindling salmon population for our magical Orca beauties.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Kaul-1	<p>I am strongly opposed to increasing the growlers at OLF, and to conducting training and testing activities at sea and around the Olympic Peninsula. As a library staff member, I have read some of the EIS, and seen that the study's own scientists confirmed that both these escalations of military testing will seriously harm the marine environment, the local economies, and impact residents tremendously.</p> <p>Where our local orca population is concerned" mitigation" is not going to help-- sonar and explosives will be the death knell for these endangered creatures, who depend entirely on echolocation to locate food, communicate and navigate. I received a card saying the Draft EIS evaluated new, relevant information -- and as I read the conclusions, they affirm that the exercises are seriously detrimental to schools, hospitals and general Whidbey Island's quality of life. I live near Double Bluff, and already hear too many Growlers,- and friends from the Coupeville area are dismayed at</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>what this onslaught is doing to their economy, real estate values and peace.</p> <p>At the library I have heard comments from many people that this is "an outrage" or "a terrible location" to conduct these activities. I stand with the Sound Defense Alliance in opposing this move, and urge you to take this business elsewhere.</p>	
Kaur-1	<p>I am completely against this. The US Navy obviously doesnt give a <i>[expletive deleted]</i> about these beautiful creatures that have been on Earth longer than we have. The Navy has known that they're tests affect these mammals severely but they don't have enough respect for them to stop doing these tests or to at least find another spot to carry out these tests. This isn't acceptable. The Navy needs to stop being selfish and make some changes. Good changes. Please stop this cruelty, and stop it as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Kayler-1	<p>We are on the north end of Camano Island. We have been here for a year and a half. Last summer, the planes didn't bother me. There were days were they were active and days when they were not. Now, it seems they are flying all the time and more and more often they start up right when we are going to bed in the evening.</p> <p>This afternoon we had one fly so low over our house I had to cover my ears and it vibrated my whole body. My husband was using the weed eater and he could hear over that! If I had had my phone with me I would have recorded it, because it was WAY TOO LOUD! And that was the lowest I had ever seen one of those planes fly over us.</p> <p>We do not expect the Navy to stop flying, but we do feel that there should be some consideration for the residents of Widbey and Camano.</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>
Keegan-1	<p>The infringement of the Naval exercises is beyond imagination. Our beautiful island and peninsula are under seige. People are being diagnosed with brain tumors at an alarming rate. Noise from Growlers shakes houses, businesses and the earth beneath our feet. Are you at war</p>	<p>Growler noise on Whidbey Island is outside the scope of the NWTTE EIS/OEIS. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	with the citizens of Whidbey Island and the Western Peninsula? Anything you can do here, you can do in the large, uninhabited areas of the US. Take a road trip and introduce yourselves to the pristine lands where people haven't developed. Where people don't call home. I moved here from San Diego in large part to get away from the military incursion. Now, 27 years later, here we are again. This is my home. You have the base at the north end, beyond that, it belongs to the property owners. You must observe the boundaries of life, as we all must. Please stop. You are not welcome here.	
Keenan-1	Please stop sonar testing.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Kelk-1	Please no more flights! You're driving us crazy already.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Keller-1	I am 100% against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Kelly B-1	The U.S. Navy is plans to expand war-training exercises off the Coast of California near the path of the annual Gray Whale migration including the use of sonar, explosions and release of chemicals into the ocean. Gray	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Whales travel through this environment two times a year. Our family lives on the Ocean in Mendocino, Ca and our family of four opposes the Navy's desire to conduct these exercises in our backyard.	<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Kelly C-1	I am a veteran who served my country during the Vietnam Conflict...I was raised in Anacortes and am being driven from my home by the noise. Please consider my declining years. I am not a scientist with facts and figures. Only a US citizen and veteran who wishes the best for the nation and the people of that nation....Please curtail flights over populated areas.	The activities proposed in the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Kelly K-1	the navy does not do real noise monitoring of the growlers. therefore they are unable to accurately judge the harm caused by the noise. I am unable to be outside while they are flying over my house.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Kelso-1	Comments are in attached file as Word document.	See responses below.
Kelso-2	I write this in haste, as I have just learned that the comment period for the Navy EIS regarding an extension of the permit to perform warfare training on the Olympic Peninsula ends on 12 June 2019. First, a full 90 days should be granted to allow for comments to the Navy's proposals, as is standard for an EIS of this scope. Second, the No Action Alternative is the only one which is acceptable to protect our increasingly fragile ecosystem here on the Olympic Peninsula, and the only one which will grant our communities freedom from continued assault. I have lived on the outskirts of the community of Port	The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Townsend for over thirty years, settling here because of the beauty and peace of the place, and this is quickly being eroded by the Navy's current escalation of activities, which is projected to get very much worse if you are allowed to proceed with plans to increase training and testing in our area. Please choose to do the right thing for our environment and your neighboring communities here on the Olympic Peninsula, and do not expand your warfare training exercises onto our home land.	
Kemper-1	I think it would be important to look at past studies similar on to these tests and fins what kind effects these tests have on marine life and to also consider the changing environment. Which is to say would your tests be even more impactful towards marine life with climate change.	The Navy uses the best available science, reviewing and considering thousands of past studies in reaching the conclusions in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy considers the current affected environment, which includes the affects of climate change. Additionally, the Navy has conducted similar activities for decades in the NWTT Study Area, with no indication of harm to any fish or marine invertebrate species. Additionally, the Navy is committed to improving the body of scientific knowledge, and in fact is the largest funding source in the world on marine mammal and marine acoustic research.
Kennedy-1	<p>I am writing in opposition to the draft EIS/OEIS Supplemental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Northwest Training and Testing, which would extend for another five years the Navy's practice of flying Growlers over the Olympic National Park, Olympic National Forest, and Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. The Navy should take its electromagnetic beam emitter training to a site designated for warfare training, for example in Idaho and Nevada; the Olympic Peninsula is NOT such an area. It is not a question of whether the Navy should train; the point is that the Navy should take its training to an area where such training is legal and appropriate, and not continue to conduct it in the most pristine, unspoiled area of the United States!</p> <p>My husband and I live a short distance from the Olympic National Park boundary, having purchased our property primarily for the peace and quiet. Our daily walks, however, are repeatedly interrupted by the obnoxious and long-lasting Growler noise. The idea of having to live with these impacts (and increased impacts) for another five years is completely unacceptable.</p> <p>But even worse is the noise and disruption on the Olympic coast. I have visited Kalaloch for nearly 60 years, since childhood; it is one of my favorite places in the whole world. My husband and I went there again for a holiday last week—our first visit to the coast since the Growler flights began. The environment was utterly degraded by the Growlers going back and forth overhead, up and down the west coast. We heard them even inside our</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Nevada are not reasonable. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>cabin at Kalaloch Lodge, until nearly 10 pm at night! If it was awful for us (it was), we can imagine how disruptive it is for the people and other creatures who live there. Furthermore, as a matter of environmental justice, it is completely wrong to foist these impacts on the many indigenous peoples who live on the Olympic coast.</p> <p>It is well-established that noise such as that of the Growlers causes and aggravates health problems, including heart disease and high blood pressure. It also particularly traumatic to people who suffer from PTSD, and who come to the silence of the Olympics for solace. Many people, including my husband and I, find spiritual refuge in the peace and quiet of the mountains. It is not an overstatement to say that Growlers thundering overhead make it impossible to have these types of experiences.</p> <p>The noise from the flights also will affect the economic benefits to local communities. Park visitors provide huge economic benefits to the communities near the park; the cumulative benefit to the local economy is estimated at \$385 million. People come to the Olympic National Park as the last best place for peace and quiet; why would they come if it's just another noisy, compromised natural environment?</p> <p>Please do not approve the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and take the Growler flights to an already-designated training site.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p>	
Kennedy-2	<p>I am writing in opposition to the draft EIS/DEIS Supplemental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Northwest Training and Testing, which would extend for another five years the Navy's practice of flying Growlers over the Olympic National Park, Olympic National Forest, and Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. The Navy should take its electromagnetic beam emitter training to a site designated for warfare training, for example in Idaho and Nevada; the Olympic Peninsula is NOT such an area. It is not a question of whether the Navy should train; the point is that the Navy should take its training to an area where such training is legal and appropriate, and not continue to conduct it in the most pristine, unspoiled area of the United States!</p> <p>My husband and I live a short distance from the Olympic National Park boundary, having purchased our property primarily for the peace and quiet. Our daily walks, however, are repeatedly interrupted by the obnoxious and long-lasting Growler noise. The idea of having to live with these impacts (and increased impacts) for another five years is completely unacceptable.</p> <p>But even worse is the noise and disruption on the Olympic coast. I have</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Nevada are not reasonable. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>visited Kalaloch for nearly 60 years, since childhood; it is one of my favorite places in the whole world. My husband and I went there again for a holiday last week-our first visit to the coast since the Growler flights began. The environment was utterly degraded by the Growlers going back and forth overhead, up and down the west coast. We heard them even inside our cabin at Kalaloch Lodge, until nearly 10 pm at night! If it was awful for us (it was), we can imagine how disruptive it's for the people and other creatures who live there. Furthermore, as a matter of environmental justice, it is completely wrong to foist these impacts on the many indigenous peoples who live on the Olympic coast.</p> <p>It is well-established that noise such as that of the Growlers causes and aggravates health problems, including heart disease and high blood pressure. It also particularly traumatic to people who suffer from PTSD, and who come to the silence of the Olympics for solace. Many people, including my husband and I, find spiritual refuge in the peace and quiet of the mountains. It is not an overstatement to say that Growlers thundering overhead make it impossible to have these types of experiences. The noise from the flights also will affect the economic benefits to local communities. Park visitors provide huge economic benefits to the communities near the park; the cumulative benefit to the local economy is estimated at \$385 million. People come to the Olympic National Park as the last best place for peace and quiet; why would they come if it's just another noisy, compromised natural environment?</p> <p>Please do not approve the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and take the Growler flights to an already-designated training site.</p>	
Kennon-1	<p>Animal Cruelty Period</p> <p>These Actions are completely inhumane and destructive to the environment!</p> <p>A child understands this!! Can you?</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Kerbaugh-1	<p>I have just learned of an EIS put out by the U.S. Navy on March 29, which is very disturbing to me/us. The only EIS alternative that is acceptable is the No Action Alternative. The other options given are unacceptable to the environment and life on the Olympic Peninsula. Alternatives 1 and 2 would cause unforgivable and unnecessary damage to Olympic National Park and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. Alternative 2 is the most extreme.</p>	<p>The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The length of the EIS, the great area it affects, and the many people it affects requires a 90-day comment period. This, so the EIS can be examined properly and thoroughly. Please ask the Navy for another 14-day extension of the comment period.</p> <p>The noise from multiple jet flights over the western and northern parts of the Peninsula will chase residents and visitors away. This will affect the health and economy of the Peninsula and the state of Washington. The search pattern of jet Growler flights looking for emitters would roar above the ocean beaches; the Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges; Washington State Department of Natural Resources land; Quinault, Quileute and Hoh Reservations; and thousands of acres of private land, including the towns of Forks and Amanda Park.</p> <p>The Navy admits to 85–100 decibels of noise per pass. That is enough to cause hearing loss and contribute to other health problems. People in Forks have recorded 94 decibel flights under the current operations. While noise is known to affect people and no studies have been done on the iconic Olympic elk, it is not difficult to reason they would be similarly affected, being mammals of a similar weight.</p> <p>The military training in the Marine Sanctuary would do damage to the ocean beaches, the marine animals of the coast, the nesting areas of many of Washington's shorebirds, migrating whales, and the birds that use the Pacific Flyway. The Navy has denied flying over Olympic National Park. This is untrue. Not only is this untrue, it is impossible not to fly these missions over the Park.</p> <p>This degradation of the Olympic Peninsula's environment is unacceptable. For 112 years, Congress and presidents have set aside areas of the Peninsula to protect its valuable environment. Irreparable damage would be caused if the activities are done as stated in the Navy EIS/OEIS Mar 2019 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Northwest Training and Testing. Please stop this plan by the Navy. The training has been done elsewhere. It can be done elsewhere. Wild places are not empty places just waiting for an invasion by the military. Our national security must also include environmental security.</p>	<p>discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Kerlin-1	<p>1. The DEIS does not give adequate review of other sites outside of the Pacific Northwest. At least five other sites should be analyzed in order to find lesser impact on air quality, noise level, and danger to animals. Warfare training already occurs in Nevada and Idaho. Not enough consideration is given to those sites.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>2. The data on the level of growler noise is inaccurately measured and therefore its effects are not properly assessed. Averaging the growler noise does not provide true evidence of the noise impact.</p> <p>The Draft uses A-weighted noise levels as a basis for determining the geographical envelope of project impacts as well as the potential for harm. This weighting method is based on the sensitivity of human hearing in air. It is inaccurate to apply the same negative weighting factor to those animals that have greater sensitivity of hearing than humans. In terms of noise impacts on wildlife, then, the Draft underestimates effective levels of exposure.</p>	<p>Nevada are not reasonable. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>For potential wildlife impacts, A-weighted sound levels are used as an indicator. The wildlife population underneath and around the Olympic MOA have been exposed to military aircraft noise for an extended period. The proposed action does not represent new noise exposure events to the wildlife.</p>
Keyes-1	<p>The proposed sonar testing will dramatically impact the already fragile population of orcas in a very negative way.</p> <p>Use your conscience and listen to the scientific community when they say this will harm the orcas.</p> <p>We must protect this delicate ecosystem, please do your part by withdrawing the proposed plan to do sonar testing.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Khan-1	Let them live in peace!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Kiersnowski-1	I am 100% against underwater sonar testing, which has proven to cause harm to marine animals!	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Killough-1	The sonar practices are dangerous and disturbing to the critically endangered Southern Resident Orcas and all Salish Sea marine inhabitants. Please do not allow them! We are not the only ones on this planet. The oceans are not ours along. Thank you for listening!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Kim-1	I am COMPLETELY AGAINST sonar testing program. There is too much marine biodiversity at risk. There is no justification and no dire need for the navy to do such testing. We DEPEND on all of the animals in the ocean, their relationship with one another and their survival. Please do not continue with this - for the sake of our future.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Kimberlin-1	I'm completely and totally against sonar testing in the Salish Sea and Puget Sound. Also, anywhere else where there are known inhabitants of large populations of marine mammals who depend on their hearing and echolocation for survival. This includes but is not limited to the Southern Resident Killer Whales. They are already suffering from lack of food and habitat pollution, the Navy has no right to add noise pollution to their list of battles they must fight to survive as a result of human callousness and greed. Find another way to test your sonar or go farther out to sea where you are less likely to permanently cripple an entire population of endangered Cetaceans who we depend on for things like tourism and ecosystem stability. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Kimmell-1	Stop this barbaric practice!!! Have a heart and stop hurting marine life!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
King J-1	No new jets or flights! The growlers are noise pollution and disrupt not only humans but pets, birds and wildlife. We may have to put up with the current state but to propose such an increase is both ridiculous and unnecessary.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
King Ma-1	I am 100 percent in opposition against Navy Sonar in the Salish Sea!!!!!!	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
King Mi-1	Life is water. Water needs to be healthy. We can't achieve health without changing that which we know is damage. Our oceans need us and without our healthy oceans there will be no US! We need to do better. We are intelligent and now aware of the damage humanity is causing! Change starts with little steps! There has got to be a better way. We have got to be better than this!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Kinkead-1	I choose to live off the grid near wilderness territory after years in Tacoma near McChord AFB where jet noise was daily. I understand the need for Navy training, to a point. When I moved to Forks twenty years ago, jet noise was non-existent. Then the Prowlers arrived, which I never heard in ONP. But now the Growlers. Not only do the flights over Forks wake me from sleep, they agitate my dog and cause me stress. Two years ago I started attending Navy meetings to voice my concerns, and have been dismayed by the lack of response. So I have done my research.	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Nevada are not reasonable. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Kinkead-2	Navy Needs to Conduct Actual Scattergram Noise Monitoring: Since 2010, no noise monitoring has been conducted over Forks, Olympic National Park and the Marine Sanctuary. Three readings at the mouth of the Bogachiel and Hoh Rivers and at Lake Ozette were done in 2010. Estimations abound in 2016 but no actual readings have been collected using modern monitors, and no readings at upper elevations such as backpackers experience (I am one). Averages are not acceptable since a 105 decibel reading (yes, over Forks!) is canceled out by 60 decibel. The Navy needs to monitor what we citizens hear on a daily basis and accurately measure readings throughout your Military Training Areas.	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Kinkead-3	<p>Protect Wilderness, National Parks and Natural Sanctuaries from Jet Noise: The Navy can go elsewhere to train. The people and creatures who need quiet to thrive have rights too. The sounds of Growlers are assaultive, war-like in a designated Quiet Zone where birds, normal conversations and peaceful solitude are shattered. Even the walls/floors of my house on the river are shaken by the Growler jets. Tourists who are our main source of income are leaving. Protect the Hoh Rainforest, Hurricane Ridge and Lake Crescent from training airspace.</p> <p>Know the Reality: Even Navy pilots admit to flying below the 6000' baseline when practicing maneuvers. If you monitor, you will know this. I have personally seen whale ears damaged by long distance sound waves. What recourse do they have? Or any of our domesticated animals? The Navy had no collected data on collateral damage to animals or people. Many war veterans live in the Forks-Quinault region fighting PTSD. No data has been collected from them by the Navy. Respond to those of us who complain on the Jet Noise Hotline so we know our voices are heard. According to Navy pilots, additional jets means more planes in each squadron, so the noise of 2-3 Growlers will be intensified by the planned 4-6 jets in each squadron's wave. How much longer will the reverberations last? The Navy has no documentation on this. Use other designated military training areas; there was no Growler action when I visited Mountain Home, ID and Nevada this Fall.</p> <p>Requested Actions: 1. Outfit backpackers, trail workers and ordinary citizens with Sound Monitoring Devices and look at what we hear. Or, use updated Navy monitoring systems and record/report ALL the data, not just averages. 2. Protect the Hoh Rain Forest and the heart of Olympic National Park,</p>	<p>See responses to Kinkead-1 and Kinkead-2 above.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>some of the quietest places in the lower 48 states, from all jet noise. Choose other airspace for practice and for getting into/out of position. Develop a "Quiet Park Alternative Flight Path and Practice area."</p> <p>3. Listen and respond to the ordinary citizens who work and live in your flight paths. We chose quiet and wilderness. The Navy has invaded us. The Growlers have invaded our country. Wilderness and quiet is a precious commodity, necessary for survival in our modern world. Acknowledge that we on the Olympic Peninsula are under attack. Bring your war elsewhere. Give us some peace again.</p>	
Kinsella-1	<p>My husband, Richard Goldstein and I support a significant decrease in training exercises along our shorelines. Exercises far from shore are possible but have not been studied. Why not?</p> <p>Our shorelines are important for birds, fish(think decreasing fish stocks), marine mammals (already Orca, Grey whales are dying), other wildlife and communities. It is an imperative to protect these vulnerable populations by reducing the harm these exercises pose along our shoreline. Training around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Marine Sanctuary, State Parks and other sensitive areas could be avoid. These areas were created to preserve them for people, creatures, life forms living there not military exercises! They can be avoid if the Defense Department would consider other alternatives. Be a good neighbor as I experienced growing up in a Navy family and my husband a Vietnam Vet. Thank you. Sincerely Helen Kinsella MD and Richard Goldstein MD</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft and ships are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Kirby-1	<p>Cannot for one minute even begin to understand how this has been allowed to happen. What the hell is wrong with humanity to do something so destructive and cruel.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Kirkendale-1	<p>Please do not test sonar or do anything sonar related near our SRKW's!!! They are critically endangered.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Kirk-Rudeen-1	<p>The only acceptable EIS alternative is the No Action Alternative. Alternatives 1 and 2 for conducting military warfare training over and around the Olympic Peninsula would cause unacceptable and unnecessary harm to wildlife and ecosystems in the Olympic National Park, Olympic National Forest, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other tribal, public and private lands managed for long-term ecological sustainability. The effects on people and communities would also be unacceptable.</p> <p>This proposal must be considered in light of the recent global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the U.N. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. https://www.ipbes.net/news/ipbes-global-assessment-summary-policy-makers-pdf</p> <p>According to the report, “the overwhelming evidence of the IPBES Global Assessment, from a wide range of different fields of knowledge, presents an ominous picture. The health of ecosystems on which we and all other species depend is deteriorating more rapidly than ever. We are eroding the very foundations of our economies, livelihoods, food security, health and quality of life worldwide.” Proposed flight frequencies and associated noise levels would negatively impact wildlife in well-documented ways. This ecologically-rich portion of Washington State should not bear the primary burden of the Navy Growler warfare training program.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Kirschner-1	<p>DO NOT ALLOW GROWLER JETS TO FLY OVER THE OLYMPIC PENINSULA. Much of this area is the Olympic National Park, a pristine nature preserve. More than 3 million persons visit this park each year. It was set aside to protect unique plant and animal species both on and off shore. The area around the park contains numerous state parks and is well populated.</p> <p>I value the US Military and all it does for us, but this proposal is stupid, ignorant and abhorrent.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA’s designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA’s designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Kitching-1	<p>I have no doubt that our fighter jets, the Growlers, are important to our national security. I also do not doubt that there are strategic reasons for the Navy’s desire to have them remain where they are. I do doubt that there is no other reasonable way to protect our national security than to destroy the “peace,” the quiet—intrinsic to the beauty—of what is left of our wild places, in particular the Olympic National</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Park/Forest/Wilderness/National Marine Sanctuary area considered by many to be the only “quiet” place left in our country.</p> <p>For me, it is heartbreaking to hear the Growlers heedlessly destroying the “peace” they were created to protect. This “peace” is not the abstract and never attainable “World Peace” that is bandied about by politicians, but the actual “peace,” the quiet, of one of the last, largest and quietest designated wilderness areas in our country. I say “heedlessly” because, having reviewed much of what the Navy has submitted to justify this destruction, it looks to me that most of the Navy’s justification amounts to the convenience of itself and its personnel at the expense of the rest of us who—also--“make their homes” here. Although I appreciate the value of infrastructure, it is not the only value of importance to what makes our country worth living in, much less worth dying for.</p> <p>I grew up in a military (Air Force) family and have known many in all branches of our military. It is my opinion that the military draws and nurtures some of the “best and the brightest,” the most courageous (the warriors and their families) of our country—those whose sense of duty is intrinsic to their being and their survival on the world’s battlefields. As I see it, our warriors, their families, are the soul of our people—tasked with the extraordinarily demanding job of protecting our people and our beautiful country, often with their lives and/or limbs. As I recall, the sign outside at least one of the military bases we were stationed at stated “Peace is Our Profession.”</p> <p>Of course, there is “Peace,” and there is “peace.” Although I would wish that we could “give Peace a chance,” history teaches otherwise. I believe that we will always need our warriors and they should of course be provided with the best technology and training that can be had within the constraints of our democracy. It also seems to me that of all the people in our country, it would be our warriors--who face the horrific sounds and terror of war--who would most understand the need for the “peace” that can be found in the wild, the National Parks and wilderness areas of our country. Is such “peace” not the “peace” we all seek, we all need—the “Peace” our warriors and their families--have died and sacrificed for? Is such “peace,” and beauty, not a vital part of what makes this “America the Beautiful?”</p> <p>From what I can discern, most of the Navy’s efforts at ameliorating environmental issues relating to “sound,” revolve around the harmful effects to marine life, particularly mammals, by sonar and other military made noise. Although laudable, these efforts have nothing to do with the</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>pervasive sound of fighter jets—particularly the Growlers, who fly low and whose sound uniquely lingers for many minutes.</p> <p>It is one thing to live in city and hear the jets flying overhead amidst the competing sounds of our civilization—or see and hear the Blue Angels scorching the blue sky during summer Sea Fair celebrations in Seattle. I clearly remember the eerie silence when the jets left our skies immediately after 911. I remember my wife and I standing in a long, winding line through darkened airport hallways, braving the increased security immediately after the jets began flying again. At that time, it felt like a patriotic act to board a jet plane with the fear that all in the line felt after watching the jets hit the Twin Towers. Finally, I remember my wife and I joined in, along with many of our fellow travelers, when someone in the long, waiting line began singing “America the Beautiful.” I remember that I, and others, had tears in our eyes.</p> <p>This beautiful land we call the United States of America is a shared gift, to be passed on to our children and grandchildren. The Navy should consider the words of John Muir: “Everybody needs beauty as well as bread, places to play and pray in. Where nature may heal and cheer and give strength to body and soul alike.”</p>	
Klabis-1	<p>A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas. □</p> <p>“For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival,” Calambokidis said. □</p> <p>Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy’s calculations. □</p> <p>Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a “behavioral reaction” (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Kleven-2	Marine Mammal Commission comment letter attached in its entirety.	Please see the responses to the Marine Mammal Commission comments.
Kleyn-1	<p>Re: The U.S. Navy's Northwest Training and Testing Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ overseas Environmental Impact Stateent (EIS/OEIS).</p> <p>I am writing to express concern about the impact that present and future military overflights of Olympic National Park and the Olympic National Forest will have on wildlife and people in the area. In the EIS/ OEIS evaluation of the impacts of sound and vibration is based on modeling, not</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA’s designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA’s designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>on actual monitoring of how aircraft noise affects wildlife and park visitors. The Olympic National Park is a World Heritage Site and an International Biosphere Reserve. It is famous for its natural quiet. Modeling is a weak form of analysis to use in any circumstance but especially when threatened and endangered species (for example, the Marbled Murrelet, the Spotted Owl and the Tufted Puffin) and a national marine sanctuary are involved. As a resident of Skagit County, I can tell you that the Supplemental EIS/OEIS greatly underestimates the impact of jet noise levels residents and visitors are already experiencing. To suggest that Growler noise is ever equivalent to a whisper is a joke. I was walking a dog in a nearby park when some Growlers flew overhead. Three out-of-state visitors were shocked, asking what they were hearing and why. The thundering, unexpected intrusion into what had been a quiet walk in a lovely park distressed them. I feel the same way at night when I'm awakened from a sound sleep. Please, we do not need more Growler flights. We need far fewer. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Kline-1	<p>Whatever sonar test you are running should not be run if it has any small chance of hurting marine life.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Knipe-1	I am 100% against underwater sonar testing in the Salish sea due to the damage caused to marine mammals. Please find a way to do this without harming wildlife.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Knolle-1	To gain support from the American public for readiness training, the Navy should be conducting training in areas that have already been depleted of marine life by such action and do nothing to in any way harm the ocean environment of the Pacific Northwest. Earn American appreciation; work to clean up the “garbage patch” which the Navy helped to create along with all of us. I live by the sea, my husband was in the Navy. I see the wildlife is being destroyed. Cleaning the garbage patch, training in “ocean deserts” as described by Jacques Cousteau, is good P.R. (Public relations)	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft and ships are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Knox-1	Please don’t proceed with the navy sonar testing. It will have devastating effects on marine life. The sound is that intense and loud marine mammals will swim hundreds of miles and deeper to get away. Because they are swimming faster and deeper they end up with nitrogen bubbles in their blood this causes decompression sickness. Also the nitrogen damages their internal organs. The sonar noise will also causes mass stranding of whales and dolphins due to it been so unbearable. Even far away the noise effects them from feeding and migration as they depend on echo location.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Koch-1	I am writing in support of the orcas and all other marine mammals and species living in the Salish sea that will be harmed by any further and /or increased under water testing by the military. The Salish sea and the life in these waters are already under stress and are endangered from pollution, ship traffic, sonar activity, lack of food (Chinook salmon) etc and need all of our help to heal and survive. We cannot survive on the planet without the diversity of species that form the ECOSYSTEM we depend upon. By reducing human activities in the Salish sea and by reducing our impact on the earth, reducing pollutants, not using single use anything and restoring natural habitats including reducing sound pollution, and by acting	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy’s ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Navy’s Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/• The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>in ways that are compassionate rather than violent, we can save life on earth.</p> <p>Please consider this request and let's all act together in ways that will help restore the earth to health and that measures our human activities that can harm any other living being.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Kolff C-1	<p>Thanks you for your service in the armed forces! Having a prepared military is important.</p> <p>HOWEVER, I refuse to believe that your current and planned activities over or near the areas of the Olympic National Park can not be carried out elsewhere. You have not stated adequately why other places would not work for your Growler flights. The noise makes peaceful enjoyment of a heavily used public area virtually impossible. We are supposed to be living in a democracy, where the public has a say, and I doubt there are many who are urging you on. Please reconsider you plans.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Kolff H-1	<p>I have lived in the Seattle area for 25 years and in Port Townsend for 22 years. The main reason our family moved here was for the surrounding wilderness and beauty. Now, when I am working outside in my garden, I have to stop and go inside and close all my windows and doors to avoid the roar of the aircraft taking off and landing at OLF. When I go to the Olympic National Park or the coast, I have to brace myself, plug my ears and stop in order to survive the noise of the Navy jets flying overhead. The majority of these training exercises do not have to be conducted along our shoreline and could instead be conducted far from shore minimizing the impact on birds, fish, marine mammals (such as our endangered orcas), other wildlife and communities.</p> <p>There has been no evaluation for other locations, such as Mountain Home in Idaho, which could significantly reduce the harmful impacts of these exercises. Training around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas could be avoided if that were a priority for the Department of Defense.</p> <p>PLEASE do not fly over the Olympics and the coast since this is a rare and</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	precious remnant of wilderness on our beleaguered planet. Thank you, Helen Kolff	
Koons-1	<p>The U.S. Navy's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for training and research, development, testing, and evaluation activities conducted within the Northwest Training and Testing (NWT) study area is of great concern.</p> <p>National Parks:</p> <p>As an advocate for the National Park system I object to the use of Olympic National Park and North Cascades National Park as warfare training grounds. The severe impact of jet noise to Olympic National Park and North Cascades National Park is unacceptable.</p> <p>*The Navy needs to monitor in the Parks to get real data on how loud the jets are and how often visitors see them. The Navy is relying on models, not real noise measurements, so it could be louder and more extensive than what they say.</p> <p>*The Navy noise modeling understates/underestimates the noise levels from Navy jet flyovers and frequency of park visitors hearing those jets.</p> <p>*Any jet noise in the park should be considered a problem that the Navy needs to mitigate and consider a way to entirely or mostly avoid. The noises from Navy jets do not belong in the parks settings and significantly harm park visitor's experiences. *Olympic National Park is recognized as a World Heritage Site, a world-class natural area, and should not be impaired by avoidable intrusions which degrade those values.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Koons-2	*The Navy needs to consider specific alternatives that would greatly reduce Navy jet noise over the Parks and that would reduce or completely eliminate Navy jet flyovers of Olympic National Park. The fact that such	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	alternatives would not be as convenient for the Navy as what it currently does is not a valid reason for refusing to fully consider such alternatives. Flying over the Parks, especially the parts of the parks not directly on the west coast of the peninsula, is not a military necessity for their training exercises. The Navy has many other airspaces it could fly in.	where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Koons-3	*The draft SEIS only considers impacts in the parts of the Parks that are in the Military Operations Areas (MOAs). But the Navy Jets fly over much larger portions of the Parks that are not in those MOAs and the impacts to those parts of the park should be addressed in the SEIS. The Navy's maps indicate transit flights between the NAS Whidbey Island and the Pacific MOAs flying over Lake Crescent and Hurricane Ridge among other areas within Olympic National Park, all of which are well-visited throughout the year. *North Cascades National Park is also visited throughout the year, with no monitoring by the Navy or accommodations for the frequent flights at low altitude.	In Appendix J, the Navy considered the noise impacts resulting from aircraft transiting into the Olympic MOA.
Koons-4	Marine: I attach the comments submitted by Peter O. Thomas, on April 15, 2019, Executive Director of the Marine Mammal Commission along with its Committee of Scientific Advisors.	Please see the responses to the Marine Mammal Commission comments.
Koons-5	Disturbance of the complex ecosystem, with plans for harassment and mortality takes is simply unacceptable. No warfare operations should occur directly over and in a National Marine Sanctuary. The Sanctuary and other parts of the adjacent ocean are prime habitat for the critically endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales. Elected Officials: Comments submitted to the Navy by Representative Rick Larson, WA 2nd District, in 2018 for accommodations related to warfare training were ignored. Washington State is not yours to ruin without citizens and elected officials' demands being heard and responded to as a basis for reasonable negotiations. Navy managers operating NASWI should not simply ignore the citizens and multiple Washington State government entities that strongly object to the Navy's plans. People & Places: Noise from warfare operations create the following problems for people and places: *Deafening toxic noise hurts adults. *Deafening toxic noise hurts children by interrupting the capacity to concentrate and hinders normal cognitive development.	The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>*Noise impacts tourism. Income from recreation visitors generates clean, healthy income for small and large businesses and tax revenue for Washington's counties and the state.</p> <p>*Real estate values decline in areas severely impacted by noise pollution. The area of the Navy's planned warfare training will harm landowners and small businesses from Whidbey Island to the San Juan Islands and through the Olympic Peninsula. Declining values will impact local governments. Warfare training may have been appropriate when Washington's population was less dense than it is now. The state's popularity, its vibrant economic growth and increasing density no longer make this region a reasonable place to conduct warfare activities as planned by the Navy.</p>	
Kossick-1	<p>In the past 4-5 years we residents of Puget Sound have started to see the effects of pollution and soundwaves on both our area's wildlife and our own health and environment. We use the Sound for food and resources as do all kinds of other animals.</p> <p>We have no idea how far the impacts of decisions 10 years ago will transpire, but we now know it has begun and is worse than we imagined. It takes double the time and effort to retroactively respond.</p> <p>We have to be smarter about how we advance technology while reducing our impact. Our planet and region is dying and we are already behind the 8 ball.</p> <p>The military has to find a way to prepare our troops with less destruction of what they are trying to protect. Otherwise, you're fighting for lost cause. Stand up and fight for your military and country by being responsible patrons and question the decisions being made. There is always a better way.</p> <p>This is our generation's biggest challenge</p> <p>Your children and grandchildren will thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Kossow-1	<p>No one in our area is going to go along with your plans to do military operations off our coast. Any attempt to proceed with this plan in our area will be met with more protest and opposition than you can imagine. Stop thinking you can convince us that any disruption of our oceans & its creatures is going to be okay. We will fight with everything we have to protect our oceans. No one supports you here.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Kotulock-1	<p>Please use your power and authority to PROTECT OUR ENVIRONMENT (and hence, also protect people), rather than DAMAGE IT FURTHER through these proposed exercises.</p> <p>We are at a critical point in climate change and ecosystem / biodiversity collapse and cannot afford to release ANY more toxic compounds or additional harmful acoustics into our environment.</p> <p>Making smart long-term decisions for the sake of a livable planet is the most important thing we can do right now.</p> <p>Please do not to release ANY heavy metals, depleted uranium, toxic chemicals, or harmful acoustics into the Puget Sound (or any oceans) or its surrounding environment.</p>	<p>The Navy does not propose to release heavy metals or depleted uranium into Puget Sound." Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.</p> <p>The analysis of impacts of the Navy's activities on water quality can be found in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the NWTTEIS Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Kozacik-1	<p>Aircraft sonic booms are on the rise in all National parks. While at Yosemite NP (4-17-2019) three booms shook the valley floor. The Navy will point to the Army: the army will point to the Air Force... around and around...No one will take responsibility.</p> <p>National security is important but this cover will always be used to hide an perpetuate this problem. Navigating around National parks is difficult with the arm forces mission priorities but somewhere there can be a solution.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Kozmann-1	<p>The sonar training damages all marine life, specially the endangered southern resident orcas who are at the edge. Imagine yourself with all this noise disrupting your daily life, compromising your feeding, nursing ... no need to explain in more words about all the damage that is done to marine life. Thank you, best regards</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Kramer-Druzycka-1	This is my voice against the proposed sonar testing by the US navy in the Salish Sea. This is the next risk for the endangered Southern Resident Orcas and a big danger other sea mammals in this region. PLEASE stop these plans!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Krause-1	I stand with many members of my community against the use of any sonar ocean mapping, all associated activities and covert activities carried out by the US Navy in this regard, in waters anywhere. The sea creatures, flora and fauna may not speak on their behalf. My concerns GRAY WHALES The SEIS cites a study done in 2008 and 2010 to claim that there are between 17,000 and 20,000 gray whales on the West Coast. Will the SEIS update information and impacts etc. on the current population of Gray whales? See attached SEIS references in the SEIS are dated from 1984-2014 Will the SEIS address the 70+ whale deaths on the West Coast so far this year, that represent only 10% of the actual loss and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbated this situation? How will the SEIS address the Wildlife Emergency just announced by NOAA? https://www.paradisepost.com/2019/05/31/feds-declare-emergency-as-gray-whale-deaths-reach-highest-level-in-nearly-20-years/ https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grey-whales-stranded-west-coast-1.5119056 A recent Study published in January 2019 documents the severe effect sonar has on whales. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533 Scientific studies have shown, without a doubt, that explosives and SONAR are detrimental to marine animals. For whales and dolphins, 'listening' is as important as 'seeing' is for humans, as they live in a world of water and sound. Noise pollution threatens whale and dolphin populations, interrupting their normal behavior, driving them away from areas important to their survival and at worst injuring or sometimes even causing the deaths of some whales and dolphins. 3.4-107 of the SEIS states that Gray whales in Baja abandoned an historical	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The Navy uses the most current marine mammal population data available from the National Marine Fisheries Service. The 2008 and 2010 references cited in the comment were not used by the Navy to determine current populations. The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>breeding ground due to an increase in noise and shipping activity. Until NOAA's study of the die off on the Gray Whales is complete shouldn't any disruption of the Ocean by Sonar and Explosive activity should be halted?</p> <p>The SEIS at 3.4-135 acknowledges that Gray whale are slow moving and sometimes exhibit "snorkeling activity," they surface quietly and exhale without of any visible blow.</p> <p>The Navy claims they have lookouts watching for whales before the use of sonar and explosives and are "very unlikely" to have their feeding and migration impacted by the Navy's activities.</p> <p>How does the SEIS take into account this "snorkeling" and fog and rough seas in watching for whales?</p> <p>The SEIS details the presence of gray whales in six of the NWTT areas for short periods and claims that the gray whales have "low risk" of being impacted. How much risk is acceptable given NOAA's Wildlife Emergency. The SEIS at 3.4.282 states that "military expended materials will sink to the ocean floor". At 3.4.302 the SEIS states that "for the most part," this material will be incidentally ingested by bottom feeders. Gray Whales are bottom feeders. Given the already stressed gray whale population should the SEIS take this into account?</p> <p>https://news.nationalgeographic.com/2016/03/160331-car-parts-plastics-dead-whales-germany-animals/</p> <p>https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/03/whale-dies-88-pounds-plastic-philippines/</p> <p>https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/04/dead-pregnant-whale-plastic-italy/</p> <p>COMMON MURRES</p> <p>We here on the Coast are in the middle of a major die off of the Common Murres. https://www.advocate-news.com/2019/05/24/major-die-off-of-common-murres-underway-along-the-mendocino-coast/?fbclid=IwAR1jCzAbxz1OsGgCxiUWjmWiUqMVP5f7_uo6vlpJF7Dhvc4A7TSgnI9HVXk</p> <p>The SEIS at 3.6.15 states that the Common Murres were deterred from gillnets by acoustic transmitters. What effect will the solar and explosive activities Stressors outlined in the SEIS have on the Common Murres?</p> <p>Will the SEIS address the major die off of the Common Murres and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbated this situation?</p> <p>KELP</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Does the SEIS address the loss of the kelp forests and abalone and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS that will exacerbate this situation?</p> <p>I see with my own eyes that the Kelp forests are gone so are the abalone. https://www.cencoos.org/about/news/2016/warm-waters-impact-california-kelp-forests https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Fishing/Ocean/Regulations/Sport-Fishing Demanding the US Navy stop any further action and cancel these sonar ocean mapping projects. They hurt and do not help!</p>	
Kruglyanskay a-1	<p>Dear MWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager,</p> <p>I am writing with much concern for the proposed increase in sonar testing off the Mendocino Coast, CA.</p> <p>First off, I am most concerned for those who will be recreational diving off our coast, We have an active diving community and our tourism and lives are based off this access for both divers and surfers who are in the water. WHAT STUDIES HAVE BEEN DONE TO ASSURE THE SAFETY OF THE PEOPLE WHO ARE IN THE WATER BOTH FOR RECREATIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC PURPOSES, WHICH IS ALL TOO COMMON OFF THESE SHORES?</p> <p>Currently we have an active community of divers and scientists working to help fend off the collapse of our ecosystems here on the coast. We are witnessing the decline of our ecosystems and the marine life that is dependent on it</p> <p>WHAT GUARANTEES CAN YOU ASSURE US OF THAT OUR ECOSYSTEMS WILL NOT BE FURTHER DAMAGED WITH YOUR TESTING?</p> <p>Our local business and tourism is dependent on the survival of these fragile ecosystems.</p> <p>WHAT COMPENSATION CAN WE EXPECT WHEN WE SEE THE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF YOUR TESTING AND PRESENCE ON OUR COASTLINE TO OUR TOURISM INDUSTRY?</p> <p>Our Board of Supervisors for the County of Mendocino have submitted their concerns for our Marine Ecosystems, please reply to those as well.</p> <p>Our inter tribal council of this county has been outspoken against this proposition</p> <p>I request that you take their practices, lifestyle and cultural survival into account in your proposition.</p> <p>The EIS has not taken the tribes of the Mendocino coast into account, I require that this be considered in your scientific data/</p> <p>HOW CAN YOU REIMBURSE THE TRIBAL COMMUNITIES FOR THEIR LOSS OF CULTURAL RESOURCES FROM THE STRESSORS OF YOUR TESTING?</p>	<p>The Navy is not proposing to increase sonar use off the Mendocino coast. The analysis of potential impacts described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>I have many concerns and am aware that NOAA just declared an emergency for the most recent whale die-offs, WHAT SCIENCE HAVE YOU DONE TO TAKE THIS NEW DECLARATION AND THE SCIENCE BEHIND IT INTO ACCOUNT?</p> <p>Please understand that these are not just my personal concerns but the concerns of the community around me of tribal communities, government, tourist industries and business members, diving and other oceanic recreational communities, fishing industry, and scientists.</p>	
Krug-von Vacano M-1	<p>We have to fully protect the resident orcas. I have a 13 year old daughter who can't understand, why we treat our environment the way we do. She is crying a lot in the evenings, because she feels so helpless. For her and for all the Kids in our world, I want to show that we can change the world, that we can protect what we love.</p> <p>And my daughter taught me, from a project she did about whales in school, that researchers think that whales could communicate thousands of kilometers, through all the Seven oceans, in times when the sea still was silent.</p> <p>Please keep the sea a bit more quiet again.</p> <p>Thank you for listening!</p> <p>With love from Germany!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Krumboltz-1	<p>Honorable Sirs/Madames:</p> <p>I hope you will take in to account how whales, dolphins and other marine life are adversely impacted by the use of underwater sonar, leading to injury and even death. Our resident Orca whales are already stressed. Certainly there are other ways to test your equipment. Here is one of many articles on the topic: https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/does-military-sonar-kill/?redirect=1</p> <p>I cannot stress how important this is to the people of the Northwest.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Krummenacher-1	<p>Please do not test sonar in the Salish Sea. The critically endangered Orcas and other marine life are in harms way during these tests.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Krumpe-1	To " the Untied States Navy., I would like to Thank you all for being in the North West Os Washington State Keeping we the people of the Untied States safe!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Again Thank you for all of your work...	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Kryla-1	No sonar testing! Protect our orcas!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Kubin-1	Please stop harming whales, dolphins, fish and larval development, stop noice input! Thank you.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Kuc-1	Marine animals are suffering. Stop the tests before irreversible damage is done!!	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Kuehne-01	Attached are the substantive comments of Lauren Kuehne, an ecologist and research scientist within the University of Washington's College of the Environment. A supplemental version of these comments were also submitted (with all attachments except the file titled L. Kuehne, Final Report, 11 June 2019, which is attached to this online comment) via certified US Postal Service Mail, postmarked on June 12th, 2019. Please include the materials from	The commenting feature on the project website, while not a NEPA requirement, was added by the Navy to further facilitate commenting by the public. The Navy placed certain limitations on comments (5,000 characters of text and 1 MB limit for file attachments), to allow the Navy to continue supporting this feature in a cost-effective manner. Over 1,800 comments were received on this project through website commenting and attachments,

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>both my online and hard copy submissions as my complete public comment. It was necessary to submit the supplemental materials via hard copy (with substantial added personal costs of time and money) only because of the 1 MB file upload limit is too restrictive to allow inclusion of the evidence and scientific sources of information supporting my public comment and that should be considered in the DSEIS. The 1 MB file limit causes unnecessary burden for those participating in the public comment process and should be expanded.</p> <p>Lauren Kuehne Research Scientist University of Washington</p> <p>Background to comments: Many of my comments on the DSEIS focus on the Noise Modeling Analysis, to which the year-long soundscape monitoring study that I conducted is directly related. I have attached a Final Report (L. Kuehne, Final Report, 11 June 2019) from those data, which are also being prepared for submission to a peer-reviewed journal. This report represents a large portion of the information that is available from the study that I conducted in 2017- 2018, but there are still many analyses that could be done from these data to provide context for the DSEIS. I requested an extension of the public comment period from the Navy on May 28, 2019 for this purpose (request letter attached in the mailed hard copy of these comments). Although I received a rather cryptic reply about 10 days later requesting my research “methods and results”, to which I provided a copy of the Initial Summary of Findings (email exchange attached in the mailed hard copy of these comments), I have to date received no answer with respect to my request for an extension of the public comment period. As a result, my comments on the DSEIS and Noise Modeling Analysis are less complete than would be possible if the extension had been granted to conduct and finalize additional analyses. Nonetheless, the results of my study – along with other research - document substantial inadequacies and deficiencies in the Noise Modeling Analysis that prevent any practical assessment of noise impacts as they are experienced by people and wildlife. This, in turn, makes it impossible to evaluate impacts and potential detriment to valued cultural and socioeconomic resources. I have grouped my comments under two broad categories (I. Evaluating Impacts from Noise Metrics, and II. Modeling Deficiencies) with 6 sub-headings.</p>	<p>with very few affected by this limit. The Navy will review this file size limitation for future projects.</p> <p>The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p>
Kuehne-02	<p>I. Inability to Evaluate Impacts from Noise Metrics a. Inadequacy in providing metrics that allow evaluation of impact on</p>	<p>Considering the natural soundscape of a National Park underneath a military operating area is a challenge. However, the currently agreed upon cumulative</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>residents and visitors</p> <p>The Noise Modeling Analysis creates only two acoustic metrics with which impacts on people can be evaluated. The first of these is the Ldn or average of the sound exposure over an “average” 24-hour period (the average potentially being obtained over a very long period such as an entire year) with a penalty for nighttime noise. The Ldn can provide some very basic assessment of average noise levels over a time period, but is nearly useless as an indicator of noise impacts because it bears no relationship whatsoever to noise as experienced by people. This is particularly true when the flight events bear more resemblance to periodic, impulsive events as opposed to more consistent levels of noise (e.g., in areas surrounding a commercial airport). Furthermore, the Ldn is highly inappropriate in wilderness areas, because the noise impacts will be offset by a quiet ambient sound level; in this way, the very noise impacts that will be perceived as more intrusive (Mace et al. 2004, attached in the mailed hard copy of these comments) will be measured as less intrusive.</p> <p>The only other metric provided is a duration and probability of experiencing the most extreme events (the Lmax), which will be limited to if a person happens to be directly under a flight event that is flying at the absolute lowest altitude. This probability is further averaged across the entire geographic space of the MOAs (Table J-13). Based on the metrics in the Noise Modeling Analysis, impact on people is available to be assessed as either a function of a Ldn metric that is never actually experienced (nor readily monitored due to perpetually confounding influences on sound pressure levels like weather), or as the likelihood of happening to experience the absolute maximum noise level. No other impacts on people can be assessed with these two metrics, and the inadequacy of using these to evaluate impact of military overflight events on residents and visitors cannot be overstated.</p> <p>People do not experience noise from aircraft events as a 24-hour average with a 10dB penalty at night. People experience noise exposure as a function of frequency of events (i.e., number of disruptions), duration (length of time of exposure), loudness (i.e., dB or dB(A)), and the cumulative exposure that is a function of these interacting factors. People also experience these factors more acutely depending on the expected levels and frequency of noise, particularly in wilderness areas (Mace et al. 2004). There are numerous acoustic metrics that facilitate assessment of impacts on human health and well-being, many of which are mentioned in the DSEIS (e.g., percent time audible, exceedance or time above certain dB</p>	<p>metric is Ldn, with Lmax as a supplemental metric. Noise modeling for SUA operations prohibit the calculation of Time Audible, which is the only metric identified in the comment and supporting report.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>or dB(A) thresholds), and no one metric allows evaluation of all impacts. At a minimum, the Noise Modeling Analysis should produce metrics that related to known levels of noise disturbance resulting in impacts on human health (Smith and Pijanowski 2014, Fox and Morris 2017, attached in the mailed hard copy of these comments). These health impacts include impairments in concentration, memory, cognition, and mental health status when noise levels reach 40 - 55 dB(A) and serious cardiovascular health effects of hypertension, stroke, and risk of ischemic heart disease associated with levels above 55 dB(A) (Smith and Pijanowski 2014, Basner et al. 2017, attached in the mailed hard copy of these comments). Number of overflight events and duration of time above these exceedance thresholds would be much better indicators of the impacts on people, particularly residents that will experience more consistent exposures to overflights.</p> <p>For assessing impact on visitors to wilderness areas, metrics of percent time audible (L. Kuehne, Final Report, 11 June 2019; also described in Appendix J) and exceedance thresholds (described on p. J-27 in the Noise Modeling Analysis) are good indicators of the extent to which visitors in wilderness areas are likely to be impacted. To these metrics, I would also add the utility of the number of flight events (L. Kuehne, Final Report, 11 June 2019) as an indicator of the number of disruptive events a person in a location is likely to experience. This metric allows for an estimate of the number of potential disturbance or interruptive events a person may experience while doing activities like recreating, working, learning, sleeping, etc.</p>	
Kuehne-03	<p>b. Failure to provide noise metrics that allow evaluation of impacts on wildlife</p> <p>The inadequacy of the two metrics in the Noise Modeling Analysis described above for people is compounded when trying to assess impacts of noise disturbance from military overflights on wildlife. For one thing, the dB(A) scale used in the Noise Modeling Analysis emphasizes the 1-4 kHz frequencies that human ears interpret most readily, and deemphasizes acoustic information below 1 kHz. Despite an overall paucity of information related to noise disturbance impacts on wildlife (Shannon et al. 2016, attached in the mailed hard copy of these comments), many species of wildlife are known to detect and respond to sounds below 1 kHz (i.e., “infrasound”, Beason 2004, attached in the mailed hard copy of these comments). In fact, some species of birds are highly sensitive to noise in this range and have been shown to exhibit “behavioral and physiological</p>	<p>For potential wildlife impacts, A-weighted sound levels are used as an indicator. The wildlife population underneath and around the Olympic MOA have been exposed to military aircraft noise for an extended period. The proposed action does not represent new noise exposure events to the wildlife. Also, the statement that noise studies on wildlife are minimal ignores the numerous studies that the DoD has sponsored in the past three decades. Many of these studies were included in the analysis of impacts to birds found in Section 3.6.2.1.4 (Impacts from Aircraft Noise) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, the Navy has consulted with the USFWS regarding the potential of proposed Navy activities to impact ESA-listed species in the Study Area.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>responses to these low frequencies” (Beason 2004). Critical components of acoustic metrics with relevance for wildlife include time interval, duration, frequency components, noise level or sound pressure levels, acuteness or how acutely events are perceived, and contrast with background or ambient sound levels (McKenna et al. 2016, Gill et al. 2014, attached in the mailed hard copy of these comments). These combined acoustic metrics allow for assessment of a diverse range of potential impacts of noise on wildlife, which can include damage to auditory organs and receptors due to excessive or cumulative exposure to noise, masking of critical animal communication systems, and disturbance during crucial activities such as feeding or protecting young (Shannon et al. 2016, McKenna et al. 2016, Beason 2004).</p> <p>For this reason, the Noise Modeling Analysis at a minimum needs to include metrics that allow assessment of acoustic disturbance relevant to specific species (i.e., species listed under the Endangered Species Act, species with substantial cultural or socio-economic significance) and/or commercially, culturally or socially important species groups (e.g., owls, ungulates, salmon). For the Olympic Peninsula, these include ESA-listed marbled murrelet, northern spotted-owl, orca or killer whales, bull trout, Chinook and sockeye salmon (Figure 8, L. Kuehne, Final Report, 11 June 2019). Other commercially and culturally important species-groups include salmon, grey whales, owls, Olympic marmot, Roosevelt elk, and numerous bird species that live and migrate through the Olympic Peninsula region. Residents and visitors alike highly value the wildlife experiences in the region, making the impacts on wildlife critical to assess adequately not only for the impacts on wildlife populations per se, but for their corresponding implications for socio-economic activities related to healthy wildlife populations (e.g., impacts on tourist activities like birding or fishing).</p>	
Kuehne-04	<p>c. Failure to provide noise metrics that allow evaluation of impact on socioeconomic resources</p> <p>Basically, people enjoy living in and visiting quiet places, and this experience is degraded by noise (Mace et al. 2004). The impacts of noise on property values have been well established and measured in multiple settings, and reviewed previously (e.g., Navrud 2004, attached in the mailed hard copy of these comments). In recreational areas, noise intrusion has been shown to affect enjoyment to the extent that the impact can be economically measured (Merchan et al. 2014, attached in the mailed hard copy of these comments). In wilderness areas, the effects of noise disturbance are experienced more profoundly precisely because of the</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA).</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic MOA, it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>expectation of quiet (Mace et al. 2004). All of these effects are already being experienced and almost certain to increase in the future for residents and visitors of the Olympic Peninsula region and the Olympic National Park under the proposed increases in aircraft activity in the DSEIS. Valued recreational activities that are highly dependent on quiet such as camping, birdwatching, fishing, and backpacking are all compromised by noise. Residents that have reasonable expectations of quiet based on distance from urban areas are already exposed to consistently high percent time audible for military aircraft (L. Kuehne, Final Report, 11 June 2016). Over time, accumulated annoyance of residents and visitors may well lead to losses in economic opportunities associated with reduced tourism and business/property values.</p> <p>However, as currently presented in the DSEIS, there is no way that these impacts (largely contained in Section 3.12.3.2.1.1) can currently be evaluated using the metrics presented in the Noise Modeling Analysis. As noted in my comment Sections I(a) and I(b), the lack of metrics that are relevant to assess effects on people's health, well-being, and enjoyment allows no path to describe the impacts on resulting socio-economic resources such as lifestyle, tourism, and cultural values. As demonstrated below in comment Section II, Modeling Deficiencies do not capture the geographic and temporal extent of current impacts.</p> <p>Collectively, these deficiencies preclude adequate evaluation of socio-economic consequences, which are often sweepingly described in DSEIS Section 3.12.3.2.1.1. For example, Section 3.12.3.2.1.1 states "While airborne acoustics from aircraft overflights are likely to be heard and may disturb some visitors to the national park, economic indicators representing tourism and recreational activities in the region, including in the national park, have been trending upwards in recent years and are projected to continue to increase". It does not follow that because tourism has been on an upswing for a while that the trend cannot be interrupted or terminated due to excessive noise or disturbance. Rather, visitors may be drawn to a landscape because it is traditionally or reportedly quiet, and leave irritated. Similarly, Section 3.12.3.2.1.1 states, "Although noise from overflights during transit could be higher than average background noise levels in the national park, national forest, and wilderness areas, on average they would not be substantially above the range of commonly heard natural sounds in the national park or nearby areas". This assessment of "impact" completely ignores that people distinguish qualities and characteristics of natural and human sounds, particularly in wilderness areas (Mace et al. 2004). One</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to approximately one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved. <p>The potential impacts to socioeconomic resources was analyzed in Section 3.12.3.2 (Airborne Acoustics). The results of that analysis include in part, "Considering that trends in economic indicators have historically increased and are projected to continue to increase, disturbances from airborne acoustics on the Olympic Peninsula are expected to have a negligible impact on socioeconomic resources in the Study Area."</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	further example is the statement “From 2015 through 2017, the average annual number of Navy EA-18G aircraft transits to and from the Olympic MOAs was 2,224. Under Alternative 1, EA-18G transits to and from the Olympic MOAs are proposed to increase by 300 per year. This proposed increase equates to, on average, less than one additional transit per day over a calendar year”. The impact of the increased transit flights (which are of negligible duration or “NA” in Appendix J Table J-7) is assessed in this fairly straightforward way that includes frequency of events and duration. However, comparable assessment is missing for the 62% proposed increase in electronic warfare training (with an average duration of 90 minutes/aircraft). Rather than pull apart 3.12.3.2.1.1 line by line, I will conclude this section by reiterating that lack of relevant noise metrics for people and wildlife can only result in weak and inconsequential assessments of impact on socioeconomic resources.	
Kuehne-05	<p>II. Modeling Deficiencies</p> <p>a. Incomplete description of aircraft engine variant used in modeling The Noise Modeling Analysis specifies that the “loudest available variants” of the F-15 and P-8A aircraft were used for noise modeling, but does not specify which engine variant is used for the EA-18G. Since the proposed increases in Aircraft/Year for the EA-18G comprise 56% of all proposed increases for the combined Olympic A&B and W-237 A&B regions, and 98% of the proposed increases for the Olympic A&B (where most of the noise impacts are experienced) (Tables J-3 to J-10, Appendix J), this represents a critical omission. The “enhanced” F414-GE-400 engine for the EA-18G is reportedly capable of twice the horsepower and 18% greater thrust (see news articles attached in the mailed hard copy of these comments regarding notification of the contract to General Electric for enhanced F414-GE-400 engines). The Noise Modeling Analysis should be based on this louder variant, unless the Navy can establish that enhanced engines will not be used in the EA-18G fleet at NASWI.</p>	<p>The engines used for the noise model were the F414-GE-400 engines, which are the current engines installed in the F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft. Appendix J has been revised to include the engine type modeled for the EA-18G aircraft. The GE F414-400 enhanced engine is currently only in a research phase for the Navy, and is not installed in any aircraft, nor are there plans to purchase or install it. If this engine were to be introduced to the fleet of F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft, the Navy would measure the noise emissions from this new engine.</p>
Kuehne-06	<p>b. Inappropriate spatial and temporal averaging of noise impacts The Noise Modeling Analysis using the software program NoiseMap did not actually produce any noise maps, which would create noise impact contours that could be evaluated spatially. As a result, the only spatial information that is provided in Appendix J is limited to the model inputs that state “the aircraft events are uniformly distributed throughout the SUA within the 3 NM offset with a diminishing distribution from the offset to the SUA boundary”. As documented in (L. Kuehne, Final Report, 11 June 2019), based on year-long monitoring at three locations within or just</p>	<p>DoD’s position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD’s position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>adjacent to the MOAs, noise impacts may be correlated but are not equally experienced across locations (Table 1, Figure 7), indicating that there are “hotspots” where activity is concentrated. This may be due to operational features and constraints (e.g., Entry/Exit points, positions of electronic warfare transmitters, which are limited to specific locations) that results in common or emphasized flight paths. Given that available evidence indicates unevenness of impacts across the MOAs, the Navy should create actual noise maps that incorporate flight paths and emphasized routes. The Navy should also conduct noise monitoring across a broad geographic range both within and outside of the MOAs to evaluate spatial concentration of noise impacts. Results from this type of monitoring could be used to help mitigate realized impacts and refine the noise modeling to account for emphasized flight paths.</p> <p>A second key result from (L. Kuehne, Final Report, 11 June 2019) is that impacts of military aircraft are strongly concentrated between the hours of 9 AM and 5 PM. The Noise Modeling Analysis reduces this effect by only considering and reporting on “daytime” as the very large range between 7 AM and 10 PM, during which period 94-99% of the EA-18G Aircraft/Year are reportedly active (Appendix J Table J-3). One reason for delineating daytime in this way is made clear for the purposes of adding a 10dB penalty to nighttime events and calculating a 24-hr DNL. However, this very limited division between daytime and nighttime obscures the fact that nearly ¾ (74%) of military flights were documented between 9AM and 5PM, with the majority of the remainder (19%) documented between 5PM and 10PM (leaving 5% between 10PM-7AM, and 2% between 7AM – 9AM). This results in an intense temporal concentration of all noise impacts, which show strong peaks in the middle of the day (Figure 6, L. Kuehne, Final Report, 11 June 2019), where percent time audible in some location-date-hours exceeded 80%. Given that the Proposed Training Missions for the EA-18G (Appendix J Table J-7) show Aircraft/Year increases on the orders of 13% (Entry/Exit, Air-to-Air) - 62% (Electronic Warfare Close Air Support), but without changes in the Day/Night percentages, it is reasonable to assume that 1) percent time audible will increase by ~13-62% uniformly across current hours, retaining the strong temporal concentration during certain portions of the day and/or 2) more flights will occur in the lesser-utilized hours of 5 PM-10 PM and/or 3) activity will occur on greater numbers of days (i.e., weekends) during the year. The ~13-62% increases in activity will have to be “fit in” somewhere. Regardless of the actual planned scenario, based on patterns from the monitoring data, the current division</p>	<p>conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	into only two daily time periods and use of the 24-hr DNL do not reflect strong temporal concentration of aircraft activity. This makes impossible any real evaluation of impacts of noise on people, wildlife, and socio-economic and cultural resources. Some possibilities for expanding the Noise Modeling Analysis to better reflect temporal concentration include: a) modeling the distribution of noise impacts across each hour of the day (e.g., Figure 6, L. Kuehne, Final Report 11 June 2019), b) conducting on-the-ground monitoring that establishes those distributions across the MOAs, c) modeling and reporting on smaller temporal time periods that correspond to peoples' schedules, such as mornings, school or work periods, evenings, sleeping periods. The latter would need to reflect schedules that are relevant for both residents and visitors (e.g., campers and backpackers) to the area.	
Kuehne-07	c. Incomplete modeling that downplays and disregards impacted areas The modeling and conclusions also imply that noise impacts will not extend beyond the SUA boundary; again, the model inputs "events are uniformly distributed throughout the SUA within the 3 NM offset with a diminishing distribution from the offset to the SUA boundary." is the only information that references the overall acoustic footprint from activities in the MOA. However, as the data in (L. Kuehne, Final Report, 11 June 2019) clearly show, one of the monitored locations in that study that is 1.8 km (1 NM) outside of the MOA boundary experiences an average of 6-14% time audible for military aircraft between the hours of 9 AM and 5 PM. These averages were obtained over 40 days of sampling (in four 10-day periods), which means that percent time audible was substantially higher within sampling periods and on specific days. For example, out of the 185 date-hours when monitoring detected military aircraft at this location, 114 (or 62%) exceeded 10% time audible for that hour, and 19/185 date-hours exceeded 50% time audible for that hour. To achieve these consistent noise levels outside of the MOAs boundary despite a 3 NM offset (Appendix J, p. J-24 "The highest terrain beneath the Olympic MOAs is found at the eastern most border of the MOAs, where aircraft presence is unlikely due to the 3 NM offset used by aircrew to avoid accidentally spilling out of the airspace") means that 1) either pilots are consistently in the offset and operating much closer to the boundary than is assumed in the modeling and/or 2) that the acoustic footprint or detection range of Growler jets is at least 4 NM. Anecdotal evidence from people that live in the area around NASWI suggests that – depending on weather conditions – Growler jets are audible at a range of at least 8-9 NM, which is consistent with the	The noise from EA-18G operations are expected to be heard outside of the MOA boundaries, but the received noise levels will be low. The noise modeling conducted for this analysis follows the standard noise modeling tools for assessing noise exposures from current and proposed airspace training operations. These procedures utilize noise level metrics to provide a comparison between the baseline (or no action) and proposed scenarios. This process allows a comparison of the changes in the cumulative noise exposure between (or among) the scenarios. These calculations are based on the operation of the aircraft and estimated over an area of exposure. Audibility, on the other hand, is a complex process that involves a source, a receiver, a background sound spectrum, and localized atmospheric conditions. Although noise models can predict audibility for an individual flight trajectory, no current audibility noise model exists for aircraft operations within an airspace. These operations are dispersed over the entire airspace volume and vary widely from operation to operation. A new section has been added to Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis for the Olympic Military Operations Area) describing audibility of the EA-18G. In this new section, a new table (Table J-17) indicates the lateral distance of audibility for the EA-18G is typically 12-15 NM.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	frequency of events and percent time audible recorded at the Hoh River Trail location (L. Kuehne, Final Report, 11 June 2019). Modeling the noise impacts based on the actual audible range and based on likely frequency of events – including transit or Entry/Exit events - will certainly extend the total acoustic footprint from activity within the MOAs. However, this is the only way in which an actual assessment of the geographic extent and impacts on corresponding socio-economic and cultural resources (e.g., Olympic National Park) can be done. Again, conducting noise monitoring vs. only doing modeling will also allow assessment of realized impacts on the landscape, and ability to mitigate or minimize those impacts by adjusting operations.	
Kuehne-08	<p>Conclusions/Implications:</p> <p>The modeling and metrics presented in the Noise Modeling Analysis in the DSEIS are highly inadequate to evaluate the impact of Growler jets on people living in and around the MOAs and/or underneath transit routes to and from the MOAs from NASWI. The metrics bear little to no relevance to how noise is experienced by people and wildlife, offering little basis for the subsequent conclusions of minimal or negligible impact to socio-economic and ecological resources (Section 3.12.3.2.1.1). The modeling downplays or disregards impacted areas, does not model noise in areas where it is clearly occurring, and ignores the existence and implications of spatio-temporal concentrations of noise impacts. This modeling and analysis should be updated to produce noise maps and metrics that are relevant to assessing impact on people and wildlife, as well as incorporating detailed information from existing acoustic monitoring data. Noise monitoring by independent parties should be conducted over a broad geographic area to evaluate realized impacts. The feasibility and utility of conducting this type of monitoring to inform environmental impacts of aircraft is exemplified in (L. Kuehne, Final Report, 11 June 2019) as well as the 2010-2011 Acoustic Monitoring Report by the National Park Service (described on pages J- 26 and J-27 of the Appendix J).</p>	The noise model used, MR_NMap is the appropriate method to evaluate aircraft noise in special use airspace such as the Olympic MOA. This model is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses. How noise impacts any individual is highly subjective, often depending as much on the individual as it does the sound source. What this Noise Modeling Analysis accomplishes is the determination of metrics, which are then compared to established noise standards.
Kuehne-09	These comments were submitted (with all attachments) via certified US Postal Service Mail on June 12th, 2019. The comments were also submitted (with only the file titled L. Kuehne, Final Report, 11 June 2019 to accommodate the 1 MB file upload limit) using the online form. I would like to note that the 1 MB file upload limit is highly restrictive and causes unnecessary burden on those participating in the public comment process.	The commenting feature on the project website, while not a NEPA requirement, was added by the Navy to further facilitate commenting by the public. While the 1 MB limitation restricts larger file uploads, it does allow the Navy to continue supporting this feature in a cost-effective manner. Over 1,800 comments were received on this project through website commenting and attachments, with very few affected by this limit. The Navy will review this file size limitation for future projects.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Kuehnert-1	Please stop using sonar.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Kukuljan-1	I want to encourage testing Tehnology which is not harming marine life. Orcas and other sea mamals are very sensitive on sound stimulus. Strong sonars are very harmfull for them. Keeping our marine life live and healthy is very important for life quality of humans and rest of the planet.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Kurkpatrick-1	Something to conceptacting The whales are dying more thought on how to stop this; rather then killing them. With any testing and training, where the marine mammals, are in the ocean.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Kyle-1	We have to protect our oceans. Our planet depends on the ocean for life. Sonar testing destroys this fragile ecosystem. We need to start taking accountability for our actions and start acting like the superior race. Please consider what you are doing. Our lives and the lives of our children depend on it.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
L		
L-1	I am against this testing due to the proven harm to marine mammals and damage to their hearing. These intelligent creatures communicate through	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	complex sounds to hunt and thrive, and the damaging underwater sonar puts them at risk.	and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Labrash-1	<p>This comment is in response to The Navy's proposal to move their training and testing activities in the Olympic Peninsula area.</p> <p>I feel the plan outlined in this EIS will have disastrous results for Olympic National Park, the Peninsula, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary in terms of harming our ecosystem.</p> <p>The noise generated by 19 trips per day of 3-jet Growler teams will be harmful to the people and wildlife of the Peninsula. That, in turn will hurt the health and economy of the Peninsula and the State of Washington.</p> <p>Noise levels within the Olympic airspace will range from over 80 dB to 100 dB. Continued exposure to noise above 85 dBA over time will cause hearing loss. People in Forks have reported measuring 94 dBA with solo flights.</p> <p>There are other health problems that are caused or made worse by noise. They include: high blood pressure (hypertension), heart disease (ischemic heart disease), and mental health problems. Loud repetitive noises also contribute to disruption of the ecosystem and our native wildlife.</p> <p>The Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuaries represents one of North America's most productive and marine ecosystems and spectacular undeveloped coastlines.</p> <p>I will argue there are other places where this training has occurred and can occur.</p> <p>ONLY the No Action Alternative is acceptable to the Olympic Peninsula's environment. Also we need a 30-day extension to comment period.</p> <p>Alternatives 1 & 2 will harm the health and economy of the Peninsula.</p> <p>I am asking the Navy to reconsider and use alternative sites where they may do their electronic warfare training.</p>	<p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Lacson-1	Marine mammals such as Orcas and Dahl's Porpoise rely on hearing to survive and connect with each other. These are social animals adapting to strained resources and a changing climate. We cannot take their sensory ability to hear away from them for any reason. It is unconscionable.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Laffan-1	Please re-think the use of sonar, it has been proven that it is harmful to dolphins/whales. It is unacceptable to disturb, let alone harm these individuals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Laflam-1	I am a concerned person who had lived in the northwest my entire life. I am against underwater sonar testing! It has been proven to harm marine life! I am truly concerned for the southern resident orcas and all other marine life. Under water sonar testing should not be allowed!!! Thank you. Candace LaFlam	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lahti-1	My husband of 44 years and I continue a 38-year-old-tradition of spending time in the Olympic National Forest & Park. Roughly at the onset of the 2015 level of the Growler flyovers, we began to notice the peace and quiet we came here to seek was a threatened privilege. The space impacted by these sudden, loud, unnatural noises is roughly the space most accessible to tourists (along coastal land). More than 3 million of us per year visit these public lands primarily for the natural silence available in a temperate coastal rain forest; a designation unique in our vast and varied nation. That lands should be set aside as too precious to be owned or sold but should be space for all citizens was a great dream of democracy. But it was implemented prior to the airplane and made no specific prohibition of violating its airspace. Just as research is beginning to show the deleterious relationship of unnatural sound on human health (increased blood-pressure and heart-rate, Alzheimer's prevalence in populations increasing near interstate highways, for openers), this proposal comes along to	The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	increase sound impact over the spaces where people might go to recuperate from the acoustic stressors of urban life. The plan should be seriously reconsidered and spaces sacred to silence with Park designation be widely circumvented by peacetime, routine, Navy practice missions.	
Lambert-1	No sonar testing!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lance-1	Just like we need to preserve and care for all inhabitants on land we need to do the same for the ones in the waters. It is called balance of mother earth. Have we as humans learned nothing when the oil spill with BP and Exxon Mobil happened? Sonar testing has proven to cause distress and in some cases death to these animals. There should be a mandate that allows the military to be open and transparent with the public on projects that require testing in the oceans and on land (testing that requires drilling into the earth.)	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lane-1	We do not need to be terrorizing the beautiful sea creature. Some species literally beach themselves to get away from that lawful sound. We don't have enough now get you the U.S. Navy continue to decimate the few we have left. Come up with something besides sonar or sonic booms for oil! And quickly. And yes I value dolphins and whales more than navy's use of deafening sonar. We can do better. We must do better!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lang D-1	The Navy has shown itself to be a strong steward of the environment and has a track record of reviewing feedback critically. I am far more concerned with the City of Seattle, that admits to dumping millions of gallons of untreated sewage directly in to the sound. The ferry boats used by Seattle commuters hit and kill whales, as do the thousands of ships that use the	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Port of Seattle. Each of these points can easily be fact check with the search engine of your choice. To act like the Navy is the problem in Puget Sound is a disgrace to common sense.	
Lang R-1	I know the outlying field has been there longer than we have. When it began the aircraft being flown were propeller aircraft that could not be heard from Port Townsend. Times have changed and the aircraft have become exponentially louder. I can no longer sleep with our windows open at night. my wife can no longer garden during the day, all due to the noise of aircraft practice landing. I have heard it called the sound of freedom, it however is not that sound but the sound of disturbance. It may or may not be physically damaging, I am not a scientist in that realm so I do not know. I however am a human being that is being adversely affected by the lack of sleep and an adverse effect in my marriage due to the noise. The United States should do better by their citizens. the arguments that this is the best place for this aircraft carrier landing practice is absolutely not true. The impact here is felt in our community as a rebuke to our military and an assault on our National Parks that are here to preserve the natural state, not undermine it.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Langosch-1	I am completely against this. This has the ability to harm our already endangered southern resident orcas. With a new baby just born, we should be trying to prolong its life.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lannan-1	Respectfully, I would like to formally object to the Navy's training and testing program and would like to see stronger protections for the fragile ocean life and Native Tribes Cultural Lifeways. The cultural impacts as well as environmental impacts from the Navy's	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>training and testing activities is especially important because these activities take place in the near coastal regions of the Pacific Ocean, which holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes and is critically important for the wellbeing of all people and lifeforms on this planet. I believe the Navy must reduce impacts to the Native Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities. The Navy should also prohibit use of sonar within the 50-mile mitigation area. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals. The "best available science" referenced in the draft SEIS should be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. The Navy's monitoring program should be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. The current standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy should expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing</p>	<p>EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy will continue to consult with the Tribes. Through Government-to-Government consultations, the Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.</p>
Lannan-2	<p>The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should also be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.</p>	<p>The Navy discusses ocean acidification in the context of climate change in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) and 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and includes information from scientific studies conducted since 2015. The Navy acknowledged in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) that "metals tend to dissociate" in more acidic ocean conditions. The Navy added a reference back to these two sections in the sections analyzing the impacts of explosives (Section 3.1.4.1) and metals (Section 3.1.4.2). Note that corrosion can also act to insulate ordnance and other metal items from contact with seawater and sediments, slowing or even halting further corrosion and movement of metals into the adjacent sediments and water column. The effects of climate change on the ocean environment, particularly effects specific to a particular region like ocean waters in the Pacific Northwest, continue to be researched and to evolve and are not necessarily predictable. For example, as described in Section 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality), increases in ocean acidity are believed to reduce the availability of carbonate in the water column, which is needed by organisms to generate calcium carbonate structures. However, increases in sea surface temperature associated with climate change appear to stimulate calcification</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		at an even greater rate, essentially overriding the inhibiting effects of lower pH levels and leading to unexpected high abundance of cocolithophores (which build protective scales from calcium carbonate) in some ocean regions.
Laperriere-1	Please stop. This is cruelty. I wish our military was more compassionate and empathic.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Larimer-1	<p>In Table ES-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2, Section 3.12 (ES-24), the Preferred Alternative states, "Impacts on socioeconomic resources are expected to be minor because inaccessibility to areas of co-use would be localized and temporary, the Navy's strict standard operating procedures would minimize physical disturbance and strikes of commercial and recreational watercraft, most airborne activities would occur well out to sea far from tourism and recreation locations, aircraft activities in the Olympic MOAs are expected to have negligible impacts on socioeconomic resources, and impacts to commercially important marine species are not expected."</p> <p>When assessing the interaction of social and economic factors in the Puget Sound Area, any threat to the region's iconic and endangered marine mammal, the Resident Orca, cannot be underestimated. Washington designated the orca whale (<i>Orcinus orca</i>) as the official state marine mammal due to the research and persuasion of second-graders from Crescent Harbor Elementary School in Oak Harbor, WA. Groups as diverse and economically vital as newly hired hi-tech workers and out-of-state summer tourists recognize the Orca's symbolic status our great state, and have been influenced by it's economic pull. Further threats to this unique sub-species endemic to the Salish Sea in turn threaten a myriad of Orca-centric economic systems.</p> <p>The Southern resident Orca population is currently at a 35 year low. While the "sound-producing activities " noted in Table ES-1, Section 3.4 (ES-10) are not expected to have "long-term consequences for the species or stocks" according to this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, this is in direct contradiction to the finding that anthropogenic noise can cause auditory masking, "leading to cochlear damage, ... altered metabolisms, hampered</p>	<p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>population recruitment...." (Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2015 Oct; 12(10): 12304–12323.) Given these populations are already at great risk due to PCB-mediated effects on reproduction and immune function (Science 28 Sep 2018:Vol. 361, Issue 6409, pp. 1373-1376), and the depletion of their primary food source (Southern Resident Killer Whale Priority Chinook Stocks Report; NOAA Fisheries, West Coast Region, and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife; June 22, 2018).</p> <p>The responsibilities of the Navy are significant and vital to our security. Yet the risk of losing broad public support for the Service throughout population dense Western WA, due to a miscalculation of the impact of these proposed activities on a highly-valued species such as the Orca, should not be minimized.</p>	
Larkin-1	<p>I am writing in respsne to the United States Navys plan to do sonar testing off the coast of caliornia. The plan is to do this testing 12 miles off the coast. Even 300 miles from the source sonar canbe 140 decibals.Wales especially use sound for communication and navigation. Royal Society B shows that even mid-frequency noisces disrupt feeding patterns in baleen whales and could negatively affect entire populations. Over 200 melon-headed whales beached off the coast of Hawaii in 2004 How can the Navy justify alowing testing that kill whales and other sea life? Our coast is a very special area where there is an upwhelming of a nutrients for saline. Using sonar so close to shore will disrupt the lifecycle of not only whales,but other sea life.</p> <p>I have lived over 49 years off the Mendocino Coast of California. I also row in the ocean where I have been surrounded by many different species of whales including Humpback and Blue. Many tourists come to our aera to observe and be awed by the whale sightings. We even have two weekends where tourists come into our area from"decreased our Abalone, salmon, crab andother over the world to observe these beautifu animals. How can the Navy justify disrupting the migration of whales as a means of protecting our coast. Our community needs the tourist industry since due to other environmental problems have damaged our abalone, salmon and crab industry.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Larkin-2	<p>Basically, Scientific American reported that in 2005, 34 whales were killed off the North Carolina coast due to the Navy's sonar testing. I row off the coast of California on a whale boat, and the gray whales basically, when I first moved here, their migration was from basically October through March. I have seen whales, humpback whales, blue whales, not during that time. So if the Navy says, "Well, we will do it when whales are not</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	migrating or moving," I'm not saying that the humpback whales are migrating, all I know is I have seen those whales out there and I've been close to them. In that Scientific American article also, they said that whales hearing the sound, the sonar, they bleed from the eyes and ears. I would not like that to happen off our coast. I feel like the whales deserve to have a place, as we all do. And I feel the Navy's decision to want to do this is totally against the whales and those of us who live on the coast. Simple. Thank you.	populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, and the "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June 2017)" (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents).
Larkins-1	I am submitting comments on this proposal as I feel it is not humane for the implementation of sonar to make large stretches of ocean uninhabitable for endangered killer whales. It is not acceptable to pollute these sea creatures' environment with this noise and it likely interferes with their very being, adversely affecting Navigation, communication and subsequent feeding and mating.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Larson C-1	These harmful military practices are unacceptable. A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas. □ "For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival," Calambokidis said. □ Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations. □ Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times. □	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Larson J-1	I have reviewed the additional documents provided since 2015, and note that the updated analyses and assessments are impressively comprehensive, but not without some perceived deficiencies. From my perspective, a summary of these areas of concern include: * a lack of some specific exposure risk data/ratings to be correlated for the	The Navy completed the analysis of impacts to marine life using the best available science and presenting the findings in a manner that is consistent with the output of the acoustic model, and in a format that best informs the National Marine Fisheries Service. For all topics described in Chapter 8, the Navy completed a thorough analysis using the best available science.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>listed profiled marine life and for the various enumerated range of naval exercises,</p> <p>*a "minimalist" approach to giving thorough analysis to each of the public issues that were listed in V.1 under 8.2 - especially 8.2.2.1-8.2.2.10 & 8.2.2.16.</p>	
Larson J-2	<p>* Where is the justification/acknowledgment and detailed discussion about how project activities for ALT.1 impact O.N.P. as a World Heritage Site and International Biosphere Reserve ? Our local paper noted how O.N.P. has >3 million visits resulting in ~\$260 million to local economy. Where is Navy data for survey of public response to its project activities and possible anxiety and noise averse response?</p>	<p>The potential impacts to the Olympic National Park as a World Heritage Site were analyzed in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS. That analysis has not changed. The potential economic impacts were analyzed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources).</p>
Larson J-3	<p>* While V.2 does provide some actual dBA data about EA-18G possible effects on a hiker, it is missing discussion that might be pertinent and provided in ANSI references for that section.</p> <p>* Finally, Navy needs ongoing monitoring plan to determine if adverse effects occur, E5.7.5.3 is actually true and project could be ended.</p>	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.
Laspesa-1	<p>I moved from Chicago, IL here to the Northwest in 2011 to escape the chaos of noise and concrete, and to be able to relax in my environment. The peace and tranquility of this peninsula was healing. Since the growlers have been flying by there are not hours of quiet any longer. Sleeping under the stars is usually magical, however now with the growlers flying by I feel like I live next to O'Hare airport with planes taking off at very regular and tight intervals. I cannot imagine hearing more!!!</p> <p>I understand that practice makes perfect. I also believe there are other bases that would allow for that practice without affecting those people (I am including myself) that need the solace of this place, and without affecting the animals that live here that use sonar and other senses sensitive to the technology used in all of the naval training.</p> <p>Please include me the Supplemental EIS/OEIS mailing list (email is cjlaspesa@gmail.com) so that I may receive notification of public meetings and project information.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Lassiter-1	<p>Please just stop the noise. It's inhumane. With all the technology, it's not necessary. I can not imagine the pain. The environment is already critical and ocean life is almost nonexistent. Please please stop the noise.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.mil/speciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lauducci-1	<p>Please monitor all noise imposed on the Olympic National Forest in real time. This area is unique and a treasure to be preserved. The quiet space it provides for creatures that live there and for people who visit needs to be protected at all cost.</p>	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Noise pollution is real and has a detrimental effect. We cannot afford to lose this space of respite. Please be a good neighbor and cause no harm.	<p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Lauren-1	Please stop these practices it is really damaging and distressing to marine life. The evidence is clear this disturbing noise causes severe stress and stranding's in marine mammals. We would not put up with listening to this as humans so why should they? It is time to end this now and create a peaceful marine environment. These species deal with enough pollution and plastic in their homes without having the additional pain and distress from these noises. Do the right thing.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Laurino-1	With ongoing efforts to care for the ocean and the flora and fauna it supports, dumping toxic waste in the ocean is completely counter productive and should be recognized as an unnecessary risk to put on an already stressed part of our ecosystem. Ocean temperatures are rising; the southern resident orcas are threatened due in part to an insufficient food supply and environmental toxins; the sea stars have only just begun recovering from the viral assault - these are just the main headline	The Navy does not propose to dump toxic waste in the ocean. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	problems facing the ocean life in our region. There has to be a better method for disposal. Please make it a top priority not to pollute our ocean waters with this toxic waste.	or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals. The analysis of impacts of the Navy's activities on water quality can be found in Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Lautsch-1	I am 100% opposed to this testing being done. Please for the sake of the wildlife in our oceans, please please do not let sonar testing happen. Please !!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lavelle-1	I am 100% against sonar testing. The use of underwater sonar can lead to hearing loss and even death in marine mammals. These sound waves can travel for hundreds of miles under water, and can retain an intensity of 140 decibels as far as 300 miles from their source. Our Orca population in the Pacific Northwest are already struggling due to loss of salmon caused by over fishing and dams blocking their migration up river to reproduce. We need to protect these national treasures not further kill them off. Pleases stop sonar testing.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lawrence-1	The Navy must cease and desist sonar in the Salish Sea causing the already endangered Southern Resident Orcas certain death.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Le Goff-1	I would like to voice my concern for the welfare of marine animals affected by noise pollution. Now more than ever, the balance and health of our	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	oceans is crucial. The sustainability of the marine environment as a viable habitat and food source for marine animals and humans alike is in danger. This threat is larger and more imminent than the possibility of war or issues of national defense. Beyond this, it is immoral and even criminal to knowingly inflict pain and loss of hearing to innocent animals.	<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Leadbitter-1	I strongly oppose these unnecessary sonar wave tests.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Leanne-1	<p>The Southern Resident Orcas and</p> <p>A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas. []</p> <p>[] "For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival. Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations. []</p> <p>Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times. []</p> <p>This is why is disagree with it!</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Lebaron-1	<p>The Navy is in clear VIOLATION of the following: The Noise Control Act of 1974 https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/Laws-rules-rulemaking/Noise-pollution MAXIMUM ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE LEVELS https://apps.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=173-60-020 (9) "Noise" means the intensity, duration and character of sounds, from any and all sources WAC 173-60-040 Maximum permissible environmental noise levels. https://apps.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=173-60-040 (c) At any hour of the day or night the applicable noise limitations in (a) and (b) above may be exceeded for any receiving property by no more than: (i) 5 dBA for a total of 15 minutes in any one-hour period; or (ii) 10 dBA for a total of 5 minutes in any one-hour period; or (iii) 15 dBA for a total of 1.5 minutes in any one-hour period. We have proof of noise levels over 70 DBA, so now what? It is not right that the Navy can skirt around these laws that were put in place to ensure "QUIET ENJOYMENT" OF OUR PROPERTY AND OUR PARKS</p>	<p>The Noise Control Act of 1974 allows the EPA to regulate products in interstate commerce, but specifically exempts military weapons or equipment designed for combat use. The federal government is not generally subject to the laws and regulations of any individual state. Appendix J of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS analyzes potential noise impacts from the Proposed Action. Any noise resulting from proposed training or testing is attributable to the safe execution of training and testing requirements within the analyzed Study Area.</p>
Lebaron-2	<p>Who are our enemies that we are building up to defend against? Russia? They hacked our election and are destroying our country from within thru hate groups in Social Media thru Russian Bots. China? They finance our debt. Not likely. North Korea? They are disarming, don't you know? https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/navy-rejects-call-for-more-monitoring-of-growler-jet-training-on-whidbey-island/ https://video.newyorker.com/watch/the-backstory-why-noise-pollution-is-more-dangerous-than-we-think The Navy has "Anti-Gravity" planes that are noiseless! Yes, here is the patent and the proof: https://exonews.org/the-us-navy-secretly-designed-a-super-fast-futuristic-aircraft-resembling-a-ufo-documents-reveal/ So the Navy could not be torturing us with these out-dated War Planes, when they actually have silent, more advance planes to defend us with. There is a movie out called; "Plane Truths" (http://planettruths.org/) that focuses on the decibels of the Growlers, the affects our hearing (, the effects on locals working outside trying to farm and sell vegetables, the crash site areas by public institutions- Middle School, Hospital, houses and the flights over the Olympic National Parks that drive off campers- leaving in the middle of the night after being subjected to high volume noise</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>pollution until 1 am. The ground water around Whidbey is contaminated by fire retardant. There are solutions that need to be addressed.</p> <p>1. Insist that the Navy dig new deeper wells for all private wells the are affected by their polluted ground water issue and stop blending the polluted wells into the public water system. For the cost of a new Growler, they can afford to fix this health issue that they are responsible for.</p> <p>2. The Navy is not supporting the community because it pays no taxes, so many basic services are being eliminated. The Oak Harbor Public Pool closed last year due to insufficient funding.</p> <p>3. When the airfield was built in the 1940's much smaller planes were in use. There is a huge airfield at China Lake in California - covers more than 1,100,000 acres. As of 2010, at least 95% of that land has been left undeveloped. We will continue to loose tourists if they get the word out that the Growlers are disrupting their vacations, and locals are loosing their hearing, their health to water contaminants, under threat of plane crash zones. Residents have measured the noise at over 130 decibels on Whidbey in residential areas. This is loud enough to damage hearing.</p> <p>4. AND the most important issue that I did not bring up, is that if a foreign power wants to take out the base, why have all the growlers in ONE LOCATION that is easy to HIT???? Isn't it better to take the extra planes to California and spread them out????</p> <p>References:</p> <p>a.. Hearing loss: https://www.nidcd.nih.gov/health/noise-induced-hearing-loss</p> <p>b. Growler Noise: https://washingtonenvironmentalprotectioncoalition.org/2-how-growler-jets-harm-owls-and-other-wildlife/2-2-how-the-navy-mislead-usfw-on-jet-noise-levels</p> <p>c. Growler Noise data cooked: http://www.whidbeynewstimes.com/news/long-awaited-eis-concludes-growler-noise-not-linked-to-health-problems/</p> <p>d. https://disclosuredeception.wordpress.com/noise-volume/</p> <p>e. hearing damage: https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/northwest/more-growlers-on-whidbey-island-increase-noise-levels-navy-study-says/</p> <p>f. hazardous to hearing: https://citizensofebeysreserve.com/2013/05/05/very-disturbing-noise-facts-from-the-navy/</p> <p>g. Lopez Concerns: http://www.islandsweekly.com/life/plane-truths-and-</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	growler-noise-on-lopez-island/ h. Olympic National Park Noise: https://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/olympic-national-park-is-no-place-for-growler-jets/	
Lebrun-1	I feel the Navy has failed to adequately address the environmental impact of noise levels within the broader Olympic Peninsula, including all area where flight patterns will have impact, not just the MOAs. The Navy needs to closely monitor noise levels in all affected areas and not rely solely on models as is currently being done in other areas. If there were no other areas within this vast country to carry out such military exercises this discussion would not be happening. But clearly there are other areas and other alternatives, and they should be considered. Moving forward with this plan is a disservice to the American public and all those from other countries who come to visit this pristine National Park.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Ledbetter-1	Though I strongly object to destructive real war or war game practice activities to occur in the universal habitat of humans and other living species, I write this comment to strongly object to the proposed War Games that include the use of Sonar and other toxic and destructive weapons in my immediate habitat the oceanic waters of the Pacific North West, specifically less than a mile from the ocean. Just the mere fact the proposal is for the “need to practice” these War Games clearly shows NO ONE has any idea of how the various toxic weapons will work in our area or their effect on the environment. This fact makes it very clear there are real possibilities of risky unknown negative short and long term effects that will result in a negative way on the well being, health, and livelihood of the humans and other species of animals and plants that live in the waters and near the areas requested in the permit for these War Games. The obvious potential of the serious unknown dangerous outcomes absolutely make it obvious these war games must NOT occur. While I am concerned about the lack of understanding of the short and long term effects of the war games on our environment in my immediate habitat, it is also clear that there are further potential complications of the unknown long term domino effects the proposed war game activities will have upon the many species of our planet as a whole. With this in mind I must point out the following: Our oceans and waters are all connected, either through the various conjunctions - rivers, seas, etc. where they join each other, or through the rivers of water carried by the clouds overhead to bring the rains that supply	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the waters to the inlands of our planet.</p> <p>Just as all species including the human species depend on healthy oceans for the planet temperature to maintain a healthy environment, we depend on these living waters to interact with healthy air, and soil to maintain our living habitat.</p> <p>Those who are given the opportunity to be representatives of the people of the United States, who have agreed to protect the well being of our land and people, and whose decisions ultimately effect all people in the world, we must NOT continue to pursue this idea of increasing perfection of how to kill other people through WAR AND WAR GAME activities. If we do, in the process we will only bring more war and destruction upon ourselves. With these facts I have addressed, I say in all sincerity and with all due respect for the well being of all of our human family, including the families of those who are asking for a permit to conduct the proposed war games on and in the Pacific North West Ocean, and those in the representative position to consider the permit request:</p> <p>On behalf of myself and others, and all of the species who reside in the surrounding seas and on the land, approving this permit request is not the way to protect the well being of all of the species of our living breathing human habitat - planet earth.</p> <p>The only healthy human choice you have available to protect our human habitat is to deny the approval to go forward with this ill thought out permit request plan.</p>	
Ledbetter-2	<p>The first thing I want to say is this meeting or whatever you want to call this presentation tonight was absolutely inappropriate and inadequate. People could not hear questions or answers. And we need to come together in another meeting, in an assembly form, with microphones, so one person can ask a question and we can all hear the answer so that we understand fully, together as a community, what is the scope of this activity that we don't approve of in the first place. And we don't support the danger to our environment and our animals in the sea, and we just want no risks taken with them. They're part of our environment and they're important to us. But we needed a type of a meeting that would allow the Navy to hear us, and their organization that we as taxpayers pay for. We need for them to be able to hear us as a group and for us to hear them as a group so we can come together and make appropriate decisions. This was totally fragmented. It created such chaos that it's shameful. It's shameful. And I would add, I want to see another meeting set up here within the next week or two, with an assembly form, so then we can truly make comments based</p>	<p>The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	on full information. And if two weeks is too short, which will give us time to comment by I think it's June 12th, then they need to extend the comment time so that it would coincide with a fair amount of time for all of us to get a fair time to make statements and then to hear information and then reply and comment.	
Leddy-1	According to Navy's own admission over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar. Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times. □That is not even mentioning our SRKW, our Biggs orcas and all the other marine mammals including pinnipeds. This is not acceptable to use sonar in these inland waters. We know it kills and maims and we are in an inland sea teeming with unique species. Time to restrict this activity in our waters as we work to save our endangered resident orcas.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lee A-1	<p>Anyone with any common sense can see what the effects of the proposed testing will be. If it ever comes to the point where the US Navy feels the need to bomb something under the ocean surface, I'm sure it will be able to do so.</p> <p>Below please find one argument against this project.</p> <p>Researchers Have Identified How Naval Sonar Is Killing And Beaching Whales</p> <p>January 31, 2019 - by Alex Larson, edited by me.</p> <p>We have known for a long time that naval sonar has devastating effects on marine life but just exactly how it leads to sickness and death was a mystery till now. New research published in the Proceedings of the Royal Society B explains that the sound emitted by sonar is so intense that marine mammals will swim hundreds of miles, dive deep into the abyss, or even beach themselves to flee from the sounds that are literally unbearable to them.</p> <p>In particular, beaked whales are one of the marine mammals often found beached due to sonar testing. Prior to the 1960s, beaked whale strandings were extremely rare; after the Navy started to use mid-frequency active sonar (MFAS) in the 1960s to detect submarines, beached whales became very common. The recently published paper, a summary of a 2017 meeting of beaked whale experts in the Canary Islands, revealed that, although beaked whales are adapted to perform deep water dives for hours at a time, the sonar is so powerful distresses them so much that they dive deep</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area or at any Navy Range Complex.</p> <p>Based on the analysis in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS and monitoring conducted during actual training and testing events, the proposed training will not pose a risk to whales, fish, and other wildlife given that these same types of activities have been conducted for many years here and in other Range Complexes with no indications of broad-scale impacts that are either injurious or of significant biological impact to marine mammals, fish, or wildlife at those locations. Please see the recent results supporting this as presented in training ranges monitoring reports available at the Navy website (www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/) and from the NMFS Office of Protected Resources website (www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental.htm#applications).</p> <p>On the Navy's website you can find the Navy's technical report on marine mammal strandings. This report includes the Canary Islands' and the Bahamas' stranding events and can be found at https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>too quickly causing decompression sickness or "the bends" from nitrogen bubbles in their blood. The nitrogen can cause hemorrhaging and damage to whales' vital organs.</p> <p>"In the presence of sonar they are stressed and swim vigorously away from the sound source, changing their diving pattern," lead author Yara Bernaldo de Quiros told AFP. "The stress response, in other words, overrides the diving response, which makes the animals accumulate nitrogen. It's like an adrenaline shot."</p> <p>The conclusions are drawn from autopsies of dead whales, although a handful of animals were killed by other threats inflicted by humans, such as collisions with ships, entanglement in fishing nets, and disease. The authors note that to mitigate the impacts of sonar on beaked whales, we must ban its use in areas where they are found. A moratorium on the use of MFAS around the Canary Islands in 2004 shows just how well this works - no atypical strandings have been seen since. The researchers urge other countries where sonar is deployed, such as the US, Greece, Italy, and Japan, to follow suit.</p>	
Lee Kar-1	<p>Your testing is irrelevant, outdated and damaging the wildlife. There's no place for things of his nature to be happening with the navy. This must stop. Respect the ocean and what lives within it!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marin-species-monitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lee Kat-1	<p>I am writing to support STOP using sonar testing which causes hearing loss to thousand of marine inhabiting in the area. Many marine animals need to utilise sound and they could loose their survival skills without their hearing</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	capability. Don't kill or destroy animals that you think are in your way. Instead, please protect them!	EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lee Ky-1	Our marine animals are crucial to our ocean systems. This harms them all.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marin-species-monitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lees-1	Please stop this cruel practice, it is causing massive harm and pain to our marine mammals!!!! Whales and dolphins are going through unbelievable suffering because of this	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marin-species-monitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lemasters-1	Please reconsider sonar testing. You're hurting sea creatures. I am against this and you should be too.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lemons-1	<p>Please don't do this — you are aware of the increasingly delicate balance between human presence in the ecosystems they inhabit resulting in logrhythmic increases in extinctions at a scale never seen before. Moving soldiers into vanishing wilderness areas with accompanying damages from transporting them—audio and sonic disturbances— increased risk of wildfires at dry times—coastline disturbance to eel grass and fragile marine life— pollution from exhaust both gaseous and solid as well as the frightening presences of war machinery in villages and small surrounding communities should by now be seen as outdated and discarded as both inefficient and inhuman.</p> <p>If 200 acre wave parks and indoor beaches can be built as they are in Europe surely a mock up can be built on various bases where this activity can take place under secure military monitoring.</p> <p>Please don't do this</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lemons-2	<p>Thank you for listening</p> <p>My 93-year-old father was stationed at the Whidbey Island air base during world war two — he's still alive and doing well but even he agrees that the increase in noise over the years has become intolerable. I've lived in Port Townsend for 44 years so I have a reference and it's very clear that there has been a dramatic frankly unbearable increase in noise pollution from the airbase.</p>	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>There are tremendous health issues as I'm sure you are aware associated with these levels of noise – both physical and emotional and even if you will —spiritual – people with weakened immune system's and people suffering from PTSD and people who have been subjected to emotional or physical trauma like many of my friends especially veterans find this constant volume of noise extremely stressful and it can trigger PTSD episodes—</p> <p>Not to mention that property values have decreased and will continue to decrease and for many of us are homes are a lifetime investment and to see the equity in them disappear is very difficult.</p> <p>And of course the natural environment is also infected – especially the animals but domestic animal like horses by the low flyovers and the sound of the jets.</p> <p>With that said I understand that the Navy is a critical part of our nations defense—no wants or is asking for the Navy to leave—instead it should be possible to work something out where the flight patterns are less over the cities and municipalities and more over uninhabited space. It would be good to get a full nights sleep during the week and to be able to sit outside and have a conversation with friends without having to shout over the sound of the growlers and that's not hyperbole – it's actually that loud.</p> <p>Thank you for reading this and for taking into consideration the feelings of the citizens affected by these flights.</p>	<p>commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Lenton-1	<p>The Marine Mammals in our waters are struggling to survive as it is = No fish from pollution, NOISE and over-fishing.</p> <p>How can you allow for this to happen??? Now or ever.</p> <p>I am 100% against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Leof-1	<p>The sonar on marine life concerns me. I am very concerned about the adverse effects of this program for the health of sea mammals & everything smaller. I have viewed the Navy as the most forward thinking branch of our military & this program seems to me to be wrong. Please reconsider & take concern for the bigger picture – the health of all life.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Leonard-1	I think it's unacceptable to test in the Puget Sound or anywhere else in the northwest. I understand that the military is an important component for the safety of our country, but there has got to be a way to live alongside our orcas and other important marine life. Our resident orcas have been diminishing and the Navy should not be part of their destruction. We have a responsibility to maintain and respect wildlife. I think human civilization and technology is advanced enough to find a way to significantly minimize disruption and harm to our wildlife while also maintaining our country's security. In addition, to appeal to one's empathic side, orcas are extremely smart, loving, highly emotional creatures. The Navy is harming these sentient beings and it needs to be recognized that real harm is being done here and something needs to be done to remedy this. I would strongly urge the Navy to prioritize wildlife.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lepage-1	You must stop this horrible noise and leave the ocean and it's animals alone.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Leung-1	<p>While the Tribes are opposed to all training and testing, Ask that the Navy work meaningfully with Pacific coast Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State your support of Tribal opposition to all Navy training and testing, 	Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>and demand that the Navy prohibit use of sonar within the 50-mile mitigation area. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that the “best available science” referenced in the Draft SEIS be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy’s NWTT. • Request that the Navy’s monitoring program be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species. • Request the Navy to expand its list of environmental “stressors” to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing. • Request that the cumulative effect of ocean acidification should also be considered in the SEIS. <p>The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy’s 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.</p>	
Lewis C-1	I am against underwater testing in the PNW	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy’s ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lewis M-1	<p>The increased noise from Navy jet flights has created a significant and negative impact on residents in the flight path of Whidbey NAS training. In Port Townsend, near Fort Worden, loud jet noise has become a constant, ugly, grating background to our lives.</p> <p>There is no reason, other than convenience, for the Navy to conduct these training flights in such highly populated residential areas. Considering alternative sites could potentially reduce the harmful effects on people, wildlife and fragile parks.</p> <p>The fragile, irreplaceable treasures of the Olympic National Park and Olympic Coast Marine Sanctuary are endangered by this destructive noise. These reserves are intended as a sanctuary for animals, marine life and humans. The jet noise and Navy training activities defiles them, disrespects their purpose and endangers life in their boundaries.</p> <p>I appreciate and support the Navy's role in our society. But Navy leaders here make their branch of the service look very bad. Their approach to the public is arrogant, callous and out-of-touch. They participate in the environmental review process in bad faith, appearing to have made their decisions before listening to requested public input. They limit the options before them without considering reasonable alternatives that could create less effect on people and wildlife. They ignore public requests to evaluate other locations for training with less impact on populations of people and wildlife, as local residents have repeatedly requested.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Li D-1	<p>We need to protect our ocean, that means marine animals living in it. Sonar tests are harmful to them. As humans, you wouldn't want to listen to some extremely loud speaker everyday. It's the same for the marine animals. Please stop testing.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Li Q-1	Please let these orcas live! Don't bother them!!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Liberty D-1	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>There are a group of citizens based on the Mendocino coast who are strongly opposed to the Navy's expanded training and testing program on the Pacific Northwest coast. We met with the Navy on May 3, 2019 at their meeting in Fort Bragg, CA, and we met again on our own on June 4, 2019 to form our coalition.</p> <p>We are extremely concerned about the health of our ecosystem and our local economy if the Navy is allowed to move forward with their training plans. Our local coastline will still be adversely affected because it is scientifically proven that sonar travels 300 miles under water. It is well established that the high-intensity pulses produced by underwater military airguns can cause a range of impacts on marine mammals, fish, and other marine life, not to mention the byproducts and waste. We also care deeply about the other areas where testing will be held. In fact, we write as representatives of the entire United States.</p> <p>Changes in marine life feeding and migration patterns could drastically alter our local fishing economy. Also at risk would be the large revenue we receive from our local whale-watching tourism; people from around the globe flock to the Mendocino coast to watch the magnificent display of humpbacks, gray whales, and orcas along the gray's migration routes.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy is not proposing to use airguns in the NWT Study Area. The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area.</p> <p>As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Of particular concern is the recent loss of over 148 gray whales off the West Coast because of malnutrition and vessel strikes. NOAA recently declared this die-off “a wildlife emergency.” We cannot subject these marine mammals to more risk. At the very least, we request that the Navy halt their timeline for their Draft Supplemental EIS until a thorough investigation into the gray whale die-off is completed.</p> <p>How do you plan on addressing these concerns? Will you wait until NOAA compiles its data?</p>	
Liberty D-2	<p>I am a student enrolled in Western Washington University’s Marine Naturalist program, which I finish in July.</p> <p>I’m here today to discuss your upcoming plans to test on the West coast. I speak not just for our local community, county or state; but for the whole west coast of North America. It has already been proven that such sonar and weapons testing is harmful and even fatal to marine mammals, which are already under threat.</p> <p>In April of this year a number of whales have washed up in Ireland and Scotland, just as 31 gray whales have washed up on our shores on the west coast, and dozens of humpbacks on the east coast in the same time frame. Sean O’Callaghan, a science officer with the Irish Whale and Dolphin Group (IWGD), which is carrying out a post mortem examination on dead whales in Co Sligo, said it was unlikely that natural causes are to blame.</p> <p>“Potentially those species were affected by noise pollution, such as military sonar but investigations are ongoing between Ireland and Scotland to verify that,” he says. Research published last month suggests sonar from naval ships can affect the behavior of whales from a longer distance than first thought.</p> <p>On your website you claim to:</p> <p>“Post qualified Lookouts to visually observe the area for marine species within mitigation zones prior to and during activities, and Power down or shut down active sonar if marine mammals or sea turtles are observed within the mitigation zone.”</p> <p>However, in 1960 a geophysicist working at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution named Maurice Ewing performed a series of active and passive sonar tests around the world. The tests accrued when he dropped depth charges off the coast of Perth, Australia, recording the subsequent explosion four hours and 12,000 miles later to the west in Bermuda. He discovered that low-frequency sound waves could be transmitted thousands of miles across the ocean, without diffusion or distortion. He calls this SOFAR, or “Sound Fixing and Ranging.”</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	As there is no way you do not already know this, how can you justify performing such tests when merely ceasing tests upon sight of a marine mammal is obviously inadequate? Also, are you already testing in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans?	
Liberty D-3	My name is Davina Liberty. I am a student enrolled in Western Washington University's Marine Naturalist program, which I finish in July. I'm here today to discuss your upcoming plans to test on the West Coast. I speak not just for our local community, county, or state, but for the whole west coast of North America. It has already been proven that such sonar and weapons testing is harmful and even fatal to marine mammals, which are already under threat. In April of this year, a number of whales have washed up in Ireland and Scotland, just as 31 gray whales have washed up on our shores here on the west coast, and dozens of humpbacks on the east coast in the same timeframe. Sean O'Callaghan, a science officer with the Irish Whale and Dolphin Group, known as IWGD, which is carrying out a post mortem examination on dead whales in Co Sligo, said it was unlikely that natural causes are to blame. "Potentially those species were affected by noise pollution such as military sonar, but investigations are ongoing between Ireland and Scotland to verify this," he says. Research published last month suggests sonar from naval ships can affect the behavior of whales from a longer distance than first thought. On your website, you claim to, quote, "Post qualified Lookouts to visually observe the area for marine species within mitigation zones prior to and during activities, and, power down or shut down active sonar if marine mammals or sea turtles are observed within the mitigation zone," end quote. However, in 1960, a geophysicist working at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution named Maurice Ewing performed a series of active and passive sonar tests around the world. The tests accrued when he dropped depth charges off the coast of Perth, Australia, recording the subsequent explosion four hours and 12,000 miles later to the west in Bermuda. He discovered that low-frequency sound waves could be transmitted thousands of miles across the ocean, without diffusion or distortion. He calls this S-O-F-A-R, or SOFAR, "Sound Fixing and Ranging." As there is no way that you do not already know this, how can you justify performing such tests when merely ceasing tests upon the sight of a marine mammal is obviously inadequate? Also, are you already testing in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans? If so, are you aware that you are already killing whales that are already under threat?	The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities. The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Liberty L-1	The proposed testing of sonar along the coast of Northern California, Oregon, Washington and Alaska has not adequately been proven to not	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>harm marine mammals. There is also the the very real threat to any humans who may also be in these waters during testing. There have not been any public notifications if and when these may take place. There have been studies by the NOAA that have linked sonar with the beaching of marine mammals along the coast the the U.S. It has also happened along the coast of the Canary Islands, Scotland, Ireland, New Zealand to name just a few. This has been going on periodically coinciding with naval exercises since 1960.</p> <p>If the navy is planning to continue testing and to do these tests in the waters off the west coast of the U.S. in direct line with the migration routes of numerous species of whales and the other marine life that occupy these waters, how will you protect them? Exactly what steps are being taken by the Navy to stop this onslaught of marine mammals?</p> <p>https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/whales-sonar-ban-military-navy-stranding-beached-canary-islands-a8752611.html</p>	<p>and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area or at any Navy Range Complex.</p> <p>Based on the analysis in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS and monitoring conducted during actual training and testing events, the proposed training will not pose a risk to whales, fish, and other wildlife given that these same types of activities have been conducted for many years here and in other Range Complexes with no indications of broad-scale impacts that are either injurious or of significant biological impact to marine mammals, fish, or wildlife at those locations. Please see the recent results supporting this as presented in training ranges monitoring reports available at the Navy website (www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/) and from the NMFS Office of Protected Resources website (www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental.htm#applications).</p> <p>On the Navy's website you can find the Navy's technical report on marine mammal strandings. This report includes the Canary Islands' and the Bahamas' stranding events and can be found at https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents.</p>
Liccardo-1	<p>Please stop doing underwater sonar testing on marine animals. It's cruel and damaging.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Lieberman-1	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this draft supplemental EIS. I live in Port Angeles along the Strait of Juan de Fuca just West of the Elwha River Mouth. I am a teacher and enjoy summers off to spend the days with my two young children. Last summer, 2018, nearly every morning I was outside with my children and our play was interrupted by the near-deafening sounds of growler jets flying West. Though I did not use technology to be able to accurately measure the altitude at which the jets were flying, I am quite certain that the jets were often flying under their mandated altitude. Throughout the school year, on weekends and</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>afternoons when I am home, I regularly see and hear the jets traveling over my house heading East. The noise from these flights is incredibly loud, and my observations of the wildlife on the beach and nearby areas, let alone my observations of my children, show me that these organisms are affected. It is unacceptable science and policy that the research the Navy cites for the effects of sound on humans is a study from 1974 (J.D. Miller). Technology related to sound tracking, human health and research techniques have advanced light years since 1974.</p> <p>I am concerned not only with the airborne electronic warfare exercised, but also that the Navy wishes to couple this activity “with training and testing Activities (which) include new activities at sea, as well as activities that are currently ongoing and have historically occurred in the Study Area.” My young children and I live along the sea on the North Olympic Peninsula, and we regularly spend time on and enjoy the peace, quiet and solitude of the Western beaches of the Olympic Peninsula in the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and Olympic National Park. I do not believe that while enjoying nature my children should be subject to air- or water-borne military training exercises, especially in a National Park and National Marine Sanctuary.</p> <p>I request a 30 day extension to the current June 12th comment deadline. I strongly suggest that the Navy adopts the “No Action Alternative” and moves this training to an area that does not include both areas heavily populated by humans and areas with pristine wilderness protected by a National Park that draws more than 3 million visitors annually.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy’s Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.mil/speciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research’s Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy’s project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lightbody-1	<p>I live in Victoria, BC, Canada. I find the rumbling of the Growler aircraft very disturbing. The sound is deafening and offensive. I don’t think that it’s very neighbourly of the US Navy to infringe their Tactics on the peace and quiet of another country’s citizens. Please find a quieter way to train your pilots! Thank you</p>	<p>Growler noise in Victoria is outside the scope of the NWTTEIS/OEIS. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>
Lilly-1	<p>FA-18 GROWLERS SHOULD NOT BE CONDUCTING WARFARE TRAINING OVER OLYMPIC NATIONAL FOREST AND OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK!</p> <p>As I sit and write this, the Growlers are flying overhead above our formerly peaceful property along the Elwha River. I can not go outside without being disturbed by their thundering sound, which causes me great stress and anxiety. It is a sinister sound, much different than passenger jets, there are always two or more, it is loud and it is constant. The idea of this permit being renewed – not to mention allowed to increase dramatically the number of flights per day - is sickening. We also have a cabin on the Bogechele River that borders Olympic National Park and Olympic National</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Forest. There have been times when they were flying so low and it was so loud it was impossible to have a conversation with the person next to me. I am not exaggerating.</p> <p>Olympic National Park is a national treasure. It's diverse ecosystems attracts people from all over the world. It is a place that is known for its beauty, solitude, wilderness and wildlife. It is not a place for warfare training. The Navy must considered other locations where warfare training is more appropriate than over a national wilderness area. The negative impact on the economy of Port Angeles and the Olympic Peninsula would be substantial.</p> <p>Do not approve the requested 5 year extension of the 2017 Navy permit over Olympic National Forest!!</p> <p>I hope that these comments are taken seriously. The recent discussions/decision to allow expanded numbers of flights had much more input regarding severely negative impact. This seems to be one of the last opportunities to protect one of the most pristine areas in our country.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved. <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Lilly-2	<p>FA-18 GROWLERS SHOULD NOT BE CONDUCTING WARFARE TRAINING OVER OLYMPIC NATIONAL FOREST AND OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK!</p> <p>As I sit and write this, the Growlers are flying overhead above our formerly peaceful property along the Elwha River close to the mouth that runs into the Straits. I can not go outside without being disturbed by their thundering sound, which causes me great stress and anxiety. It is a sinister sound, much different than passenger jets, there are always two or more, it is loud and it is constant. The idea of this permit being renewed - not to mention allowed to increase dramatically the number of flights per day - is sickening. We also have a cabin on the Bogecheil River that borders</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Olympic National Park and Olympic National Forest. There have been times when they were flying so low and it was so loud it was impossible to have a conversation- with the person next to me. I am not exaggerating. Olympic National Park is a national treasure. It's diverse ecosystems attracts people from all over the world. It is a place that is known for its beauty, solitude, wilderness and wildlife. It is not a place for warfare training. The EIS appears that the Navy has not considered other locations where warfare training is more appropriate than over a national wilderness area. The negative impact would be huge on the economy of Port Angeles and the Olympic Peninsula.</p> <p>Do not approve the requested 5 year extension of the 2017 Navy permit over Olympic National Forest!!</p> <p>I hope that these comments are taken seriously. The recent decision to allow expanded numbers of flights had much more input regarding the negative impact this would have, and it appeared the decision had already been made. This seems to be one of the last opportunities to protect one of the most pristine areas in our country.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved. <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTC Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Lily-1	<p>And I just wanted to check to make sure that -- I was just wondering if you were recording what was going on over there?</p> <p>Okay. Could I just talk about what's happening?</p> <p>A Yurok elder is asking Navy officials to open up a forum so that we may talk as a group. Because she says there are die offs still happening and that there's a mass extinction that we are currently in. And she's talking about how the Navy funds more in protection and that lots of money goes to that but not to protecting our -- And she has been chanting a world renewal song because we are still on Yurok lands. Thank you. And the majority of the people here are surrounding or encircling, listening to her sing. Thank</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>you.</p> <p>I just wanted to, like, suggest something that the Navy could do. And someone else said this and I thought it was a really good idea, that the Navy could -- I also heard that the Navy does humanitarian efforts and things like that. And it would be awesome -- would be wonderful if the Navy could also dedicate some of its resources and time to environmental stewardship, like, by cleaning up, like, the giant garbage patches in the ocean and helping out with, like, marine restoration areas if possible. Like -- and, oh yeah. Yeah. Putting money in for research into like deacidifying the oceans. And I think that would be great instead of just, like, funding, like, biologists to study the impacts of what they already do but to also study what they can do to -- or put to practice what we already know about, how we can help restore our oceans. And -- and that's all. Thank you.</p> <p>Yeah. I just had an idea that maybe since the Navy has, like, a public land chest I just learned about and maybe the Navy could partner with Humboldt State University or something and help protect this precious Douglas Fir forest on Rainbow Ridge in the Mattole that is threatened to be logged. And it's like one of the last of the old growth Douglas Fir forests. And the Lost Coast League is trying to protect it. But they don't have the money to do it. And the Humboldt Redwood Company owns the lands. Maybe the Navy could buy it from them. Okay. Thank you.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lina D-1	None	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Lina G-1	Stop damaging the ecosystem! Endangered orcas are threatened by fisheries, human behaviour and noise pollution. Marine testing only makes this worse! It should be forbidden to threaten our own planet like this!!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lindahl E-1	I do not want the navy dumping environmental stressors in the ocean off the Pacific Northwest. Please process the waste in an environmentally responsible way no matter the cost. Sinking it in the ocean does not make it disappear. Or perhaps you can dump it in the water in front of Mar el Lago on the East Coast. Really, hasn't the government learned the lessons from Hanford, 3 Mile Island, Love Canal and who knows how many purposeful environmental disasters. Just do the right thing for our children's future.	<p>Note there is no dumping involved in any of the proposed activities. The use of expendable devices and other items as they were designed does not in any way constitute the act of "dumping". Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.</p> <p>Please see Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for the analysis of impacts to sediments and water quality from the Navy's proposed activities.</p>
Lindahl M-1	I strongly oppose the Navy releasing heavy metals and depleted uranium into the Puget Sounds and all waters of the Salish Sea, as well as in the Pacific Ocean and all other bodies of water. Our waters are a reflection of the health of our planet. Contaminating them kills fish and other sea animals. The fish consume the pollutants which are then passed on to us. I am appalled by the Navy's intentions to release pollutants thereby harming the very waters on which our lives depend.	The Navy does not propose to release heavy metals or depleted uranium in Puget Sound. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.
Linehan-1	I think you should respect those of us who live in the northwest for the beauty and quiet. We value things that feed our souls. Please stop.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Linstromberg-1	First, my comment is "substantive" because, having followed this issue and read reports/comments over time germane to the Navy's plans for extensive training in the waters of the Pacific NW, my opinion is based on substantive evidence/comment. The Navy's training will include, e.g., electronic warfare practices, mine training, and torpedo testing. Fragile ocean environments including the creatures inhabiting them will be irreparably harmed. Communities depending on sea life are already suffering from climate change and disruptive practices in the ocean...the Navy's on-going and proposed activities have and will exacerbate damage. AND for what? The Navy needs to re-assess its duty to we the people.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lippincott-1	Please do not conduct any more seismic-sonar blasting-testing in the waters. We're killing everyone! This is not necessary. Please move forward into better ways. No more oil. Please stop the destruction and corruption.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lippincott-2	Please do not practice sonar testing in the Salish Sea. The Sonar confuses, causes illness, panic and distress of Cetaceans. Please do not do Sonar Testing. Thank you	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lish-1	Olympic National Park is too special to be degraded by thunderous jet noise. I am requesting the U.S. Navy use its considerable resources to avoid	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>flying over the park, and instead train in other designated military areas that do not interfere with Olympic and other national parks. Please help protect the natural sounds of Olympic National Park by finding other locations for the U.S. Navy's electromagnetic warfare training using EA18-G "Growler" jets.</p> <p>"Our duty to the whole, including to the unborn generations, bids us to restrain an unprincipled present-day minority from wasting the heritage of these unborn generations. The movement for the conservation of wildlife and the larger movement for the conservation of all our natural resources are essentially democratic in spirit, purpose and method."</p> <p>-- Theodore Roosevelt</p> <p>The unique qualities of Olympic have been recognized as a national park, wilderness area, International Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Site. At the heart of the park is the Hoh Rain Forest, one of the quietest places in the Lower 48. Olympic National Park is a unique resource and serves as an invaluable place where millions of visitors--including military veterans, some of whom suffer from the trauma of combat--find healing peace and quiet. This place is too special to be irreparably damaged by thunderous jet noise. Places like the Hoh Rain Forest and our national parks deserve the Navy's protection.</p> <p>"Every man who appreciates the majesty and beauty of the wilderness and of wild life, should strike hands with the farsighted men who wish to preserve our material resources, in the effort to keep our forests and our game beasts, game-birds, and game-fish--indeed, all the living creatures of prairie and woodland and seashore--from wanton destruction. Above all, we should realize that the effort toward this end is essentially a democratic movement."</p> <p>-- Theodore Roosevelt</p> <p>Warplanes do not belong above one of the quietest, wild, and protected areas in the country. Please consider a training alternative that would avoid Growler training and noise over and around the Olympic Peninsula or other national parks.</p> <p>"A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise."</p> <p>-- Aldo Leopold</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Please do NOT add my name to your mailing list. I will learn about future developments on this issue from other sources.</p>	<p>the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Liu-1	<p>With all due respect, I am writing to urge the Navy to stop the extremely harmful and dangerous underwater sonar testing practices.</p> <p>The sonar testing has countless harmful effects to the environment and wildlife. Most importantly, it is putting the critically endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales living in the Salish Seas in harm's way and pushing them to the brink of extinction. Like other cetacean species, Killer Whales are very sound sensitive animals who use their auditory senses as their primary senses and rely on their hearing to navigate, hunt and survive. Due to the sonar testings, these animals' lives are being risked as their hearing is greatly damaged. With a mere population of only 76 individuals, these critically endangered Killer Whales will go extinct if no measures are taken to protect them. With this being said, it is utterly and totally unacceptable to continue having sonar testings and it must stop now.</p> <p>So please please stop this atrocious practices now before time runs out for these beautiful animals. Please spare the lives of thousands and thousands of marine animals and stop the sonar testings. We will not stop fighting for these animals until actions are taken to protect them.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Livingston-1	<p>I would like to plead for the cease of sonar testing off the coast of Washington out of deference and respect for the critically endangered Southern Resident whales and the rest of the marine life in our beautiful Salish Sea and its surrounds.</p> <p>It have been scientifically proven that sonar testing results in marine mammal injury and death. We already have far too many Gray whales, Orcas and other species dying in our waters due to starvation, noise pollution and other environmental stressors. This testing is severe and cruel.</p> <p>I ask that the military discontinue its current testing and not move forward with any future testing. I ask that we as citizens of Washington and the United States no longer allow this to occur and to protect our vital, natural resources.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Lo-1	<p>We should be doing things to improve the habitat of these southern resident killer whales, not further negatively impact them, however minor these impacts (you said) are.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lodahl-1	<p>I am a supporter of the US Military, and I thank you all for your service. With that said, The practice of sonar testing in the Salish Sea/Puget Sound need's to end. It is inhumane to subject the wild creatures that inhabit our waters, by absolutely blasting them with sound underwater. If the wild populations of this inland sea are destroyed, the sea itself will die. It does not make sense to destroy our beloved water bodies, in the process of training to protect them. The Southern Resident Orca population is already in great peril, their numbers are dwindling. This is a warning shot to us people, that things need to be different. The Governor of Washington late last year created an Orca Task force, to ensure Southern Resident survival. One of the findings by the task force was that noise pollution from boats is a threat. Sonar beaming is an even more disruptive event, blasting them with sound. The wild inhabitants of the Inland waters of the pnw should not be allowed to become collateral damage for sonar testing. Please cease this practice immediately.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Loeffler-1	<p>I am writing to indicate my concern regarding underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. ☐A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas. ☐ For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival. Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations.☐ Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times. I urge you to reconsider these efforts and to respect the lives of the marine animals in these waters. Thank you.	
Logli-1	I am 100% against the United States Navy using underwater sonar testing as it destroys the hearing in our sea mammals	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Longoria-1	Our wildlife and resources deserve better. At this point we know full well what we are doing and it's a shame that an organization designed to help America is damaging one of its primary resources.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Lootsma-1	Please stop the noise and excersize in the oceans. It is so bad for all the animals. Stop killing them. Stop the loud sonar. You are harming the earth.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Lopez E-1	Sonic testing is unacceptable and I am 100% against it.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lopez S-1	In my opinion any further impact on already-stressed marine animals with Navy testing of a rail-gun system, pilot mine-detecting underwater drones and airborne surveillance in the Salish Sea is completely unacceptable. Consider our increasingly noisy waterways and impacts on our declining resident Orca population.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTIEIS.com
Loran C-1	<p>Your data is lacking the study on the harmful effects it has on humans and on the economic effects on the communities.</p> <p>1) Has the growler noise caused hearing loss in civilians? On page 9 of your NW Training and Testing pamphlet, you cited decibel levels that would rarely be exposed to maximum noise levels greater than 80 decibels. How about the people on Whidbey Island who are daily being subjected to decibels way over 110 a day, the equivalent of a rock band? Statistics warn us of hearing loss due to going to loud concerts. I don't see a study on this.</p> <p>2) How has the stress of the noise of the growlers affected the health of the individuals in the affected communities? Also, on page nine, the decibel reading of an alarm clock is at 80. You turn the alarm clock off after a few minutes. Unfortunately, you can not turn a growler off, they can fly for</p>	<p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). In this section the Navy found, in part, that "The aggregate impact on public health and safety would not observably differ." Thus, based on the analysis done by the Navy, the increase in Navy activities proposed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS is not expected to have any noticeable effects on public health and safety. The Navy is not proposing a significant increase in Growler activity. A minor</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>hours. Sit and listen to an alarm clock for 5 hours a day, after day after day, how would that affect a person's physical health?</p> <p>3) How about sleep deprivation? I believe the noise level in a residential area must be below 45 decibels after 10:00 pm. That is there for a reason. Sleep deprivation can cause serious and mental affects in people. I don't see a study on this either.</p> <p>4) How has it affected visits to the National Park and surrounding areas? I have heard of visitors reducing their visiting days on the west end of the Peninsula because of the noise levels. We have a hiking friend, who served in the military, totally upset because he had to listen to the growlers for five hours while he was hiking on a west end river. The North Olympic Peninsula is one of the quietest places in the Lower 48. That is what draws visitors and residences to visit and live in this area.</p> <p>5) I went to a public meeting in Port Angeles on April 26th, and were told that the Peninsula is not an essential area to train in. That they train here because they get approved air space. Has there been studies where similar training can occur with the growlers where the noise levels will not have such an affect on the people or the community?</p> <p>Please consider the negative effects that this has and will, to an increasing level, subject the community and we the people whom the military is supposed to be protecting.</p>	<p>increase in training flights in the Olympic MOA is projected over the next several years; increasing by approximately 300 total flights per year by 2023; approximately 1 additional flight per day.</p>
Loran J-1	<p>Noise pollution is harmful to all life forms. It stresses humans, terrestrial and marine animals - all fauna and flora. Noise pollution generated by Navy jet flights harms all terrestrial life forms, and noise pollution in the form of sonar and explosives in the marine environment harms all marine life forms.</p> <p>As scientists determine the specific causes and attempt to develop solutions to atmospheric, fresh and marine water, and soil pollution, it is imperative the USA's Armed Forces fully cooperate with the science and ameliorate the causes it is responsible for.</p> <p>This effort on the problem of types of pollution must, and is now beginning to, address other forms of pollution, including but not limited to, noise pollution and light pollution.</p> <p>I implore the United States Navy to ameliorate the noise pollution it is responsible for causing, in order that all life forms on this planet are not harmed, some harmed to the point of death and even species extinction scenarios, so that all life forms can live in peace and flourish.</p> <p>Surely the mission of the US Navy includes ensuring the peace of the citizens of the USA. Do it!</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for the analysis of impacts from the Navy's proposed activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Lorca-1	I am adamantly and fully against Navy sonar testing. Y'all know it causes irreparable harm and distress to the many life forms in the ocean. It is irresponsible and unconscionable to continue to do so given the facts. Some of these creatures are already in danger of extinction. Your actions only speed their decline.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lorio-1	"I stand with the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council in strongly opposing the Navy's proposed actions. The Navy's training and testing harmfully impact the cultural and spiritual significance of #marinespecies and habitat, for the Tribes of the #WestCoast. The Navy predicts that there would be more than 500,000 instances of marine mammal behavioral impacts, harassment, and injuries over five years, including 275,000 instances of temporary hearing loss, and more than 600 instances of permanent hearing loss. Vessel strikes from increased water traffic will increase marine mammal death rate. We have already seen the loss of nine #greywhales in the San Francisco Bay area in the last six weeks. The western North Pacific population of grey whales is estimated to include fewer than 200 individuals. We cannot afford to put these animals in greater danger. Risks to #marinemammals, fish, and birds from entanglement in wires, cables, and parachutes, and ingestion of expended military materials and toxic debris will increase. The Navy holds no responsibility to clean up their spent munitions and debris." My "substantive" comment is this: NO MORE LIVES SACRIFICED FOR THE MACHINES OF WAR.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lorrain-1	Not only is our Southern Resident Killer Whales on the verge of becoming an endangered species due to starvation. They have a lack salmon to eat due to fish farms and dams preventing the salmon to spawn each year in Eastern Washington. This being said they are also under attack in another, very serious matter, as well as just under 12,000 other porpoises that live inland of our Puget Sound waters. For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit to this survival, EVEN MORE SO! Over 7 years harbor	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	porpoises in inland Washington would likely experience temporary hearing loss at least 95,942 times. This is according to the Navy's calculations. Please, let's be humane here. We aren't the only animals on this planet, we hardly even enjoy the beautiful earth we live on. Let's not ruin it for the rest of the creatures.	EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lovette-1	The Navy's underwater sonar testing practices are damaging all sorts of marine life, including the CRITICALLY ENDANGERED Southern Resident Killer Whales. This is a horrible practice and needs to stop.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lu-1	Smettete di fare i test sonar sott'acqua, LASCIATE IN PACE LE ORCHE, I DELFINI.... BASTAAAAAAA Siate maledetti	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lucas-1	The project should be moved to a less inhabited area. A desert would be a good option. The noise levels make sane living impossible. People describe the noise as that which one would expect in a war zone. Sane living is impossible near the "touch and go" operations. It is not ok to subject people daily and hourly to conditions one would experience in a war zone. Move the project and their families if the families want to go to an area in the desert where there are few people. The aircraft noise will have a severe adverse effect on threatened marine mammals in the Sound.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Lucco-1	I urge you to choose the "NO ACTION" alternative. Our oceans are in peril and all life in the oceans are at risk. We need to give some time for restoration.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Luce-1	<p>Are you quite serious? I would like to express my sincere concerns with this plan, as not only it's environmental impact but it's impact on waters we rely on to live and recreate on. What an incredibly lazy thing to do. You make a mess, you fix it. That's about as American as it gets. Or at least it used to be. Now apparently it's "take a dump in the Pacific". Don't do it.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lucy-1	<p>We should be doing everything possible to prevent these beautiful, sentient creatures from becoming extinct, not adding to their woes and causing them further problems.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Luethje-1	Please stop this!! :(<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Lufkin-1	thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS. I have attached the Marine Mammal Commission letter, as they express more clearly than I ever could, my concerns about the project. In layman's terms, I am concerned about the impact of the noise on our environment, specifically orcas.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Lufkin-2	Marine Mammal Commission comment letter attached in its entirety.	<p>Please see responses to the Marine Mammal Commission comments.</p>
Lullwitz-1	Stop sonar tests in the ocean, instead use tanks for tests. The effect on the environment and the creatures is verified. Human mankind should abolish any weapons	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lumpkin-1	Like the Indian Tribes that have commented on this issue, I am opposed to all training and testing in this area. There is much that the Navy has not taken into account on an important level. This includes the Tribes special relationship to the area, the cumulative impacts that have significantly already depleted local wildlife and that your plan will only exacerbate, and the rapidly increasing impact that global climate change and the ocean's rising acidic level are having. What you want to do will result in direct damage and in pollution that will last long after those who are alive now and before this damage will have healed, which make take generations, you will want to do something very similar again. It has been well documented that sonar has important serious negative impacts on marine mammals and should not be allowed in the mitigation area at all.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Lundquist-1	I am very concerned about the impact of this testing on Southern Resident Orcas and all Salish Sea marine life. Please see the following article which tells of the effects that are now known. https://www.nature.com/news/2008/080801/full/news.2008.997.html Please reconsider before harming our marine life.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/• The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org• The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr• The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology• The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lundsten-1	The Navy has to provide real data about the actual sound level of the jets as they fly over the Park, and quantify how long they fly, and how frequently. Currently, the Navy relies on vague models that average out the sound levels. Jet noise is certainly much louder and more extensive than what they say. It does not belong over public lands anywhere in NW Washington state, and certainly not over Olympic National Park. The public needs to know alternatives that would reduce or completely eliminate Navy jet flyovers of the Park. The fact that such alternatives	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations);

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>would not be as convenient for the Navy as what it currently does is not a valid reason for refusing to fully consider such alternatives. Flying over the Park is by no means a military necessity for training exercises. The Navy has many other airspaces it could fly in, but there is only one Olympic National Park.</p> <p>Stop the Growler flights over our public lands, communities, and natural areas. They do not belong there. They are WAY too loud.</p>	<p>however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015. ² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Lutzelschwab-1	Totally understand testings, but there must be previous analysis where they can take place. A lot of things can be done in simulators and CBTs	The Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	(personell education), and equipment testing should/must be done harmless to the environment!! Please make better evaluations where to do testings and what the impacts will be. Wildlife is vulnerable to Sonar!!! Thank you.	Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, see the discussion in Section 2.4.1.4 (Simulated Training and Testing Only) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that discusses the need for live training specifically for aircrews.
Luxenberg-1	<p>I am against the increase in jets/Growlers coming to the Whidbey Island Naval air station for many reasons, including HEALTH for the humans being impacted by the noise; impacts to national park units (Ebey's, Olympic, San Juans), impacts to natural and cultural resources; and impacts to property values, among others.</p> <p>The Navy has been disingenuous about the impacts of the noise by the jets. You can't measure the "average" noise levels and use that as the number to put in reports--residents and visitors don't experience the AVERAGE--they experience the REAL. The Navy has no credibility by playing this game and it will lose support in the years to come by taxpayers like myself.</p> <p>The Navy has committed a "taking" of private property by forever altering the quality of people's lives in their permanent and secondary/vacation homes, without paying for this taking. If people cannot enjoy living in their homes or visiting, they will abandon them, but lo and behold, there will be no buyers because the Navy will have created a dead zone for living. It is unbearable (and for some terrifying) when the jets fly. The Navy must reconsider the lives it is impacting by this proposal.</p> <p>Impacts to national park units, lands with resources set aside for the enjoyment of future generations, will be forever changed, which is unacceptable. The Navy should believe this is unacceptable. There are OTHER PLACES MORE APPROPRIATE for this kind of training. TAKE THIS TRAINING ELSEWHERE. Don't trivialize these impacts. The Navy will be criminals in the lives of many Americans if it proceeds. Make us proud, not shameful, of the Navy's efforts. And please don't tell us how to comment.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Lyngsoe-1	Protect marine life! Stop interfering!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Lyons D-1	<p>I am writing about the US Navy proposal for extensive training flights over the Olympic Peninsula, and continued/increased active sonar in the area of the National Marine Sanctuary.</p> <p>Sonar disturbance is not in keeping with the intent of a marine sanctuary. For decades, my family and I have hiked and camped in the Olympic Peninsula. I have great appreciation for the foresight our predecessors had in setting aside much of this area for wilderness protection, public stewardship, and recreational use. The beauty, peacefulness, and ecological diversity of this area is a treasured resource. Noise of the level and extent proposed unquestionably impacts the Olympic Peninsula, whose beauty and wilderness attributes draw people to Washington State from around the world. I have experienced Growler flyovers on the Olympic Peninsula and in the Cascades, and I had to stop what I was doing and put my hands over my ears to block to whatever degree I could the incredibly loud and powerful noise.</p> <p>Furthermore, I am concerned about the increased electromagnetic activity being proposed. I am aware that many people react adversely to heightened electromagnetic activity (this is a fact), and I cannot help but consider that the proposed activity may disrupt living things in and around the area (possibly including me as a visitor).</p> <p>Please continue to protect the diversity of life and wilderness now present in this rich resource we have in our state. Safeguard this resource from the high levels of noise pollution and electronic warfare activity the US Navy proposes. The No Action alternative is the only reasonable alternative. Maintain the environmental protection, ecological diversity, wilderness, and peacefulness for which the Olympic Peninsula is famous.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for your dedication to the people of Washington and your protection of our treasured natural heritage.</p>	<p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Lyons T-1	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Please cease all sonar testing in the Pacific Northwest. The Southern Resident orca population is endangered and whales are extremely sensitive to sound.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
M		
M-1	<p>The adequacy of the assessment of Tribal cultural impacts as well as environmental impacts from the Navy's training and testing activities is especially important because these activities take place in the Pacific Ocean, which holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes and is critically important for the wellbeing of all people and lifeforms on this planet.</p> <p>The Navy should work meaningfully with the Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities.</p> <p>The Navy should prohibit use of sonar within the 50-mile mitigation area. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals.</p> <p>The "best available science" referenced in the draft SEIS should be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy's NWTRC.</p> <p>The Navy's monitoring program should be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy should expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered.</p>	Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.	
Macdonald B-1	<p>Marine mammals, fish, crustaceans, and flora are at recognized danger from human activities as indicated by strandings, increasing death rates, diminished populations, varying marine desertification and extensive plastic pollution. These and other human/climatologist insults to our oceans lead to the distinct possibility of vast, irreversible damage to our ocean ecology.</p> <p>Whales, in particular are of immediate interest to all of us west coast residents. We've lost 70 Blues to the shore and probably ten times more to the briny deep – this year. We cannot even imagine the life of a giant communicative leviathan who hunts and communicates the breadth of the pacific; conversationally!</p> <p>This is inhumane insanity and must be fully evaluated by the public as to cost to the panet. It is an excessive ue of force against THE OCEAN AND PLANET WHICH IS UNNECESSARY AND NOT COST EFFECTIVE. It endangers our community and planet without due process.</p> <p>Requests: Reduce overall effort to 10%; reduce ordinance/throttle to10%; Experience: 9 months USM CTAD USS Spiegel Grove</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The alternatives carried forward meet the Navy's purpose and need to ensure that it can fulfill its obligation under U.S.C. Title 10. As explained in Section 2.5 (Alternatives Development) of the EIS/OEIS, the range of alternatives considered by the Navy must be reasonable alternatives. To be reasonable, an alternative must meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. A curtailment or reduction in the number of training and testing activities would not meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, and would therefore be unreasonable.</p>
Macdonald D-1	<p>It is an unconscionable transgression on Nation Park wilderness -- and its values to both people of all kinds and wildlife of all kinds -- to expand training flights over the Olympic Peninsula.</p> <p>Please rescind this proposal and find somewhere else -- if anywhere needs to be found at all -- for these exercises.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Macdonald J-1	Please eliminate sonar testing to protect whales and other marine creatures from proven negative impacts.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Macdonald L-1	I would like the NW Training and Testing Supplemental EIS Statement to address the substantial effect of the increased noise pollution to the well being of all marine mammals from increased training over the Olympic National Park, The Olympic Marine Sanctuary, and other sensitive areas. This increased noise level is unacceptable for an area that has been historically renowned as a quiet environment. I must insist the Navy addresses these concerns of a substantial noise pollution increase, and the plans for mitigation for the harmful affects of this in the EIS Statement.	The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Macdonald M-1	Have you ever saw the beauty of a whale? Please stop your sonar testing, the waters are not ours to own. Please respect ALL living things.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Macdonald N-1	Stop the irreparable and catastrophic damage to marine animals!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Mack-1	Why do we continue to disrupt nature and the intelligent animals that we share our habitat with? Let's be more respectful of nature and the earth we share. Discontinue sonar testing period.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Macleod-1	I oppose the permit to "take" protected species within the training range of Navy operations. A recent, and much-publicized, report demonstrates that we are approaching the sixth great extinction, in which millions of species will cease to exist over the next few decades. America should be doing all it can to preserve what ecological diversity remains, not hastening it in the name of military exercises. In addition, Olympic National Park is one of the quietest places on earth; to bombard it with noise from the Growlers makes a travesty of our national policy to protect and preserve public lands for the enjoyment of all Americans. I oppose the relocation of all Growlers at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island.	The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Madeleine-1	these military practices are absolutely unacceptable and harmful to sea life. please be respectful and stop this !	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Madigan-1	<p>According to government estimates, 138,500 whales and dolphins will soon be injured and probably killed along the east coast of the U.S. if exploration companies are allowed to use dangerous blasts of noise to search for offshore oil and gas. The Navy's own report states that more than 40 marine mammal species will be impacted, including the endangered humpback whale and the blue whale. Beautiful orca's, dolphins, and ocean life will be killed, in their Own Home, the oceans around the world because of senseless sonar testing. The powerful sonar blasts will destroy their hearing and even cause their brains to hemorrhage. Naval sonar has already led to mass whale strandings, as disoriented whales attempt to escape the noise.</p> <p>No Sonor Testing!!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Maeding-1	<p>I understand that the Navy needs to do trainings, but the impact on Marine wildlife from the testing of weapons and sonar is simply unacceptable. The information provided does not substantiate the trainings proposed. With current technology, surely Trainings can be restructured to be done without actually exploding weapons, or at least be done farther out in the ocean, well away from migrating species.</p> <p>It should be obvious that Marine life will be harmed with weapons testing without "backing up statements with explanations" and without being "as specific as possible" and without referring to page numbers and paragraphs"! The information event held at Dana Grey Elementary School in Ft Bragg California was a joke. One of the officials at the event told me that a bomb being exploded in the ocean would be only temporarily disorienting to marine life 'like us hearing a car backfire'. I pointed out that it would depend on how far from the explosion the marine life would be. The noise from a bomb exploding can damage ear drums and sound travels immense distances in water and is damaging and disorienting to all marine life, as is sonar as well.</p> <p>Weapons Trainings could be done through technology, perhaps in a virtual reality method or farther than 100 miles out at sea.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Maes-1	<p>I'm 100% against sonar testing. This is unacceptable.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Maes-2	No sonar testing!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Magliola-1	<p>The Olympic National Park and the surrounding US Forest Service Wilderness areas are no place for the Navy's Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT). The invasion of Growler supersonic jets in the airspace over Olympic National Park and Forest and their interaction with land-based electromagnetic radiation emitters based in Olympic National Forest poses serious threats to wildlife and visitors. Any proposed increase in military training activities within these areas is both unwarranted and unnecessary. Established training areas already exist within range of Whidbey NAS and elsewhere on the west coast.</p> <p>Olympic National Park is a special place: an ecologically diverse landscape, a refuge for plants and animals including threatened and endangered species, and a soundscape where human intrusions are minimal. This unique setting is threatened by the continued presence of the Navy's military exercises.</p> <p>Olympic National Park has been recognized as a UNESCO International Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Site. In 2017, 3.4 million people visited Olympic National Park and countless others visited Olympic National Forest. Ninety five percent of Olympic National Park is designated wilderness and five areas within Olympic National Forest are designated wilderness. The designation of wilderness should insure that human intrusions are temporary and minimal. The frequent and incessant noise and pollution produced by Growler jets represents a serious threat to this wilderness and diminishes the human experience of wilderness. A visit to wilderness is a multisensory experience: you see, hear, smell, taste, and touch it. Exploring wilderness is more than just a physical challenge, it's a place for reflection, an escape from the modern world, and a source of</p>	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>renewal. This experience is severely threatened by the Navy's NWTT. The Navy's NWTT in the airspace over the Olympic Peninsula also impacts the communities and households that lie between Whidbey NAS and the training areas on the peninsula. As a resident of Sequim, Washington the almost daily appearance of Growler jets over my home intrudes on the natural soundscape. I retired to Sequim to escape crowding, pollution and noise and to position myself on the doorstep of a world-class wilderness. This is threatened by the Navy's NWTT. It appears to me that the decision to train here is more a matter of convenience than one of necessity. Other more appropriate training and testing areas are available to you. Please consider moving your military training off the Olympic Peninsula.</p>	
Mahon-1	<p>The beach is full of tourists, and the Navy EA-18 Growlers are flying non-stop. This is my home and Navy Growlers are transforming Port Townsend into a military zone. Tourists and guests hosted by Fort Worden are subjected to overwhelming sound and leave remembering fighter jets rather than Port Townsend. Jets fly in circles in the middle of the night so we make our beds in our living rooms with doors closed and white noise machines on. In summer, windows and doors are shut even when it's hot. Walking the beach can be impossible. With the introduction of the Navy Growler the Navy has changed the quality of our lives beyond imagining. The Prowlers were inconvenient, but they were not toxic and did not fly nearly as much as the Growlers are. After 33 years of living here our friends, whose children and grandchildren were born here, are leaving. Where to go? There is nowhere safe in Western Washington!</p> <p>The Olympic Peninsula has been overwhelmed by sound. Growlers have invaded the no fly zone of Olympic National Park because of Electromagnetic Warfare Training. After 20 years of hiking in the silence of the natural world, I have recorded them on the Sol Duc, Hoh and Elwha rivers. In 2016 they flew continuously through our 5 day hike. At Hurricane Ridge they accompanied our ranger guided snowshoe tours the past 2 years. Last week at LaPush jets flew the entire afternoon over the Bogachiel, Quileute and Sol Duc rivers as my husband fished. At beaches 1,2 and 3 whales and calves and hikers were tormented from 9 am to 5pm for our 4 days there. I was told they buzz native fishermen in their boats and don't worry about disturbing whales. Every time I have been in the Olympics these last 5 years Growlers have been flying. The wildlife is being impacted, both on land and in the sea.</p> <p>The noise is overwhelming! The sound levels that have been submitted by the navy are erroneous and do not reflect actual levels that I and others</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>have recorded up to 115 decibels, which are well over the 85 decibels that cause permanent hearing loss. And then there is the sound in the seas where weapons are being tested that impact the creatures of the ocean that are already significantly stressed by ocean acidification and global warming with its impact on food sources. The current levels of acceptable casualties for ocean and land wildlife have no justification when hundreds of whales died this year due to starvation and other causes.</p> <p>We need your help! Protect Washington State, the Northwest region, ocean creatures and wildlife from being collateral damage. Increased military training by land and sea are not acceptable. 36 more jets and plans to increase flights from 6,100 to 23,700 per year for a total of 280 days a year, 80 percent from outlying field Coupeville, will destroy our community. Noisy Growlers flying all hours, night and day over the Olympic Peninsula devastate the most amazing natural environment I know.</p> <p>Protect Washington State from losing its reputation as a great place to live and an amazing vacation destination. Please mitigate sound, minimize flights, and safeguard our economic base by flying away from populated areas and National Parks. A good neighbor takes care of neighbors. There are choices for less populated areas. It is inconvenient for the Navy to locate flights somewhere less populated. More fuel, trainees spend more time flying. But the financial cost to the Navy will be a fraction of the cost to the Olympic Peninsula and neighboring communities, to the creatures of the sea and land that these decisions are devastating.</p>	
Mahon-2	<p>The beach is full of tourists, and the Navy EA-18 Growlers are flying non-stop. This is my home and Navy Growlers are transforming Port Townsend into a military zone. Tourists and guests hosted by Fort Worden are subjected to overwhelming sound and leave remembering fighter jets rather than Port Townsend. Jets fly in circles in the middle of the night so we make our beds in our living rooms with doors closed and white noise machines on. In summer, windows and doors are shut even when it's hot. Walking the beach can be impossible. With the introduction of the Navy Growler the Navy has changed the quality of our lives beyond imagining. The Prowlers were inconvenient, but they were not toxic and did not fly nearly as much as the Growlers are. After 33 years of living here our friends, whose children and grandchildren were born here, are leaving. Where to go? There is nowhere safe in Western Washington!</p> <p>The Olympic Peninsula has been overwhelmed by sound. Growlers have invaded the no fly zone of Olympic National Park because of Electromagnetic Warfare Training. After 20 years of hiking in the silence of</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the natural world, I have recorded them on the Sol Due, Hoh and Elwha rivers. In 2016 they flew continuously through our 5 day hike. At Hurricane Ridge they accompanied our ranger guided snowshoe tours the past 2 years. Last week at La Push jets flew the entire afternoon over the Bogachiel, Quileute and Sol Due rivers as my husband fished. At beaches 1,2 and 3 whales and calves and hikers were tormented from 9am to 5pm for our 4 days there. I was told they buzz native fishermen in their boats and don't worry about disturbing whales. Every time I have been in the Olympics these last 5 years Growlers have been flying. The wildlife is being impacted, both on land and in the sea.</p> <p>The noise is overwhelming! The sound levels that have been submitted by the navy are erroneous and do not reflect actual levels that I and others have recorded up to 115 decibels, which are well over the 85 decibels that cause permanent hearing loss. And then there is the sound in the, seas where weapons are being tested that impact the creatures of the ocean that are already significantly stressed by ocean acidification and global warming with its impact on food sources. The current levels of acceptable casualties for ocean and land wildlife have no justification when hundreds of whales died this year due to starvation and other causes.</p> <p>We need your help! Protect Washington State, the Northwest region, ocean creatures and wildlife from being collateral damage. Increased military training by land and sea are not acceptable. 36 more jets and plans to increase flights from 6,100 to 23,700 per year for a total of 280 days a year, 80 percent from outlying field Coupeville, will destroy our community. Noisy Growlers flying all hours, night and day over the Olympic Peninsula devastate the most amazing natural environment I know.</p> <p>Protect Washington State from losing its reputation as a great place to live and an amazing vacation destination. Please mitigate sound, minimize flights, and safeguard our economic base by flying away from populated areas and National Parks. A good neighbor takes care of neighbors. There are choices for less populated areas. It is inconvenient for the Navy to locate flights somewhere less populated. More fuel, trainees spend more time flying. But the financial cost to the Navy will be a fraction of the cost to the Olympic Peninsula and neighboring communities, to the creatures of the sea and land that these decisions are devastating.</p>	
Maione-1	<p>To whom it SHOULD concern,</p> <p>In this day & age, there are multiple ways to train, using simulators. The obsession with blowing things up and using active sonar in & around migration path of whales & dolphins is archaic & unnecessary.</p>	<p>The Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, see the discussion in Section 2.4.1.4</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	County of Mendocino is for NO ACTION OPTION Move training 100 miles from coast NO ACTIVE SONAR We STAND with TRIBAL concerns NO LIVE EXPLOSIVE NO CHEMICAL Contamination NO OCEAN POLLUTION PUBLIC NEEDS microphone	(Simulated Training and Testing Only) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that discusses the need for live training specifically for aircrews. All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Mala-1	Living in Oak Bay, BC the sound from your testing is affecting my health. I have MS and the loud pitch sound of these aircrafts creates massive headaches and causes my hearing to blackout out often. I now have to make sure when I am outside that I wear ear plugs to help drown out the sound just in case you decide to test. This often works to no avail. This is so inconsiderate and shame on you.	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Oak Bay. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Malcolm K-1	Were the Growler airplanes created to make as much noise as possible, to scare our enemies? Their engines do Not need to be THIS loud for US. For the quiet area that they are practicing in, they need to have mufflers installed, or their engines reworked to eliminate their excessive noise volume. Why wasn't that done before moving a whole new batch of planes here? Why can't that be done now? We are a former foster family who has been doing respite for a family that adopted our last foster child. We specialized in drug affected/special needs children. We can no longer have any special needs child in our home due to the extreme noise that the Growlers make. We used to have a child here during spring vacations, and all summer, to provide the much needed time away from care giving their family needs. These children cannot handle this type of extreme volume, they feel it to their bones, and it affects them for Days afterwards!!! They can't eat properly, they can't sleep properly either. When a Growler flies overhead at 10 pm, like it did the other night, if we had a child here, I would have been up all night trying to calm them down. When I am gardening or otherwise outside, when they fly overhead on a low cloud day, it hurts my ears, what do you think it does to small children?	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	To animals? Shame on the Navy for being such a bad neighbor!!! Please either move them to a less populated area, or put mufflers on them. This is ridiculous. We were a good foster family, and the Navy has ruined dozens of children's lives by not allowing us to care for them in our home.	
Malcolm M-1	The Southern Resident orcas are already on the brink of extinction. They're starving. Chinook runs are at historic lows. Please explore all other options before testing sonar that will further endanger them! Remember how important they are to this region and our country, please!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Malizia-1	The Navy has already done so much damage to the sound's marine life, water health. We already are constantly warned about swimming or eating seafood from the area because of the sewage you dump. Your sonar gets used in places you've been told not to, harming the whales and other sonar reliant species. You're a <i>[expletive deleted]</i> show. Stop it. Just stop it	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Mallow-1	I do not support the the Navy harming marine life.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Malone I-1	<p>Can the Navy be sure that all types of marine life will not be harmed by the proposed Northwest Training and Testing? There is a very fragile situation on our coast now.</p> <p>Will the SEIS use explosives and SONAR, which have been proved to be detrimental to marine animals?</p> <p>NOAA is currently involved in a study of the die-off on gray whales and the disruption of the ocean by sonar and explosive activity should be halted.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Malone J-1	<p>Really cannot believe we are having this discussion, given the stats we have on the catastrophic impact of navy activities on marine life. Refer to United Nations reports on our ailing planet, to headlines in our beached and ailing marine life, and give us a reason why we would not immediately ban this Navy testing in waters where a resident pod of orcas are struggling to survive. Surely we can think better, do better.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Mancuso J-1	These Orcas need to be protected. Please reconsider doing the test.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Mancuso M-1	Please, for the love of this earth and all things that live on it, stop the sonar testing in the Salish Sea! Orcas are an integral part of the ocean and are already endangered due to humans. Let's not make it worse for them! There is hope...a new baby Orca has joined the Southern Resident Orcas! Let's give this baby a chance to grow up and make more Orcas! We need them just as much as they need us. We only have one ocean...it is not unlimited in it's resources. We need to be more cognizant of the damage we do here. Don't make it worse for the creatures that live in it.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Mandelstein-1	<p>I am writing to request that all sonar testing in the Puget Sound be halted immediately. Reasons include:</p> <p>Over seven years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters could experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations.</p> <p>Sonar would cause those porpoises permanent hearing loss 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" — anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound — 101,377 times, according to the estimate.</p> <p>"It may be something that distracts the animal from normal activities, such as feeding or reproduction," Mosher said.</p> <p>Many of these animals could be exposed to sonar multiple times. A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters.</p> <p>Dozens of other creatures in the Salish Sea would be affected in lesser numbers, including endangered southern resident killer whales, which the Navy predicts would exhibit behavioral responses about 15 times over seven years. The documents say endangered humpback whales in waters off California, Oregon and Washington would suffer temporary hearing loss 277 times and alter their behavior 221 times because of sonar.</p> <p>"For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival."</p> <p>PS: While I live in California, I visit the Puget Sound regularly and the safety of the ocean life there is very important to me and all my friends who do live in the Puget Sound area.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Mangone-1	<p>Sonar testing needs to be stopped! Why has the navy ignored years of important research on the the sonar testings ill effects to marine animals? How these animals communicate, migrate, hunt for food etc is being impacted by this testing not to mention the sheer torture of it all! How is this not more important than anything?! It's truly shameful what the navy is being allowed to do.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Mann Che-1	<p>I am a resident in Port Townsend and I hear the Growlers so often - that it interrupts my daily living. For instance, I was talking to a friend who lives in Coupeville and our conversation was completely covered over by jet noise. We had to make three attempts to make a simple phone call (which was important - dealing with a medical situation) in order to cover the</p>	<p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island or Ebey's Reserve. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>necessary information. I was a substitute at a local school and several times one day the noise was distracting - I had to repeat my directions and/or stop until the noise was over.</p> <p>*Education for our children on the Peninsula is compromised!</p> <p>*Important communication is interrupted and/or needs to be repeated by the Jet noise.</p> <p>Dungeness Spit: More often than not, when enjoying the Olympic National Park or walking on the Spit, there are Growlers flying really low - the intensity of the sound is somewhat frightening. I have a noise meter and I am tracking the incidents and they are on the increase. Increased noise over the Olympic National Park threatens its status as a UNESCO World heritage Site and Biosphere Reserve.</p> <p>Economic Compromise: The U.S. has a tradition of setting aside lands for public enjoyment. Public enjoyment is inconsistent with the purposes of a military installation conducting warfare exercises. Pacific Northwest reserves, parks, and monuments provide home for birds, mammals, and marine life. Migration patterns, mating habits, and feeding patterns are disturbed by noise from the Growlers. The presence of the Growlers conflicts with an important mission of the National Parks Service to preserve the soundscape of parks.</p> <p>Legal Process: Forty years ago, the community on Whidbey made the decision to protect Ebey's Reserve; property owners gave up their developmental rights. Allowing military jets unlimited access to the airspace above the Reserve diminishes the significance of this community treasure. Everything is threatened when Growlers fly 300-600 feet overhead! Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires that adverse effects on historic properties must be avoided, minimized or mitigated. While weakening or not recognizing the outright damage from intense low frequency vibrations from the Growlers is virtually guaranteed with 100 flights on busy training days. Section 106 requirement is totally dismissed. Navy terminated negotiations last November.</p> <p>Water!!!: Property values in Oak Harbor, Coupeville and quite frankly all of Whidbey are compromised! Prospective buyers fear that the noise will only increase and the water compromised!</p> <p>The increase in jet noise is making a negative impact on Tourism, wildlife, property values, education, basic communication (phone) and Orca survival! Enough is enough!</p> <p>The action by the Navy does not honor public process and our irreplaceable natural resources, and must be rejected! The decision to single site all</p>	<p>Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Growlers in Puget Sound, Olympic Peninsula, Whidbey Island...is for convenience! Move and share those trainings with other parts of the Northwest! Please!	
Mann Chr-1	Look, I as an American appreciate the new technology and advances your military sector uses to keep us safe, but at WHAT cost to mother nature and the planet? Your testing WILL further the destruction of our sea life and our FOOD supply we get from the seas. When one harm's or destroys a part of the environment, an irreversible chain reaction starts that can not be undone. We humans are part of Earth, and when we keep going at the rate of which your harmful testing is surely going to help exaggerate, there will be nothing OR no one left to protect by 20 years time..... please, THINK.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Mann H-1	We need to stop the harmful encroaching into the living space of other entities on this planet. If a practice is unnecessary to the survival of one species while quantifiably harming another, there is no justifiable reason to keep engaging the practice.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Mantia-1	Please don't use sonar!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Maragos-1	There is no need in today's world to do this,all you are doing is killing the sea life & we can't afford that,we need sea life to sustain our human life,with out it we will not exist,please stop these needless experiments.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Maravel-1	Please protect them	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Marcus-1	I just moved from the Mendocino Coast to Washington. The coast has been a stunning area, full of migrating whales, many varieties of fish and sea creatures. Looking through binoculars to try to stop abusive and damaging	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	sounds to these creatures is very ineffective. I am very much against this study.	<p>minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Mariette-1	This is cruaaty against animals. We shouldn't accept that, what ever is the reason. People Who thinks That researching is a good reason should be treated the same way they treats animals.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Marinelli-1	È incredibile come il genere umano continui a perpetrare azioni distruttive che hanno il solo risultato di confermare la sua crudele stupidità. Non è mai abbastanza? Non vi sembra il caso di cessare questa tortura nei confronti di poveri mammiferi marini?!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Marini-1	Work meaningfully with Pacific coast Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life.	<p>The Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.</p> <p>As stated in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the term "traditional resources" is used to encompass protected tribal resources.</p>
Marini-2	Expand prohibited activities in the 50-mile mitigation area to include use of sonar.	<p>Training and testing with active sonar is essential to national security. The Navy uses active sonar during military readiness activities only when it is essential to training missions or testing program requirements since active sonar has the potential to alert opposing forces to the operating platform's presence. Passive sonar and other available sensors are used in concert with active sonar to the maximum extent practicable. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict certain activities or types of sonar year-round within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, seasonally within the Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area and Stonewall and Heceta Bank Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, and year-round in the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to help the Navy avoid potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. Additional mitigation for active sonar (e.g., prohibiting sonar within 50 NM from shore) would be impractical to implement for the reasons described in the Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) and Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar).</p>
Marini-3	Monitoring program be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels.	<p>The Navy understands there may be limitations of the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act protecting cultural and spiritual resources. The Navy's monitoring program does address impacts beyond the potential for harm at the population level. The Navy uses cutting edge</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		research to improve the science in a number of areas, including marine mammal densities, species occurrence, exposure and response, and habitat use. The Navy has consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service pursuant to the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the resulting mitigation measures achieve the least practicable adverse impact. The Navy is committed to continual good faith consultations in the context of the government-to-government relationships, which endures beyond consultations limited to a specific law or project.
Marini-4	Expand the list of environmental “stressors” to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections.	The Navy acknowledges the spiritual connections, as stated in Section 3.10.1 (Affected Environment) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, “Sociocultural elements, such as traditions, lifeways, religious practices, community values, and social institutions may be considered by some groups to be types of cultural resources, especially within tribal communities whose traditional interaction with the natural world is integral to their culture. However, the Navy has completed this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS within the framework of NEPA, providing impacts as determined using the best available science. As stated in Section 3.10.1, this supplement is organized “to consider cultural and historic elements of the human environment within and between the three following sections: Section 3.10 (Cultural Resources), Section 3.11 (American Indian and Alaska Native Traditional Resources), and Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). Combined, these sections seek to provide a full analysis of the potential impacts from the Proposed Action on sociocultural elements of American Indian/Alaska Native communities and American history.” The Navy acknowledges that some of its activities may impact cultural or spiritual resources.
Marini-5	The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should also be considered in the SEIS.	The Navy discusses ocean acidification in the context of climate change in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) and 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and includes information from scientific studies conducted since 2015. The Navy acknowledged in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) that “metals tend to dissociate” in more acidic ocean conditions. The Navy added a reference back to these two sections in the sections analyzing the impacts of explosives (Section 3.1.4.1) and metals (Section 3.1.4.2). Note that corrosion can also act to insulate ordnance and other metal items from contact with seawater and sediments, slowing or even halting further corrosion and movement of metals into the adjacent sediments and water column. The effects of climate change on the ocean environment, particularly effects specific to a particular region like ocean waters in the Pacific Northwest, continue to be researched and to evolve and are not necessarily

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>predictable. For example, as described in Section 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality), increases in ocean acidity are believed to reduce the availability of carbonate in the water column, which is needed by organisms to generate calcium carbonate structures. However, increases in sea surface temperature associated with climate change appear to stimulate calcification at an even greater rate, essentially overriding the inhibiting effects of lower pH levels and leading to unexpected high abundance of cocolithophores (which build protective scales from calcium carbonate) in some ocean regions.</p>
Marino-1	<p>I am against testing of any weaponry offshore along any coast. It is detrimental to all lifeforms and pollutes the ocean water as well. Rather than pour our tax monies into more weaponry/arms/ammunitions, use it to develop ways to reduce CO2 emissions, pollution of air, water and land and reduce killing of humans and animal life and other life forms. Climate action and saving life on Earth is more important.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Markham-1	<p>It is totally unacceptable to subject Cetaceans and other Marine life to the high levels of sound during sonar. tests. It is known that this causes extreme pain and damage. A deaf Cetacean is unable to exist if it is subjected to this high level of disturbance. Please stop all testing the SR Orcas are seen swimming away from these intense sounds in the video clearly in great distress. Marine mammals including the endangered remaining 76 Southern Resident Orcas are at great risk.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Marks-1	<p>I urge you to deny this Project entirely, thus choosing the No Action Alternative. (I do want to let you know that I appreciate the fact that you actually included a No Project Alternative as I have seen so many EISs</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>without a No Project Alternative over the years.)</p> <p>There certainly should not be any increase in the number of Growler planes passing over the Olympic Peninsula, Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary offshore in the Pacific Ocean, and Strait of Juan de Fuca. In fact, all Growler planes should be phased out of these areas, and the US Navy should use its brains and resources to find other more remote, unpopulated, non-wilderness areas to do this testing.</p> <p>It's perfectly obvious that no severe noise and/or air vibrations and pollutions should be allowed over a National Park. The distractions and actual harms they will cause to wildlife and recreationers (tourists) in the Park detract significantly from what the NPS is trying to protect as a natural environment in its Parks. Increased noise over the ONP threatens its status as a UNESCO World Heritage Site and Biosphere Reserve.</p> <p>The Olympic Peninsula is a jewel in the state of WA for residents and tourists alike. Because of its scenic beauty, it creates jobs for residents who work in the tourist trades. The 4 small towns out here at the NW corner of the Olympic Peninsula have had an increase in unemployment since the logging businesses dwindled, and citizens, residents, and taxpayers need tourism jobs to make ends meet and raise their families. If Growler planes were to be passing over regularly, the tourist trade would fall off significantly and local residents' incomes and well-being would be seriously affected. Nobody out here wants these planes passing overhead, period.</p> <p>It is highly likely (and you have received scientific comments about this) that flying low over the ocean and strait also will disturb wildlife in our water environments. The local Southern Resident Orea pods are immediately endangered this very summer, and there should be no increased stress on Orcas or their Salmon allowed. The latest news in the public media reports existential information on Gray Whales, mammals who migrate north and south through the ocean waters off the coast of WA, OR, and CA. Gray Whales are dying off on the beaches of CA, OR, and WA this spring from starvation. Both high and low frequency noise have negative impacts on whales' ability to navigate and identify food. This negative impact exists for both Orcas and Gray Whales. There should be no additional stress on the Gray Whale population out here off the NW coast of WA at this time, and I'm sure you have heard about this from scientists in detail.</p> <p>It has been reported that your Agency already is not in compliance with some of your own current regulations with regard to Growler planes on Whidbey Island. You should not be promoting any increase in the number</p>	<p>where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island or Ebey's Reserve. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Also, see Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources) for an analysis of the Navy's proposed activities on tourism and other socioeconomic resources. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>of these flights unless these problems are completely remedied and, until they are remedied, all Growler flights off Whidbey Island should stop.</p> <p><u>Site of Project</u> Whidbey Island is an inappropriate site for training program like this. The Navy itself indicates that at least 2,000 unsettled acres are preferable to conduct the Growler training program. Currently, the Navy is in violation of its own safety standards by doing these Growler training missions over 664 acres of populated land on Whidbey Island.</p> <p><u>Single siting</u> Single siting of any military function is a violation of the Technical Joint Cross Service Group guidelines. Your Growler Project plans should cease to be on Whidbey Island alone, and you should be including another Alternative whereby this training program will be located at at least two geographically separated sites, each of which would have similar combination of technologies and functions. Please ensure that you answer this noncompliance issue in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p><u>Noise level</u> Real-time measurements taken at Ebey's Reserve near Coupeville show damaging levels of noise, up to 115 decibels -well past the 85-decibel level that begins to cause permanent hearing loss (NIH). Residential areas should not be exposed to these hearing-loss decibels.</p> <p><u>Runway length</u> The 5,400-foot runway, built prior to 1943 to accommodate aircraft built in the 1940s, is nearly 3,500 feet too short for Growler jet "touch and go" operations, which require 8,800 feet. This runway cannot be extended. For 32 years, the runway has failed to meet Navy runway safety standards. This too-short take-off and landing runway exposes pilots, expensive planes, and adjacent residents to unacceptable dangers. Please ensure that you answer this noncompliance issue in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Please respond to these documented noncompliances in your Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Have they been remedied? If so, how and when? If not, please admit the truth about these noncompliances of the Navy in this Growler Project, and at the least deny this Project because of unacceptable continuances/expansions of noncompliances.</p> <p>I have had personal experiences with the noise disturbances of Growler planes in my home environment. I live 2 blocks from the hospital in Port Angeles near the water. Several times when I was out in the back yard tending to raised veggie gardens - enjoying the sun and fresh air, chirping of birds, and quiet neighborhood - my peace and quiet were very noticeably interrupted by a Growler plane passing overhead nearby. The low rumbling cannot be ignored and, for some reason, is ominous - like a growling tiger. But even more significant is the fact that the birds stopped</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>chirping while these planes were in my neighborhood. To me, this is adequate proof that Growler planes disturb wildlife significantly. Another incident of atmospheric interference in my area was one time when I felt my old, small, stucco house and my bed actually tremble when the Growler plane went over. Whatever kind of waves caused these disturbances are unacceptable to me in a residential neighborhood, and I don't want Growler planes going over Port Angeles anymore.</p> <p>There is organized and formidable opposition to this Growler Project. The Sound Defense Alliance is composed of 15 scientific, environmental, health, etc. organizations. It's for sure this broad citizens' and scientists' organization will sue to stop this project should you make the mistake of trying to push it on through in spite of all the opposition by all of us out here. You must know of the resources, both knowledge and legal, that members of the SDA have to stop Projects that significantly destroy our natural environments. Think some more to design other alternatives to get your testing done. The SDA suggests spreading the Growler jets around the US rather than have them all on Whidbey Island in Puget Sound WA. I urge you to consider this as a good compromise choice and to cease promoting the Project of this particular EIS.</p>	
Marquis-1	<p>Testing sonar in the ocean is detrimental to marine life. Whales, orcas, and dolphins are especially harmed and sometimes killed. Please stop.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Marrs-1	<p>I am writing in regards to your (The Navy's) EIS/OEIS Draft and Growler operations in the Olympic National Forest. The operations you are currently carrying out and are proposing are being done in an inappropriate place. A place of peace and of quiet. Your plans and actions are not compatible with our Olympic National Park. You have other areas in which to train. According to your own analysis, training in the Olympics is a nonessential convenience.</p> <p>For your nonessential convenience you are and will inconvenience a large number of people and wildlife. Not to mention those who's economy and livelihoods depend on the area without the presence of one of the loudest</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>planes flying. You downplay and dismiss anything or damage that you may or will cause.</p> <p>I respect the Navy, but that being said, respect is a two way street. Your disrespect for us begins in this case with the post card placed in the post office in Forks, WA. announcing your intent to train in the park. Even though you were all ready training. Your pressuring of the Forest Service to rollover and grant you a permit. Ahh America is this what we have become? I believe that the permit should not of been issued. That it violates the Forest Services own Mission Statement. Their own employees feel the same as they are suing their employer.</p> <p>The fact that over Four thousand people took-the time to comment to the Forest Service. All but thirty something in opposition to your wants. You are not listening. The Olympic Peninsula has been my home for just short of forty years. It is a special and rare place. The impacts of your nonessential convenience will be felt long after you've moved on.</p> <p>I am feeling the Navy's disregards for those they call neighbors. The last meeting I attended in Port Angeles Had many beautiful pamphlets and brochures available. They put a halo around you. Studies and statistics are very malleable when done by those that want something. They Can paint and frame the issue in a way to receive what they are after. Land developer are experts at this. They have to use their own money when you've got ours!</p> <p>I feel the meetings I've attended have been to tell us what you are going to do. A recent meeting I attended was put on by the Washington State Chamber of Commerce. They were gathering ideas for a guide for how the public can work and get along with the Navy. This is so backwards. Turn that around. We are the people that support ALL of this. We are being pushed into a corner for your nonessential convenience.</p> <p>Want respect? Than give it! Want support? Give It! The sound Of Growlers is not the sound of freedom. It seem in this case to be a whole lot more like a loud middle finger to the Peninsula for your nonessential convenience.</p>	<p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved. <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTS Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Marsh-1	<p>I oppose all sonar and explosives use because it has long been established that this has fatal results for sea life, including whales and dolphins. The human race is hard at work destroying the oceans with plastics, pollution, and your sonar and explosives, posing an existential threat to human life. Isn't security supposed to be your job? Your activities are threatening the security of the nation and the planet.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Marshall-1	I am 100% against underwater Sonic testing. The effects on marine life are unacceptable.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Martensen-1	This was the worst format possible for the information that needed to be exchanged. Very difficult to hear and very disorganized.	The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.
Martin Ca-1	I live on southern Vancouver Island, in greater Victoria. For years now the sound of the growler jets has been a regular - and disruptive - presence. I am writing to let you know the effect of training flights in my community. The sound disturbs and worries humans, increasing stress, and is frightening to household pets, especially dogs, causing visible distress. The tranquility and peace of our beautiful community is interrupted. Please do NOT expand the training program - your impact may not be seen by the US military, but it is felt by your neighbours in Canada.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Martin Co-1	Hasnt there been enough damage done to the environment yet? Please check your priorities	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Martin D-1	<p>I have lived on the Mendocino Coast for the last 40 years. I am writing to ask you to stop testing in the waters off the West Coast until further studies are enacted to address issues that are urgent.</p> <p>I have lived on the coast of California all of my life. I have swimmied, surfed and kayaked in the Ocean since I was a child. I have fished in the surf, out at sea commercially and have harvested sea weed, rock picked abalone and fed my family from the waters of the Pacific. The changes I've seen in the last 20 years have been frightening.</p> <p>We now have massive die offs of marine mammals. We have wrecks of sea birds. We have collapses of fish species.</p> <p>Sonar has been proven to disrupt and damage the delicate hearing of whales, dolphins and orcas. The sound travels up to 300 miles in the oceans. There is video documenting of the chaos and disruption that sonar creates in sea mammals. They are instantly deafened. How can you accommodate, heal, protect them from your sonar? It is harming much more than your projected incidental take that you cite. How will you address that?</p> <p>What effect does the toxic by products caused by the expended munitions have on sea species? How does that, and the sonar, affect the krill and the other smaller sea life that are so important to the food chain?</p> <p>How will you address the effects the noise has on sea going birds? Murres are known to be affected by acoustic transmitters. What will the effect of much louder, deafening sonar have on them?</p> <p>The kelp forests are decimated, we can no longer take abalone, can you unequivocally say your testing does not affect these?</p> <p>How will you address these issues—not with old (1984) studies, but with current information?</p> <p>I was told at the presentation in Ft. Bragg, California that you want to test off the Mendocino/Humboldt coasts because our geography resembles the South China Sea and N. Korea!?! So, in addition to toxic, invasive testing, you are engaging in war games. Please address this issue.</p>	<p>All of the issues raised in the comment are addressed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences).</p>
Martin L-1	<p>I am a resident of nearby Sonoma County with a family home on the beach. I am also a paying tourist along this coastline in Mendocino County. It would be a travesty to do these tests in our local ecosystem where it will do massive damage to animal communities, leak toxins into our water and affect local businesses and people. We do not want this testing done here.</p> <p>There has also been utter disrespect by the Navy toward local indigenous people who have had to stand up for this coastline.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Martinez D-1	<p>Usually during this time of year I see, daily, a least two pairs of Mother and calf gray whales swimming close to the coast. This year I haven't seen any. I have attending the Navy's public meeting and a read a lot of the draft SEIS. I don't believe the SEIS accurately states our Ocean's current state and the state of it's inhabitants. The Ocean ecosystems are in collapse. Sea creatures are starving. Just in the last month there have been over 70 dead Grey Whales washed ashore on West Coast. How many dead whales are still out there or have been eaten by other creatures?</p> <p>Will the SEIS address the 70+ whale deaths on the West Coast so far this year, that represent only 10% of the actual loss and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbated this situation? How will the SEIS address the Wildlife Emergency just announced by NOAA?</p> <p>https://www.paradisepost.com/2019/05/31/feds-declare-emergency-as-gray-whale-deaths-reach-highest-level-in-nearly-20-years/</p> <p>https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grey-whales-stranded-west-coast-1.5119056</p> <p>A recent Study published in January 2019 documents the severe effect sonar has on whales.</p> <p>https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533</p> <p>Scientific studies have shown, without a doubt, that explosives and SONAR are detrimental to marine animals. For whales and dolphins, 'listening' is as important as 'seeing' is for humans, as they live in a world of water and sound. Noise pollution threatens whale and dolphin populations, interrupting their normal behavior, driving them away from areas important to their survival and at worst injuring or sometimes even causing the deaths of some whales and dolphins.</p> <p>3.4-107 of the SEIS states that Gray whales in Baja abandoned an historical breeding ground due to an increase in noise and shipping activity.</p> <p>Until NOAA's study of the die off on the Gray Whales is complete shouldn't any disruption of the Ocean by Sonar and Explosive activity should be</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. As described in Section 5.2.1 (Procedural Mitigation Development), the Navy's analysis assumes that due to limitations such as those mentioned in the comment, Lookouts will not be 100% effective at detecting all individual marine mammals.</p> <p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Climate change is addressed in the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Section 3.2.3.2 (Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>halted?</p> <p>The SEIS at 3.4-135 acknowledges that Gray whale are slow moving and sometimes exhibit “snorkeling activity,” they surface quietly and exhale without of any visible blow.</p> <p>The Navy claims they have lookouts watching for whales before the use of sonar and explosives and are “very unlikely” to have their feeding and migration impacted by the Navy’s activities.</p> <p>How does the SEIS take into account this “snorkeling” and fog and rough seas in watching for whales?</p> <p>The SEIS details the presence of gray whales in six of the NWTT areas for short periods and claims that the gray whales have “low risk” of being impacted. How much risk is acceptable given NOAA’s Wildlife Emergency?</p> <p>The SEIS at 3.4.282 states that “military expended materials will sink to the ocean floor”. At 3.4.302 the SEIS states that “for the most part,” this material will be incidentally ingested by bottom feeders. Gray Whales are bottom feeders. Given the already stressed gray whale population should the SEIS take this into account?</p> <p>https://news.nationalgeographic.com/2016/03/160331-car-parts-plastics-dead-whales-germany-animals/</p> <p>https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/03/whale-dies-88-pounds-plastic-philippines/</p> <p>https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/04/dead-pregnant-whale-plastic-italy/</p> <p>NATIONAL SECURITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE</p> <p>The Pentagon Issued its own finding in 2015 outlining the security effects of Climate Change and issued orders that, all combatant commands integrate climate-related impacts into their planning cycles,</p> <p>https://dod.defense.gov/News/Article/Article/612710/</p> <p>Will the SEIS address the how the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will contribute to the threat to our national security and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbate this situation?</p> <p>Climate Change is fluid and getting worse all the time. The draft SEIS does not integrate current climate -related impacts</p>	
Martinez D-2	<p>TRIBAL CONCERNS</p> <p>The Navy is mandated to work meaningfully with Pacific Coast Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities.</p> <p>Will the SEIS expand prohibited activities in the 50-mile mitigation area to</p>	<p>Training and testing with active sonar is essential to national security. The Navy uses active sonar during military readiness activities only when it is essential to training missions or testing program requirements since active sonar has the potential to alert opposing forces to the operating platform’s presence. Passive sonar and other available sensors are used in concert with active sonar to the maximum extent practicable. The Navy will implement</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>include use of sonar. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals?</p> <p>Should the "best available science" referenced in the Draft SEIS be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge?</p> <p>Will the SEIS expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing?</p>	<p>procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict certain activities or types of sonar year-round within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, seasonally within the Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area and Stonewall and Heceta Bank Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, and year-round in the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to help the Navy avoid potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. Additional mitigation for active sonar (e.g., prohibiting sonar within 50 NM from shore) would be impractical to implement for the reasons described in the Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) and Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar).</p> <p>The Navy acknowledges the spiritual connections, as stated in Section 3.10.1 (Affected Environment) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, "Sociocultural elements, such as traditions, lifeways, religious practices, community values, and social institutions may be considered by some groups to be types of cultural resources, especially within tribal communities whose traditional interaction with the natural world is integral to their culture. However, the Navy has completed this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS within the framework of NEPA, providing impacts as determined using the best available science. As stated in Section 3.10.1, this supplement is organized "to consider cultural and historic elements of the human environment within and between the three following sections: Section 3.10 (Cultural Resources), Section 3.11 (American Indian and Alaska Native Traditional Resources), and Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). Combined, these sections seek to provide a full analysis of the potential impacts from the Proposed Action on sociocultural elements of American Indian/Alaska Native communities and American history." The Navy acknowledges that some of its activities may impact cultural or spiritual resources.</p>
Martinez R-1	Stop sonar testing	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Marty-1	Please stop using sonar it's causing the whales distress and injury. There must be something else you could use.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Marx B-1	Thank you	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Marx J-1	<p>Climate Change Impacts</p> <p>The numerous training and testing events involve ships, fixed-wing aircraft, helicopters and land vehicles. The sheer number of these fossil fuel driven vehicles will emit a significant amount of CO2 and other pollutants contributing to global warming. According to Table 3.2-15 Preferred Alternative 1 will contribute 166,406 metric tons per year of CO2 equivalents. This in addition to increased Growler training flights off of Whidbey Island and other local activities not connected with these specific training and testing events. It is unconscionable to ignore the total greenhouse effects of all these actions in regards to our greatest threat, climate change. These cumulative activities should be addressed.</p> <p>Forest Fire Threat</p> <p>The Growler's F-18 airframe is one of the most accident-prone military airframes in existence. Between 1980 and 2014, the F-18 sustained 39 accidents; 22 crashes of the EA-18G and F/A-18 E, F have occurred since 2000. The F-18 Super Hornet platform has a mishap rate well above the average of all military aircraft, including two serious mishaps involving EA-18G Growlers, since December of 2016. (wikipedia.org/wiki/List of</p>	<p>Climate change, as a cumulative impact was analyzed in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and referred to in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Regarding aircraft mishaps, non-anticipated accidents or emergencies are not included in the NEPA analysis.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>accidents_and_incidents_involving_military_aircraft_ (2000–09) (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_accidents_and_incidents_involving_military_aircraft_ (2010%E2%80%93present))</p> <p>With the number of proposed aircraft flights over the Olympic National Park and National Forest lands a jet crash would be a disaster. These are rainforests with a heavy fuel load and steep inaccessible terrain. Fighting a fire in a rainforest is extremely challenging. The tree tops rarely catch fire due to their density and moisture. Heavy moss and lichens provide the tinder and keep the fires near the ground. The forest canopy is so thick that dumping water does not penetrate. There are locations where the depth of the mineral soils precludes digging fire-lines.</p> <p>This potential hazard is not addressed in the EIS even though the Navy fire fighters likely have little or no experience in fighting a rainforest fire. This is not the type of terrain over which you should be conducting constant flights without a plan to meet this threat. There are better locations with flatter and open terrain rather than risk our treasured and valuable resources.</p>	
Marx J-2	<p>As a citizen who is affected by the NWTT activities I protest these open house "dog and pony shows" consisting of exhibits and handouts presenting only the Navy's plan. Most government entities require a recorded hearing in which the public can ask questions and respond to an applicant's comments. Proposals with this extensive an impact require hearings that provide equal status to both the applicant (Navy) and the affected citizens.</p> <p>If the Navy really wants citizen involvement and cooperation, affected communities should be aware and involved in decision making early in the planning process. Not after a plan is ready for the "sales pitch".</p> <p>Furthermore, you should have Washington State NWTT informational meetings in Coupeville, Brinnon and Forks - three communities, with travel challenges to your meeting locations, who are especially impacted by the NWTT.</p>	<p>The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.</p> <p>Because of the large size of the NWTT Study Area for this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, it is not feasible to hold a public meeting in every location where there may be public interest. Generally, the Navy has tried to locate public meetings in locations central to training or testing areas and potentially affected communities. Meeting locations were also identified based partially on suggestions received from the public, feedback from elected officials and other stakeholders, attendance levels of previous public meetings for similar projects, and the number of public comments received during the scoping phase.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Massoni-1	<p>I am opposed to the planned dumping of materials into Puget Sound. This impairs efforts to protect the critically endangered orcas and to restore the fish needed for their food supply. Once dumped, material continues to leak and spread toxic chemicals and metals that then end up everywhere else in our ecosystem.</p> <p>I am also opposed to planned sonar testing. This physically harms the marine life, including the critically endangered orcas, and makes it more difficult for them to locate food. by increasing the noise they must navigate.</p> <p>The Navy is already being sued by Puget Soundkeeper, starting in 2017, over illegal release of toxic material into Puget Sound.</p>	<p>The Navy does not propose any activities such as “dumping” materials in Puget Sound. In the course of the Navy proposed activities (listed in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of the EIS/OEIS), some expended materials are left behind in the ocean. The potential impacts of these actions was thoroughly analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Matallana-1	<p>The Navy should not be doing this because it hurts the marine life and we can’t afford more things to hurt them because there so vulnerable already.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Mathias-1	<p>Please stop using sonar. It is truly beyond cruel and unusual practices. Orca whales are vital to the preservation and health of our Northwest waters. Orca whales are part of PNW people's identity. Harming and torturing them is a personal attack on all of us. Stop this practice immediately.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Matthews-1	<p>As a marine biologist, I disagree with the conclusions presented in this EIS Report. Expansion of naval activities will have a detrimental effect on marine biological organisms as well as humans. I urge the Navy to reconsider the continued activities in this sensitive ecological area and to relocate them elsewhere.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Matthieu-1	Just stupid, please show us that human kind are not so stupid. Orca's are intelligent animals, sensitive maybe more than human. So it's inhuman to di this !	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Maureen-1	Please stop any testing that will kill these magnificent creatures!!!!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Maxwell-1	Thank you for extending the comment period 15 days although I feel at least 90 days are needed for the public to have input on their federal lands. I also think the Navy should host public hearings so more people can speak about public owned areas.	It is important to note that flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) over the Olympic National Park are proposed to increase by as much as 10 percent annually. The approximate 10 percent increase in flights equates to about one additional flight per day. These flights have been

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>My name is Janet Maxwell and I recently moved to SC. I have lived all my life before this in the West. Both of my parents were in the Navy. My mother was a Wave and my father was a Chief Warrant Officer. I love going to National and state parks. I enjoy Wilderness and Wildlands experiences. The quiet gives people the opportunity to reflect on what is important to them and remind us of the importance of nature. Therefore I urge you to consider using some other location for the Growler training. A National Park is not the place for this and please consider the Quiet Park Alternative!</p> <p>I also hope the Navy will conduct actual noise monitoring in the Olympic National Park. Although you can simulate it with a computer you don't really know how it will affect birds, wildlife or visitors unless you do actual tests.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this very important issue.</p>	<p>occurring for decades, and as described in Section 3.12.3.3.2.1 (Training) of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, attendance within the National Park has been steadily increasing since 2010, concurrent with these activities. The statement that jet noise is incompatible with natural soundscapes is a personal judgment outside of the scope of the noise analysis.</p> <p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
May La-1	<p>The nas whidbey jet expansion will cause great harm to humans and wildlife in the Puget sound.</p> <p>Wildlife life cycles will be impacted by the noise.Orcas will die and become extinct.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Education will be harmed as children will be unable to learn due to excessive decibel noise at schools. Businesses and tourism will be impacted because tourists will not want to come to the noise affected Areas, The safety of humans is severely at risk due to more flights on a Olf runway that is out of date For current	minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
May Lu-1	Please stop sonar testing! We already do enough to destroy their habitat, let's not destroy their hearing and survival mechanisms too.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Mayell-1	Ocean ecosystems are so important! We as a race are destroying them at an exponential rate. Surely there is another way for the navy to test its technology. Damage to the ocean and it's creatures means damage to humans and our survival. It doesn't matter how good our technology is if there are no humans left on earth to use it.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Mayen-1	I am 100% against underwater sonar testing. It is cruel to our marine biodiversity. We are supposed to protect those who are helpless. Please stop this.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Mayhew-1	This is an improper use of military progression. To put ocean life at risk which already struggles from a number of debilitating impacts is a threat to our survival and foundation for human and non human life. We should look further than the present to these impacts we may cause. It would be detrimental not to. Please do not begin sonar and electromagnetic testing in our oceans that would harm more ocean life. We are already seeing ecological impacts of our poor decisions. Do not cause harm to these animals which support a greater ecosystem we're ourselves involved in. Thank you for your consideration.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Maylett-1	At an alarming rate, whales are dying up and down the west coast another environmental stressor, navy sonar testing, will add to the destruction of the marine ecosystem. The death of whales threatens the survival of other species in the marine ecosystem. If we damage these populations with our human interactions of noise pollution and shipping activity, we will be breaking the balance of the ecosystem cycle and our planet will be detrimentally changed for future generations.	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. As described in Section 5.2.1 (Procedural Mitigation Development), the Navy's analysis assumes that</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		due to limitations such as those mentioned in the comment, Lookouts will not be 100% effective at detecting all individual marine mammals.
Mazumdar-1	Please stop all underwater sonar testing in the salish sea and surrounding waters as they are adversely affecting already endangered marine life and may cause mass deaths	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Mazzola-1	The majority of these training exercises do not have to be conducted along our shoreline and could instead be conducted far from shore minimizing the impact on birds, fish, marine mammals, other wildlife and communities. There is no evaluation for other locations which could significantly reduce the harmful impacts of these exercises. Training around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas could be avoided if that was a priority for the Department of Defense.	<p>Please refer to the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) for a thorough list of why this location is selected for Navy training and testing. Some of the reasons include "proximity of multiple training and testing range complexes in the Pacific Northwest to each other," "proximity to shore-based facilities and infrastructure, and the logistical support provided for testing activities," "environmental conditions (e.g., bathymetry, topography, and weather) that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness," and several other factors mentioned in the document making this an ideal training and testing location.</p> <p>The U.S. Navy has conducted training and testing activities for decades in the seaspace depicted in the Study Area with no evidence to indicate any meaningful impacts to marine habitats or marine species in the area. The Navy has consulted with the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) regarding the effects of the Proposed Action on Sanctuary resources. The Navy concludes its continued activities are not likely to result in the loss, destruction, or adverse changes to the viability of Sanctuary resources. Several points support this determination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than two percent of proposed training and 15 percent of proposed testing activities would occur within or immediately adjacent to the OCNMS. • The NWTT Final EIS/OEIS shows that training and testing activities have minimal temporary impacts on the quantity or quality of the Study Area's physical environment, and minor to no impacts on marine or shore birds, fish, sea turtles, or invertebrate marine life. • Although explosives have the potential to affect the physical and biological resources, the Navy does not use explosives within the OCNMS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy concludes any marine mammal behavioral reactions to NWT training and testing activities would be transitory, infrequent, non-cumulative, and impacts are not expected to decrease overall individual fitness or result in long-term population-level impacts on any given population, and consequently will not result in any adverse changes to the sanctuary.
McCabe-1	I'm primarily concerned about the damage to the whales and dolphins and other wildlife that are impacted by sonar testing. Please don't subject them to dangerous and damaging tests. It's their world more than ours.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
McCaffray-1	Please do not use that underwater sonar, it is destructive to underwater life. It has been proven over time you just need to pay attention please please do not use that, allow our underwater life to flourish!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Mccann-1	Please stop doing this science has shown this is bad for all sea mammals	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
McCarter-1	I am writing to express profound concern regarding the use of sonic and seismic testing in any ocean/marine environment. Testing has been proven to have serious deleterious effects on cetaceans and other marine mammals. Please stop all sonic and seismic testing! There are no economic benefits that outweigh the costs. Thank you for your consideration.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
McCaughey-1	I believe they should be no underwater sonar testing in the area of critical habitat to the only 75 southern Resident Killer Whales. The PNW is an area known for the SRKW because of their salmon run. The salmon run is in depletion as well, so they do not need more stress. Marine life in this area already faces critical threats such as high boating exposure and the sonar associated with cargo and recreation and commercial boats. Please find a different area for this project.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
McClellan-1	Does anyone care about all the living creatures underwater? They are just as important as humans, in some cases more so, & they have just as much right to a healthy harmless life as we do. MURDER is a crime regardless of the recipients, please bear this in mind! Thank you.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
McClure-1	Please stop – just stop and think about a course of action which takes into account the ecosystem as a whole. The mission of the military including the Navy should be to protect all life and address the coming challenges of climate change. It is time to turn the ship around. Peace not war.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
McClure-2	I made the point to the gentleman there that we should not be damaging the ecosystem. The ecosystem is in danger of collapse as it is. The Navy should reconfigure its operation and its objectives. Peace is what we need in the world, not more military action. And I'm really concerned about this approach, all this testing and possible explosive devices being set off off our coastline. You know, we've already seen collapse of the fishing industry here, and I just think the Navy has to shift 180 degrees. Humanitarian missions only; reduce their size significantly. It's ridiculous we're spending nearly a trillion dollars a year on the military. And so in closing, we need to stop and reevaluate, and take into account the serious nature of climate change and the challenges ahead for humanity.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
McCormick-1	I'm 100% AGAINST sonic testing in the Salish Sea. This practice is proven to be harmful to all marine mammals, especially the critically endangered & starving 76 Southern Resident Orcas who are veering close to extinction. These loud underwater practices are UNACCEPTABLE. Please STOP!	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
McCovey-1	J-E-N-E L. McCovey, M-C-C-O-V-E-Y, with Tri-Valley Care, the Yurok Tribe and Pacific Alliance for Indigenous and Environmental Action. So my question: This hearing is in regards to a supplemental document which I am requesting a hard copy of. ADA compliance. I cannot go and sit in a library. I cannot be in front of a computer. I -- dexterity, I don't got it. So I'm requesting a hard copy. Also this supplemental document, is it in response to and in addition to the Navy's five-year plan? So what that -- those documents are like this (indicating). That's what I'm asking. How do I want to say this? The mode of presentation for this document is not beneficial -- or could be more beneficial to the public by allowing a forum for questions, that everybody gets to hear the questions. And it allows for the understanding so we're one on one with one person. Not thorough. It's just not thorough.	The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Question: Where is it in the research for mammals, fish and birds in consultation with the indigenous population and the TEK, Traditional Ecological Knowledge? Where is it documented? And I guess that's the question. I guess under Jene McCovey you want to put on the advisory committee to the Yurok Tribe's Natural Resources Committee and Epic lifetime achievement work for activism. Okay. Yeah. Epic environmental protection information have awarded me the Semper Virens Lifetime Achievement Award. Yeah, Lifetime Activist Achievement Award.	The Navy will continue to consult with the Tribes. Through Government-to-Government consultations, the Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.
McCrosky-1	Please stop these tests, they are harmful to the marine animals. This is not okay!	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
McCulloch-1	No more toxic noise! My primary home is on Whidbey Island where I no longer have any quality of life, due to FCLP at OLF. I own a cabin on 80 acres on the Olympic Peninsula, where I retreat to when the noise on Whidbey becomes unbearable... and now that safe haven is under attack as well?! I am done with the Navy obliterating this pristine area... and what I don't get is this. Why must the jets be so LOUD?! They go directly over my house, and at TIMES, even flying low they are capable of not emitting ear shattering noise, where the noise is actually tolerable. You have created a crisis in this region that could be diffused if you retrained your pilots how to fly, in terms of being a good neighbor. I know it is possible because I see this day in and day out, exactly where and how they fly. The experienced from inexperienced... how the flight path varies by pilot, on same LP. My point being, you the Navy snub your nose at the public, and a change in how you operate could be tolerable for all... but you refuse. Life changes, policies change, you are not being a good neighbor, and I will therefore do every thing I can to oppose you.	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
McDaniel-1	The Olympic Peninsula is home to a variety of wildlife, as well as home of hundreds of people who live here. The peace and quiet is what has drawn many here, to escape the big city chaos and noise. The noise of the jets will disturb everything on the Peninsula, farm animals, wildlife, fish life, whales and people. Please abandon this plan for this area...there are many other less affected areas in which to train.	Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved. <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTS Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
McDonald J-1	NO MORE SOLAR TESTING! We used to wonder what caused mass beach strandings but particularly whales. Now we know it's sonar. Years ago scientist reported we needed to make drastic changes before the year 2000. Then they said we had 50 years, then 30, the latest report I read said we only have ten! Fracking, pipelines, plastic pollution, species extinction, climate manipulation, and sonar are all contributing to shorten the life of our Earth. All life is interlinked. Ten years means your children and my grandchildren will never grow up! Please do your part and stop sonar!!	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
McDonald J-2	This must be stop! You are killing integral links in the ocean's chain. If the ocean dies, we die. It's way passed time to stop destroying our world.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
McDonald P-1	<p>The powerful sonar blasts that ships, such as destroyers, deploy to find submarines produce sound waves that can travel across hundreds of kilometers of ocean, disrupting the communication and feeding of marine mammals. At closer distances, the sonar can cause the animals to become deaf and disoriented, leading them to strand.</p> <p>Many of these beached whales have been found with physical injuries, such as bleeding in the ears, brain, and other tissues, and with large bubbles in their organs-damage that's similar to the "bends," an ailment, scuba divers can suffer if they surface too quickly.</p> <p>Considering the area off of the coast of Oregon, from Astoria to Brookings, is a rich fishing ground, it is inappropriate that testing should occur here. Healthy marine life is economically important to Oregonians. Doing these tests will damage the ecology of the ocean and impact the economy of the Northwest.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
McFarland-1	<p>Sorry there are so many negative comments because we in out home, are all for you!</p> <p>Keep up your good work!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>
McGillivray-1	<p>There is no practical or defensible need to release toxins into a body of water. Any statement to the contrary is uninformed. Any proposed release of "environmental stressors" is nothing more than an illegal dumping activity. Set aside any toxin release permanently.</p>	<p>Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.
McGovern-1	Please do not do any sonar testing,you are hurting the whales and dolphins.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
McHugh C-1	Sonar that harms wildlife is unacceptable.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
McHugh M-1	Please stop the testing! It's killing the creatures of the Salsh Sea!	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
McKay-1	There is a lot of water on our planet. A significant percentage surrounds our east and west borders and surrounds our 50th state. I am concerned about our safety and appreciate most of what the military does. I am the wife of a Vietnam 100% disabled, service connected veteran. I understand that most of the decisions made come from what is in the best interest of our nation. Unfortunately, some of the decisions made are not fully explored.i would like to see a study done on the possible locations being considered with studies being done on the impact on the ecological impact to each of the locations. I believe the military branch of our country has an	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	obligation to an alternative location when their first choice may cause ecological damage to our planet and country.	
McKee-1	<p>We wish to document our objection to the Navy's plan to continue the use of Growler jets over our home and the wilderness area of Olympic National Park. I urge the Navy to relocate these drills further over the ocean, or in the already designated areas in Idaho.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to use such noisy aircraft over the very place people go for peace and quiet. To have our sky sounding like that of Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria, conflicts with the purpose of wilderness designation.</p> <p>Our approximate home coordinates are latitude 48° 5' 0" N, longitude 123° 44' 0" and we are being subjected to this noise with increasing frequency during the day.</p> <p>Thank you for your kind consideration of our comments, Dave & Elena McKee</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTS Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
McKenzie-1	This needs to stop our sealife is suffering so much already but to deafen and distress them is unacceptable STOP it NOW	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
McKnight-1	I understand that testing needs to be done and will continue. However, for the sake of our planet and the ecosystem we must find a safer way to complete the testing. This is causing more damage than you think.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
McLaughlin-1	<p>I have strong concerns regarding the inadequacy of the assessment of Tribal cultural impacts as well as environmental impacts from the Navy's training and testing activities. These are especially important because these activities take place in the Pacific Ocean, which holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes and is critically important for the well being of all people and lifeforms on this planet.</p> <p>At minimum, the Navy should work meaningfully with the Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of</p>	Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities.</p> <p>The Navy should prohibit use of sonar within the 50-mile mitigation area. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and well being of whales and other marine mammals.</p> <p>The “best available science” referenced in the draft SEIS must be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy’s NWTRC.</p> <p>The Navy’s monitoring program should be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy should expand its list of environmental “stressors” to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy’s 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing. Thank you for considering these substantive comments regarding the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>	
McLoughlin-1	<p>We owe it to ourselves and our future generations to preserve this beautiful species. Sonar is outdated unnecessary technology.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
McMillan-1	<p>THE GROWLERS ARE THE NOISIEST PLANES IN THE UNIVERSE. IT IS TORTURE FOR COUPEVILLE RESIDENTS. IF THE NUMBER OF FLIGHTS IS INCREASED IT IS AN ASSAULT OF THE POPULATION ON THE WHOLE OLYMPIC PENINSULA. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
McMullan-1	PLEASE do what's right and end sonar testing so these (and many other) wonderful creatures can live in peace as they should.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
McMurtrey-1	I am very concerned about sonar testing and it's effects on all whale species. The pod of orca that will be affected is in a very fragile position. Whales rely upon sonar and the decibel level the navy uses is not a natural occurrence and will harm these beautiful creatures	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
McNeilly-1	Navy Sonar testing around marine life is unacceptable. The endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales are at a massive risk due to this, not to mention how physically and mentally damaging and disorienting it is to them considering they are already battling starvation due to our overfishing, they are battling through their daily lives due to our pollution. They recently had a baby to the Jpod putting the numbers of the SRKW at 76, we are fighting for their chances of survival, we refuse to allow our own human race be the reason for another Orca calf (baby) death. This must stop. We must allow them a chance at rebuilding their numbers and we owe that to them, they have and continue to suffer due to human cause therefore it is up to us as humans to change that, we can live in harmony with other animals/mammals but that is a two way street that we must respect rather than continue the greed and disruption of the earth.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
McNulty A-1	Please reconsider this testing. It will be an environmental disaster for sea life which use sound waves and echolocation to communicate and find food.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
McNulty T-1	<p>I wish to register my opposition to the Navy's expansion of Growler Jet warfare training over Olympic National park, Olympic National Forest, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, and associated wilderness areas. I live on the Olympic Peninsula, in the flight path of Growler jets returning to base after training on the Peninsula, and I am a frequent visitor to the Park and Forest.</p> <p>One priority for moving forward with this plan should be to monitor jet noise in Olympic National Park to attain data on jet noise and its impact on park visitors. The amount of noise and impacts described in the SEIS is unrealistic.</p> <p>The extremely loud and disruptive noise from Navy jets does not belong in one of our nations most popular national parks. Olympic National Park is recognized as a World Heritage Site, a world-class natural area, and should not be impaired by avoidable intrusions which degrade those values.</p> <p>The Navy needs to consider specific alternatives that would greatly reduce Navy jet noise over the Park and that would reduce or completely eliminate Navy jet flyovers of the Park. The fact that such alternatives would not be as convenient for the Navy as what it currently does is not a valid reason for refusing to fully consider such alternatives. Flying over the Park, especially the parts of the park not directly on the west coast of the peninsula, is not a military necessity for their training exercises. The Navy has many other airspaces it could fly in, but there is only one Olympic National Park.</p> <p>The draft SEIS only considers impacts in the parts of the Park that are in the Military Operations Areas (MOAs). But the Navy Jets fly over much larger portions of the park that are not in those MOAs and the impacts to those parts of the park should be addressed in the SEIS. The Navy's maps indicate transit flights between the NAS Whidbey Island and the Pacific MOAs flying over Lake Crescent and Hurricane Ridge among other areas within Olympic National Park, all of which are well-visited throughout the year.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses.</p> <p>In Appendix J, the Navy considered the noise impacts resulting from aircraft transiting into the Olympic MOA.</p>
McPhedran-1	<p>i AM 100% against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals! please do the correct thing and stop this madness.....</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
McVay A-1	Please consider the damage sonar testing will do to the wildlife and orcas in the area. Reconsider.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
McVay M-1	Stop The growlers. Please. Thank you	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
McVetty-1	The way you conducted this meeting is a DISGRACE, to both the American people and the US Navy. The American way of life, of open democracy, public meetings & discourse has been subverted by your actions. The information you purport to give is fragmented and no one could hear what anyone was saying. SHAME ON YOU! This was a joke. Next time, bring a P.A.	The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.
Meadows-1	I'm fairly confident that with the navy being an ocean role that almost every member of the crew loves the ocean and the ocean sea life. Sonar terrorises sea life and drives whales dolphins and more into mental states that cause them to beach themselves. It ruins migratory paths and upsets them hugely. Sonar kills sea life, that's science. Please please please stop the killing and torment	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Meecham-1	I would like to express my concern about the US Navy's proposed sonar testing in the Salish Sea these tests cause enormous harm the precious creatures who live in it value our natural world. Thank you so much.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Memmott-1	This may not be Substantive, but I am strongly opposed to the continued and expanded use of sonar in the Puget sound waters. Our endangered animal populations are barely surviving, and the outlook is bleak. Purposefully making this situation worse is unforgivable.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Mendes-1	I am a resident of Kala Point, WA, and often hear the growler flights originating on Whidbey. They disturb my night time reading and sleep. They seem to be occurring more frequently, and becoming more bothersome. Expansion would only make this worse. My other main concerns are: Wildlife/Marine Life/Bird Populations. Puget Sound is the nation's second largest estuary. The waters of the Salish Sea are some of the most biologically significant and productive marine areas in the world, home to both abundant and threatened species of marine life, including six endangered whale species, threatened Stellar sea lions, threatened and endangered salmon, steelhead, and rockfish species, and endangered leatherback sea turtles. .Aircraft noise and sonic booms have been implicated as a cause of lowered reproduction in a variety of animals. The J, K and L pods of Southern resident orcas that inhabits the Salish Sea is on the decline; only 76 remain as of the date of submitting these comments. Both high and low frequency noise have negative impacts on whales' ability to navigate and identify	The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>food. The carbon dioxide in jet exhaust acidifies the water, damaging the web of marine life that sustain salmon, the orca's primary food source. Additionally, chemical compounds from the Navy's fire fighting fire retardant, already in Whidbey's aquifer, enter Puget Sound as surface run-off. These effects, taken together, will further stress the pods and may make the difference between survival and extinction.</p> <p>National Parks and Other Protected Lands. Puget Sound is bordered by 68 state parks and 8 national parks and monuments, wildlife refuges, forests, and public lands. These assets help drive approximately \$9.5 billion in travel spending, including 88,000 tourist-related jobs that bring \$3 billion to the region, much of it to Washington State. Increased noise over the Olympic National Park threatens its status as a UNESCO World Heritage Site and Biosphere Reserve. Tourists seeking tranquility as they visit these parks will stop coming if they are subjected to noise, and the media will amplify the deterioration through the negative comments that will be posted. The Olympic Peninsula relies heavily on the tourist industry, and anything that damages this industry does great harm to the economic viability of an already stressed region.</p> <p>Climate Change A four-fold increase in Growler flights will add 60,000 metric tons of additional carbon dioxide—a known cause of climate change— and speed ocean acidification, harming coral reefs, shellfish, and marine ecosystems.</p> <p>Native Americans. An increase in Growler flights will impinge on the treaty-promised hunting and fishing rights of native peoples. Pacific Northwest native tribes rely on the forests, rivers, and oceans for their survival and way of life. The lands and seas on which they depend are subjected to military maneuvers: bombing practice, ship-sinking, and sonar buoys that have killed whales, dolphins, porpoises, and other marine mammals.</p>	
Mendez D-1	<p>3-time Army combat veteran demanding the navy cease these tests and DO MORE, FASTER, to contribute to the betterment of our lands/waters instead of destroy/damaging them for "defense."</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Mendez J-1	<p>The noise is a deadly to them. It's time to think how much we, "the human" are put them through in order to meet our goals.</p> <p>Humans are the worst treat to humanity and everything else. We (humans) destroy anything around us, we don't care about the animals, or the</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>environment. We just care about our progress... it is time to PROTECT OUR ANIMALS!!!</p> <p>YOUR NOISE IS JUST ANOTHER KIND OF ABUSE !!</p> <p>NEEDS TO BE STOP NOW!!!! JUST USE A COMMON SENSE!!! STOP IT !!</p>	<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Mendham-1	<p>I respectfully ask that you do everything possible to mitigate any possible adverse effects on marine mammals such as dolphins and whales. They are already under considerable threat by inhumane methods of capture and slaughter and by the changing climate and increasing pollution in our oceans. Please consult with concerned and knowledgeable experts about these cetaceans so we can be certain that we are doing everything possible to avoid harming them.</p> <p>I appreciate that our comments are welcome and everything you can do to avoid possible harm to these animals and their environment.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Meng-1	<p>The Navy has expanded its operations from Whidbey to the San Juan Islands and the Olympic Peninsula. These activities include land, water, and air wartime training activities, resulting in a large amount of our population and wildlife in these areas being forced into a wartime daily environment. This environment includes bone rattling noise, pollution, and war equipment activity. These activities continue from early morning to often well after midnight. Environmental impacts are severe - particularly the noise and pollution impacting whales, birds, fish, water, and humans, that depend on these resources.</p> <p>In particular, I believe the sound impacts have not been measured; and their impacts on animal and sea life, and human health have not been studied. For instance, when we have high decibel noise shaking our house and trees, and we see whales in the bay, we have never seen the navy testing noise levels or the effects on our health.</p>	<p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Menhorns-1	While I understand the importance of a strong defense/Navy, like the obsolescence of whaling and other practices which deplete our natural resources, this sonar testing seems like it causes too much impact for the return. It brings such serious impact on marine life seems unwarranted. I love this country, but I also love this ocean, and need its inhabitants for my livelihood. Please stop. Thank you so much!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Menzies-1	<p>Hello and good day,</p> <p>I support the stance of local Native American tribes, copied below.</p> <p>While i understand that we need to have a military and that that military needs to train, the scale of our military has gotten out of control. We can't keep thinking only of military power and not the overall future of our planet or the other species that have rights to live their natural lives as much as we do. Thank you for helping protect the future of the sacred ocean and Tribal peoples along the west coast.</p> <p>Thank you, Scott Menzies</p> <p>Since 2005, Tribes in Mendocino & Lake Counties have opposed Navy training and testing in the Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT) range. The ten Tribes demanding that their cultural ways of life and the marine environment be protected from impacts of the Navy's training are: Cahto Tribe of Laytonville Rancheria; Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians; Hopland Band of Pomo Indians; Little River Band of Pomo Indians; Pinoleville Pomo Nation; Potter Valley Tribe; Robinson Rancheria of Pomo Indians; Round Valley Indian Tribes; Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians; and Sherwood Valley Rancheria of Pomo Indians.</p> <p>For countless generations, the Tribes have maintained deeply significant cultural and spiritual ties to the coastline and ocean waters adjacent to Mendocino and Humboldt Counties, California.</p> <p>The Tribes have commented on earlier reviews of the environmental impacts of the training and testing, and are now requesting the public to submit comments on the Navy's current Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS) to support the Tribes' position. The comment deadline is June 12, 2019.</p> <p>The adequacy of the assessment of Tribal cultural impacts as well as environmental impacts from the Navy's training and testing activities is especially important because these activities take place in the Pacific Ocean, which holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes</p>	Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>and is critically important for the wellbeing of all people and lifeforms on this planet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I request that the Navy work meaningfully with Pacific coast Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities. • I demand the Navy expand prohibited activities in the 50-mile mitigation area to include use of sonar. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals. • I request that the "best available science" referenced in the Draft SEIS be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy's NWTT. • I request that the Navy's monitoring program be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species. • I demand the Navy expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing. • I request that the cumulative effect of ocean acidification should also be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing. 	
Mercer S-1	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to the Navy's planned SONAR and weapons testing along the west coast from Alaska to Mendocino California. In 2013, the Navy submitted comments stating that its actions would kill "only 130 whales, dolphins, and other marine mammals and seabirds."</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Further “ 1600 others would suffer hearing loss.” How can the Navy know that? Those are precise numbers and sound like underestimates. The Navy has stated that hearing loss is temporary in mysticetes. How does the Navy know that. To know that, an individual known to have suffered hearing loss would have to be identified, then followed and then constantly tested to diagnose its condition. Has the Navy accomplished that? If so, please supply me with a link to the publication the work is published in.</p> <p>It’s well documented that ship noise of 20 to 200 Hz overlaps the acoustic signals used by the baleen whales. Responses by baleen whales to increased noise include: habitat displacement, behavioral changes, and alterations in the intensity, frequency, and intervals of calls. A publication from 2012 in Proceedings Of The Royal Society B by Rosalind M. Rolland, et al, Evidence that ship noise increases ship noise in right whales, shows that physiological changes occur from stress directly related to increased noise. Gray whales feed in Arctic waters after migrating north from Mexican calving grounds. The Arctic ecosystem is undergoing extreme changes caused by climate change that is affecting the Arctic food webs. We know that undernourished pregnant females abort their fetus. Pregnant females traveling south to calving grounds in winter and exposed to loud noise and explosions may abort their calf.</p> <p>Dramatic displacement by loud noise from ancient migratory paths is not an option for this species. Further, increased noise will cause separation of mother calf pairs, and will drown out calls as they attempt to reconnect. In the 2013 comments submitted by the Navy, there is no differentiation between pinnipeds and cetaceans. There are tremendous and significant differences between the behaviors and biology of the two groups, as well as significant differences in behaviors and ecology between odontocetes and mysticetes.</p> <p>The recent Unusual Mortality Event caused by the known deaths of more than 70 gray whales, and likely 600-700 total dead makes it inconceivable that the Navy undertake extended operations involving increased noise including explosions to species already experiencing stress through a noisy environment, warming habitats, decreased forage resources, and in the case of the Southern Resident orcas, dwindling populations</p>	<p>emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Mercer T-1	<p>Since 2014, Mendonoma Whale and Seal Study, of which I am a founding and contributing member, has been conducting a gray whale census and studying the behaviors of all cetaceans that use and pass through our study area which is part of the Northwest Training and Testing area. We are deeply concerned about the harmful effects the acoustic stressors will have</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	on whale species, particularly the highly endangered southern resident orcas and gray whales. On May 31, 2019, NOAA FISHERIES WEST COAST REGION issued an UNUSUAL MORTALITY EVENT, or UME, for gray whales. Most of the stranded gray whales have been determined to be significantly emaciated suggesting a disruption in the food web. Studies done by the University of Western Australia have shown that sonar transmissions have actually blown holes in swarms of zooplankton upon which many species, including gray whales, depend for food. Clearly, further investigation is needed. Your report states “while data are lacking on behavioral responses of mysticetes to continuously active sonars, these species are known to be able to habituate to novel and continuous sounds.” Section 3,4-108. How does the Navy plan to collect the data that is necessary before subjecting mysticetes to sonar and other forms of acoustic stressors?	<p>examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Merryman-1	The majority of these training exercises do not have to be conducted along our shoreline and could instead be conducted far from shore which would minimize the impact on birds, fish, marine mammals, other wildlife and communities that have been in the area for generations. The Olympic Peninsula contains some of the more remote locations accessible to foot traffic, including a site that has been listed as the most quiet location in the United States. There needs to be an evaluation of other locations which could significantly reduce the harmful impacts of these exercises. Training around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas must be avoided to protect these pristine areas for future generations. Please make this a priority for the Department of Defense.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Meschi-1	Please stop this!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Metcalf-1	I'm writing with regard to the proposed Navy training exercises that would if permitted, take place off our Northern California coast line. I'd like to start by thanking you for your dedication to National Security and for your service to the people of the United States of America. I have many friends in the US military and understand the importance of training our military to	As described in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety), a diver would have to be within 3,000 yards of the Navy's most powerful sonar to experience any effect. The Standard Operating Procedures implemented by the Navy would prevent a diver from being that close to any active sonar activities.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>keep our troops prepared. I also imagine you've now spent hours/days reading and responding to the many concerned citizens during this public comment period. I would like to thank you again for taking the time to listen, read and respond to the many letters you've no doubt received. I live in the small town of Mendocino in California and am concerned about the negative impact the training exercises would have on our town. In the years past Mendocino and the surrounding natural resources once supported a booming logging and fishing industry. They have since crashed and our town is now dependent on tourism, much of which is driven by the Marine environment off our coastline. I'm a freediver/spearfisherman and am primarily concerned about the potential negative impact of the naval training on our marine life/kelp forest as well as on the diving community. In the last decade I've seen our once lush kelp forests begin to die. The underwater structure which was once home to the kelp and abundant sea life is now barren covered in purple sea urchins. Here's a picture from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to give you an understanding of the decline. The picture is an aerial survey of the kelp forest, on the left 2008 and on the right 2016. The decline has only continued since. Due to the decline of the kelp forest less and less people travel to our coast line to dive. Many used to come for Abalone which is now closed to take. My favorite and only local dive shop is going out of business. Many hotels and inns along the coast are also struggling due to the reduced number of tourists. Jobs and economic opportunities are disappearing. Person to person, I have to say it really sucks. I never thought I'd see such a decline in my lifetime. I always assumed (oops.) I would be teaching my son Leo (now[4] to freedive and take him out to explore, enjoy and harvest dinner from the rich marine environment as I have over the past years. I'm no longer confident it will be healthy enough for his generation to enjoy. I can't imagine that Naval training in such close proximity will help the---_already stressed environment. I have a few questions for you before I conclude:</p> <p>1) Is is still going to be safe for me to freedive during the training? I have heard reports that the active sonar used can travel for miles underwater and worry about the negative physical effects it might have on me and my dive buddies.</p> <p>2) Does the Navy understand how any toxins released into our ocean during the training will affect the kelp?</p> <p>Thanks again for taking the time to read all this. If your ever stressed from the review process come visit Mendocino, it's a real gem. If by chance you</p>	<p>Please see Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for the analysis of impacts to water quality from the Navy's proposed activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	freedive or spearfish and are in the areas, contact me and I'll take you out personally to show you the kelp and cook up some fish tacos.	
Meyer J-1	I would like to comment on the proposed flight plan increase for the Growlers over the Coupeville area. I am opposed to my hearing damage caused by jet flyovers near my property and work place The sound decibels have been measured professionally at my work place at 118 decibels. My hearing protection offers 18 decibel reduction so the resulting decibel is 100 decibels. My ears ring with the protection on therefore my hearing is being damaged. It is accumulating hearing damage to me. Please relocate the jets. The nuclear bomb detonation testing was stopped because it was damaging to people's health, and the environment. Thank you for listening.	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Meyer K-1	I was always brought up to be a good neighbor. Performing these noisy disturbing to the environment and community exercises in an area where it is not necessary I feel is not being a good neighbor. I am supportive of our troops and appreciate the intent however I feel it is disrespectful to the community you serve. Please look and other options and don't brush us aside as if you know what is best for us. Ca respectfully	When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context: 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Meyer R-1	God Bless the Navy but for the love of God and Country don't test in the Salish Sea or Puget Sound. Our marine animals are already being stressed and are almost at the point of no return 🙏. What will our grand children say. Thanks 🙏	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Meyer R-2	<p>I endorse Choice 5.1 - NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE. My reasoning is that if training and testing is discontinued it would result in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lessening the negative impact on sediments and water quality. 2. Improving the ambient air quality as amount of pollutants emitted would decrease. 3. Lessening the impact on marine habitats and marine mammals, the general fish population, sea turtles, bird population, marine vegetation and marine invertebrates. 4. Lessening the negative impact on the American Indian traditional resources, transportation, recreation, tourism, quality of life for nearby inhabitants and public health and safety. 	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Meyer-Kittredge-1	<p>We have just learned of an EIS put out by the U.S. Navy on March 29, which is very disturbing to us. The only EIS alternative that is acceptable is the No Action Alternative. The other options given are unacceptable to the environment and life on the Olympic Peninsula. Alternatives 1 and 2 would cause unforgiveable and unnecessary damage to Olympic National Park and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. Alternative 2 is the most extreme. The length of the EIS, the great area it affects, and the many people it affects requires a 90-day comment period. This, so the EIS can be examined properly and thoroughly. Please ask the Navy for another 14-day extension of the comment period. The noise from multiple jet flights over</p>	<p>The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTTEIS Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	the western and northern parts of the Peninsula will chase residents and visitors away. This will affect the health and economy of the Peninsula and the state of Washington. The search pattern of jet Growler flights looking for emitters would roar above the ocean beaches; the Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges; Washington State Department of Natural Resources land; Quinault, Quileute and Hoh Reservations; and thousands of acres of private land, including the towns of Forks and Amanda Park. The Navy admits to 85–100 decibels of noise per pass. That is enough to cause hearing loss and contribute to other health problems. People in Forks have recorded 94 decibel flights under the current operations. While noise is known to affect people and no studies have been done on the iconic Olympic elk, it is not difficult to reason they would be similarly affected, being mammals of a similar weight. The military training in the Marine Sanctuary would do damage to the ocean beaches, the marine animals of the coast, the nesting areas of many of Washington's shorebirds, migrating whales, and the birds that use the Pacific Flyway. The Navy has denied flying over Olympic National Park. This is untrue. Not only is this untrue, it is impossible not to fly these missions over the Park. This degradation of the Olympic Peninsula's environment is unacceptable. For 112 years, Congress and presidents have set aside areas of the Peninsula to protect its valuable environment. Irreparable damage would be caused if the activities are done as stated in the Navy EIS/OEIS Mar 2019 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Northwest Training and Testing. Please stop this plan by the Navy. The training has been done elsewhere. It can be done elsewhere. Wild places are not empty places just waiting for an invasion by the military. Our national security must also include environmental security. Sincerely, Kit Kittredge, Dr. Keith Meyer	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Michan-1	Stop it. It is so annoying that we are always doing something wrong to wildlife. Seriously, the US is always doing something so wrong to wildlife, always. I'm sick and tired of it	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Michell-1	Find somewhere else to do Growler trainings; somewhere not along the coast that will impact marine sea life! The population of Souther Resident Orcas and their endangered health should be a main priority! The majority of these training exercises do not have to be conducted along our shoreline and could instead be conducted far from shore minimizing the impact on	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the ships and aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	birds, fish, marine mammals, other wildlife and communities. There needs to be an evaluation of other locations which could significantly reduce the harmful impacts of these exercises. Training around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas SHOULD be avoided.	
Milholland-1	See attachments.	The attachments were unrelated to the Navy's Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Milholland-2	<p>(With Port Townsend Nuclear Ban Team) Hi, Sara. I'm Doug Milholland from Port Townsend, Washington. I'm profoundly discouraged that our government is insisting on the next generation of nuclear weaponry. I think it's a death sentence for the planet, and I'm very concerned that we've made a strategic blunder as a people.</p> <p>I so wish that the military industrial congressional media complex had some kind of some system balance so that we weren't stuck with the best defense, the most profitable defense that can be made. It's a terrible mistake. I'm a father and grandfather. I don't like hearing the Growler (inaudible) weapons at all, because when I hear them, I think of nuclear war. That's what I think they're strategically built to do.</p> <p>If we have a war with Russia and only a portion of their nuclear weaponry escape our first strike, which is logically what will probably happen, even if only the fallout will create a nuclear winter, there will be billions of casualties. Somehow we have to change course.</p> <p>I'm not sure how to accomplish that as one citizen, but for what it's worth, I'm putting my tiny piece of weight in that direction. I'll do what I can to help you and your children and grandchildren survive by being active. I would like you and the people that you are writing for to consider listening to Dr. Ira Helfand. He has a short video that's available on TED Talk and on the website -- H-e-l-f-a-n-d -- you're doing okay, aren't you?</p> <p>COURT REPORTER: Yes.</p> <p>MR. MILHOLLAND: -- if you go to "Resources" and preventnuclearwar.org and watch the Ted Talk Nobel Prize winning Dr. Ira Helfand on this topic of can we prevent a nuclear war. His strategy is to help us understand what it would be like. And for people who don't know what a nuclear war would be like and yet are willing to follow or willing to help out, whatever we can, on defending our wonderful nation, somehow I think it's an important -- what would it be? -- an important spice to understanding the complexity of the time that we're here.</p> <p>More weapons are making us less safe. The more active war fighting strategy is making us less safe. But Ted Talk with Dr. Ira Helfand available at preventnuclearwar.org/resources is something that I would like everybody</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>who gets to consider the remarks from the public to watch and mull over. There are other resources here too, but I've left a copy of this with the receptionist, and I can leave it with you as well.</p> <p>So a second Nobel Peace Prize winner is talked about in the New England Journal of Medicine. I'm not sure when it was published, but it describes how we can eliminate weaponry through stigmatizing, prohibiting and eliminating. It's a helpful article.</p> <p>And I would hope that the process of getting feedback from the public would include things like that we call on the United States to lead a global effort to prevent nuclear war by renouncing the option of using nuclear weapons first. Our country hasn't done that. You probably know that.</p> <p>Two, ending the sole, unchecked authority of any president to launch a nuclear war. Taking U.S. nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert. Four, canceling the plan to replace the entire arsenal with enhanced weapons like the Columbia-class submarines, and actively pursue a verifiable agreement among nuclear armed states to eliminate their nuclear arsenals. Can we do this? It's not like we're facing a volcano or an act of God. We actually have the power to change course as a species, but it will require a profound amount of courage. It will require reconsidering some of the toxic programming that so many people have taken into themselves; us-versus-them programming, better-the-top-dog-than-the-dead-dog programming. There is a path, but it has to be found deep within our hearts, and it's moving from obedience to authority to obedience to the call of life that we may live. That's the kind of message I'm carrying.</p> <p>COURT REPORTER: Thank you. This will be sent to the Navy.</p> <p>MR. MILHOLLAND: And this is a picture of what I think a nuclear war holds for the Puget Sound.</p> <p>COURT REPORTER: Do you want this to be on the record?</p> <p>MR. MILHOLLAND: Oh, sure. This is a photograph I got from a website, "NukeWatch" I think it is. And it shows that the Trident nuclear submarine base is perhaps the most important target on the planet in case a nuclear war occurs. And believe me, we're ready 24/7 to have such a thing happen. This isn't like a little possibility. As time goes by, it becomes a greater possibility.</p> <p>Here's Everett, where there's one of the bases. I didn't put in the Bremerton complex. I chose to consider the target-worthiness of the weapons transfer depot on Puget Sound that's across the bay from where I live. Here is the Ault Field. I know the commander's here. I'd like to talk with him.</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>This kind of understanding helps to season the willingness to say yes, we have to consider what we're really talking about. This particular graph indicated 131,000 fatalities within the first few minutes.</p> <p>In any case, this document here focuses just on the Trident base, and you're welcome to a copy of it if you like. It talks about the nuke map and its understanding of impact. It's an important thing to include in the record because, after all, the activities of the Navy are not about sending sewing machines overseas to the indigent nor are they about enabling people in the Third World countries to have hospitals or roads.</p> <p>What the activities are is to maintain and enhance a balance of terror that threatens annihilation of life on the planet. It's important, I think, for to us change course as a species. In military parlance, it would be about-face, march, and March towards a survival of the future, march away from being at the brink.</p> <p>Thanks so much.</p>	
Milholland-3	<p>Greetings Navy planners and analysts:</p> <p>Proposed Naval activities over the next seven years will continue to sharpen the sword of Damocles that dangles over our collective heads.</p> <p>Insisting that Growlers electromagnetic warfighting planes must practice with nuclear attack subs, trident nuclear weapon subs, missile destroyers and aircraft carriers clearly defines nuclear warfighting practice, wars that threaten life on our planet.</p> <p>Our reputation as a force for good lies shattered at the chaos and massive destruction our military is responsible for in the Middle East. The economic and threatened military warfare directed at Iran points out the bankruptcy of our ability to negotiate long-standing agreements that prevent more nations from becoming nuclear states. Crushing the Venezuelan government economically in order to accomplish theft of that countries mineral resources makes a mockery of earlier American administrations development of the United Nations, the rule of law, the Nuremberg principals. Our refusal to recognize the World Court's duty to haul Hegemon America into court to address war crimes our country has committed lays bare the fact that our ruling elites have devolved into an armed group bent on plunder.</p> <p>I read the supplemental analysis comparing the growlers to prowler's noise equivalency and found no mention of the Washington State Department of Health sharp criticisms and suggestions of how to proceed to accomplish necessary testing, use quality evidence, and guard the human rights of those subject to abuse.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The supplemental detailed the continued collapse of the population of Marbled Murrelets, but did not consider the impact of electromagnetic warfare practice on the bird's ability to find their way home. I suspect that many migrating birds are negatively affected as well.</p> <p>The growing necessity to fill the ocean basins with low-frequency sonar in order to find the ever-quieter attack and nuclear weapons carrying submarines deafens and kill whales. Have critical areas for the survival of the resident Orcas of the Salish Sea been set aside? Has sonar practice been banned from the Haro straits?</p> <p>Spending vast sums of wealth and intelligence on the goal of full spectrum dominance makes impossible our ability to live in harmony with the other peoples of our planet, forcing other nations to embark on vast spending on their militaries, which we then use to justify more spending. That the Pentagon is yet to be properly audited, has misplaced Trillions really stinks of decay and corruption of the balance of powers designed into our political system.</p> <p>Having such an enormous military threatens our democracy, and was succinctly questioned by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Martin Luther King. It is such a tragedy that America abdicated being a light for the world, and is seen by many as the greatest threat to peace on the planet. https://www.pri.org/stories/2014-01-03/new-poll-says-these-nations-are-top-4-threats-world-peace-guess-whos-number-one</p>	
Miller B-1	<p>The No Action Alternative is the only acceptable Alternative for this EIS by the Navy. It is the only alternative acceptable to the Peninsula's environment. Should the plan under this EIS become fully operational, the Olympic Peninsula will be radically changed NOT for the better. It will damage the national park, national forest, beaches, and the waters off the coast. That does not match our mission, "to protect the wilderness and ecological integrity of Olympic National Park.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Miller H-1	<p>The drums of war are beating once again, a carrier sails towards the Persian Gulf. Diplomats are re-assigned.</p> <p>It is important that the American people and our Sailors understand that the Navy is the principle advocate for everything that America stands for, and an American Sailor in uniform on a liberty call is often the first person, and the first American that somebody overseas may meet. It is a great responsibility, but our Sailors are magnificently prepared to be war fighters at sea, but also diplomats defending our prosperity.</p> <p>George Washington said "it follows then, as certain that night succeeds the day, that without a decisive Naval force, we can do nothing definitive, and</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>with it, everything honourable and glorious.” So for all of you who are displeased with the very necessary military training on the Olympic Peninsula for personal grievances, such as the noise of a jet taking off or landing, and interrupting a very important dinner party, grow up. With respect to preparing for combat, you must have a very sober view of what combat may bring. We have got to make our training as absolutely realistic and prototypic as possible. The more realistic you can make your training, the better you are going to be making the transition into combat. This is just one reason why advanced training on the Olympic Peninsula is vital to our national security, and the future of America as we now know it. So stop your whining and your protesting about training which has been going on since about 1940. You knew when you purchased land & homes that the Navy had a Naval Air Station there, and would be flying many missions and training our military.</p> <p>Just for once in your life put God and country before self.</p>	
Miller K-1	<p>Wildlife is already having a rough time as it is with their natural enviroment. No need to complicate their lives with our problems.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Miller N-1	<p>Oh gawd that sound is excruciating. I cannot imagine how such intelligent personnel at the navy can think this is not affecting wildlife or that they are so ignorant of the beings around them. End this archaic practice. We have computers and many options now to avoid doing this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Miller P-1	<p>I was fishing at La Push last week and could not believe the almost constant roar. A few weeks earlier we noticed the many con trails over La Push. So this is about your Quinault Range Site. This is a national park where people come to get away from city with its noise and stink. I noticed the locals had become used to it as they hear it every day. I know, I grew up on the flight line both on SAC and ADC bases. Back in the day the EA-6Bs were busy out here and over in the cascades, but not as often. I live in P.A. and some nights I can hear the Growlers go over and here them all the way to the coast. I know this won't do any good but please tell the boys to stay off the after burners as much as possible. Pardon our noise is the sound of</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	freedom. Keep up the good work but try and get congress to get quieter planes next time. I suggest F-22s now theres a quiet plane.	
Miller R-1	<p>The Navy says that noise levels over the Olympic airspace range from over 80 dB to 100 dB, which alone does damage to wildlife as well as humans. These measurements are even higher on Lopez Island. The actual noise levels quoted by the Navy's draft EIS are wrong, because they have been generated by a flawed and outdated computer model. A Department of Defense Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program determined that new software was needed to provide legally defensible noise assessments of current and future aircraft operations. The final report found that NOISEMAP's linear acoustics were inadequate for modeling higher thrust engines used in the Growler.</p> <p>In 2010 a new noise model, the Advanced Acoustic Model (AAM), was developed under DOD contract to address these shortcomings. Given acknowledgement by a DOD program that NOISEMAP is not legally defensible for the Growler, why did the Navy use the flawed and dated NOISEMAP as the modeling tool for this draft EIS? This choice rendered the noise analysis scientifically inaccurate.</p> <p>The Naval Research Advisory Committee (NRAC) issued a report that highlighted the Navy's lack of empirical jet noise data measurements, lack of consistent measurement methodology and standards, and lack of jet noise database and its proper maintenance. NRAC's report was submitted to the Navy in April 2009. The Navy appears to have failed to act on the NRAC's recommendations. It should start now by taking proper Growler noise measurements as a key input into preparing a scientifically and legally defensible draft EIS.</p> <p>In addition, the noise measurements represent only an average of flying and non-flying times. They are not actual noise measurements.</p> <p>A moving aircraft causes compression and rarefaction, setting air molecules in motion and producing pressure waves. High-thrust engines, like those in the Growlers, emit low-frequency "window rattling" pressure waves that penetrate into body organs and cause medical problems. This impact is significant and different from any high decibel noise impact. Show actual scientific evidence of the impact on "Low frequency" vibrations on the human body and to that of wildlife.</p> <p>We know that wildlife is severely impacted by noise, including the spotted owl, the marbled murrelet, and Orca whales. Referring to Title 10 US Code 35 Section 1536, this makes it possible for the Secretary of Defense to request an exemption from the Endangered Species Committee citing</p>	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. The noise model used, MR_NMap uses state of the art science and is the appropriate method to evaluate aircraft noise in special use airspace such as the Olympic MOA. This model is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>The Navy considered but did not develop mitigation for aircraft overflights, such as shifting transit routes, relocating aircrew training activities, or modifying flight altitudes, because such mitigation would not be practical to implement due to implications for safety and mission requirements.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>“reasons of national security” and we are required to issue an exemption. Only the military can take a species to extinction. The EIS must spell out how many species will be destroyed, decimated or damaged and provide thorough reasoning for any by-catch, mortality of wildlife expected. Finally, the fuel consumption rate of the EA-18 Growler is 1,304 gallons per hour, or 12.5 metric tons of CO2 per hour. You could drive 38 Toyota Prius’s from Anacortes to New York City and produce less emissions than a Growler makes in an hour. 5000 Growler jet flights a year over the Olympics adds significantly to global climate change, not to mention to the air quality over the peninsula. Each Growler costs \$81.5 M, so that 1.9 hours of flying is the same cost as an average Washington State elementary school teacher’s salary of \$59,700. We must take action now for the future of this planet for the children of today.</p> <p>I respectfully request:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Do actual real-time, accurate noise testing on the ground by a qualified independent agency—UW, for example. 2) Reduce the noise immediately, by mitigation and less jets and flights. 3) Request the Navy seriously explore other places to fly and train which won’t degrade a premier landscape that is the pride of Washington State. 4) Show actual scientific evidence of the impact on "Low frequency" vibrations on the human body and to that of wildlife. 	<p>Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>The Navy used the best available science regarding noise impacts on humans and on wildlife.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Miller S-1	<p>Stop the sonar testing that interferes with marine wildlife on the West coast. Critically endangered species like the Southern Resident Orca are being hurt as further endangered by this testing. They cannot properly hunt or effectively communicate with each other! This is absolutely unacceptable and must stop. Extinction is forever- let’s give these iconic and beautiful mammals every chance possible to survive.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Miller T-1	<p>Please address the following concerns with the draft supplemental EIS/OEIS (referred to below as the draft SEIS):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The adequacy of the assessment of Tribal cultural impacts as well as environmental impacts from the Navy’s training and testing activities is especially important because these activities take place in the Pacific Ocean, which holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes and is critically important for the wellbeing of all people and lifeforms on this planet. 	<p>Please see the Navy’s response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>2) The Navy should work meaningfully with the Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities.</p> <p>3) The Navy should prohibit use of sonar within the 50-mile mitigation area. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and well-being of whales and other marine mammals.</p> <p>4) The "best available science" referenced in the draft SEIS should be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy's NWTRC.</p> <p>5) The Navy's monitoring program should be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.</p> <p>6) The Navy should expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing.</p> <p>7) The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.</p>	
Miller W-1	See attached pdf from Wayne Miller, 110 kb only.	See responses below.
Miller W-2	<p>FLAWS IN THE EIS:</p> <p>I have been an oceanographic researcher and an investigative scientist, studying marine environments and researching ocean chemistry, as far back as the 1960's.</p> <p>Historical military testing on marine environments is known to have produced much environmental damage to the oceans and to ocean life. In</p>	<p>The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>your case, the Navy EIS does not provide adequate mitigation or prevention of damage when testing occurs. Consequently, I am deeply concerned and object to the continual destructive military testing at sea, including that which could be generated from the result of your current EIS.</p> <p>Not only should the flawed EIS be rejected, but the overall condemnation and banning of these destructive exercises is absolutely necessary, substituted by other options for training, some of which are described below. We are most certain that the military could investigate and implement other more desirable, less-harmful training exercises, and still satisfy the intractable fears and insecurities of the public, military and the government. In any case, we must circumvent the habitual fixations entrenched in the evolution of these self-imposed human beliefs, which have been generated from the past.</p> <p>Furthermore, presentations from the military, Department of the Navy, in particular, reveals that public meetings, exposure, workshops and input is also flawed--designed to confuse and obfuscate in order to limit appropriate input, as evidenced in the more recent EIS presentation in Fort Bragg, CA. That process is the same one used to "divide and conquer", to confuse and discourage rational evaluation by the public. The process normally occurs in many other public meetings designed to drive an agenda from an agency of the government or private industry. The result is flawed and divisive documents, such as this EIS, which perpetuates flawed agency responses towards public review, where agencies have even discarded and rejected peer-reviewed scientific evidence.</p>	<p>to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.</p>
Miller W-3	<p>MILITARY BUILDUP AND ITS LONG-TERM DESTINY</p> <p>Over a long history, in both war and peace, human nature, with its fear and insecurities, has fostered an exponential buildup of military force in a number of countries, especially the USA, with its adversarial posture after WWII. Evolution of the military industrial complex grew concomitantly with the addictive attachment to find or even create an enemy, whether real or apparent, to justify the growth of the complex in the name of democracy. Assumed threats justified the self-serving, continuous development of more sophisticated and greater weaponry.</p> <p>A good example is the nuclear arsenal that countries have competitively expanded upon, with habitual and wasteful funding through the influence of military defense contracts and budgeting, industrial lobbies and political entrenchment. Despite the obvious, the destructive, growing power of nuclear military arsenals can still destroy the planet many times over, easily mutating surviving biological life into an inexorable process of decay, in a</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>radioactive wasteland that could never recover, unlike some optimistic assumptions. A nuclear holocaust could produce environmental destruction resulting in loss of our atmosphere from our planet and never support any life again, permanently--ending up like the planetary conditions that evolved on the planet Mars.</p> <p>Training exercises in ocean activities, from Navy vessels, in particular, are also perpetuated by the military industrial complex that auto-catalytically is self-feeding through the corporate lobbies, contractors tied to political donations, and the military and political superstructure that ensures the flow of money. Even when the Pentagon says they do not need increased funding and arsenals of destruction, the corporate/political process drives the system towards the inevitable outcome, anyway.</p> <p>Currently, the course of direction towards a more intelligent and safer solution between nations, to protect and prevent destruction of both human and ocean life is being continually eroded. Like an epidemic, international cooperation and insightful solutions within systems of government are dwindling throughout the world, thanks to the posture of our existing government and its private agenda.</p>	
Miller W-4	<p>NAVY TESTING</p> <p>Evolution of military testing at sea, with sonar and detonations, has long been documented in scientific literature, where a variety of injuries and death have been reported throughout much of ocean life, on whales, in particular. The amount of devastation from these types of testing to any life can be demonstrated in laboratory conditions, as well.</p> <p>In fact, rather than test in the open ocean, destructive post-war training exercises can be simulated on land, substituted with virtual conditions that normally would exist at sea. An example is the more advanced technical training of pilots in simulated virtual aircraft and ocean vessels. After all, we are long past old methods of WWII and war games, because we can effectively train by less destructive methods using more advanced technology. Therefore much of the training can be implemented with land-based laboratory simulations, with little need for excessive spending and complex, destructive outdoor exercises.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of military testing, exercises, war-games and actual war is rarely exposed, mostly suppressed. Flawed documents, such as this EIS, add to the list of human causes of other perils and do not take into account the overall actual effects for this type of military testing.</p> <p>As if military testing exercises aren't enough in preparation for war, and actual war itself, degradation of ocean environments and ocean life comes</p>	<p>The Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, see the discussion in Section 2.4.1.4 (Simulated Training and Testing Only) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that discusses the need for live training specifically for aircrews.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>at a much higher collective cost when you add to it the [scientific evidence] for human causes of all other perils. Some egregious examples that exacerbate the impact of military activities: pollution, created by human efforts, from thousands of toxic chemicals (many designed to be persistent chemicals, non-biodegradable over the long-term), drugs and other endocrine disruptors, plastics and plasticizers (with huge island garbage gyres within the ocean, also washing up to shorelines); refuse, trash and sewage from spills (many deliberate); oil spills and fuel dumping, gas and oil drilling, fossil fuel burning (crude, dirty fuels from land use and from ships at sea); disruption at sea from propeller-driven ships in general (interfering with navigation and feeding of marine life, with injury to small and large organisms, such as whales); excessive noise from ships, blast waves, sonar, electromagnetic, etc. that do irreparable harm; changes in physics and ocean chemistry with declining quality of both ocean and terrestrial waters (warming oceans and increasing acidity, with coral bleaching, loss of habitat and disruption of food chains); climate change/disruption resulting from atmospheric and oceanic impacts (sea level rise and rise in severity of unpredictable, inclement weather); etc.; etc.</p> <p>More so, the evidence of injury to whales and other ocean life is most profound. Sonar, electromagnetic disturbances and blast waves from munitions testing, at different frequencies and intensity, travel considerably faster in water than air. Deaths of sea creatures, such as whales and others that rely on sound transmission to communicate and navigate are clearly linked to detrimental activities of invasive human technology. The scientific evidence, both here and abroad, is compelling.</p>	
Miller W-5	<p>SOME QUOTED SCIENTIFIC STUDIES: "https://www.nrdc.org/onearth/noise-makes-dolphins-and-whales-flee-and-can-take-their-breath-away": Many species of whales and dolphins have supersensitive hearing because they use sound to navigate, a process known as echolocation. ... Some hear high-pitch frequencies up to 100 kilohertz (kHz), which is about 80 kHz higher than the upper limit of human hearing. When they encounter very loud noises it can even cause damage in their ears and lungs. ... However, noise pollution is just one among many threats for whales and dolphins. Oil and chemical spills, plastic pollution and rising sea temperatures are also big concerns. (Jul 3, 2018)." "Apr 2, 2014: Extreme noise pollution has been known to kill hundreds of whales and dolphins at a time. There's evidence that jarringly loud noises</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>could also lead to a surge in mass strandings, the deadly phenomena in which droves of marine mammals flop ashore.</p> <p>When a single whale beaches itself, the cause is thought to be Injury, illness, or old age. But when dozens, or even hundreds, of the animals come ashore at once, scientists think something more is at play. While no one can say definitively what causes mass strandings, a growing body of research seems to point to one trigger.”</p> <p>Noise: “According to a study published last month in the Journal of Experimental Biology, noise pollution such as ship traffic and seismic testing may force marine mammals to exhaust more energy on their dives than usual. This is particularly bad news because today our oceans are noisier than ever. As a proof of concept, Williams and company applied their findings to the Cuvier’s beaked whale, which may grow to 23 feet long and 5,500 pounds and is known for making dives of nearly two miles in depth—deeper than any other mammal. Perhaps most important, beaked whales have already been shown to be extra sensitive to noise pollution. In one 2011 study, scientists found that Blainsville’s beaked whales stopped echolocating during dives when navy sonar was present and then avoided the source of the sound for two to three days. What’s more, several other studies have shown a correlation between navy sonar exercises and beaked whale strandings.”</p> <p>As another example, “Noise Makes Dolphins and Whales Flee—and That Can Take Their Breath Away”, resulting in inability and injury from ‘bends’ when diving and returning safely from various depths in the ocean.”</p> <p>These are only a few examples, with more evidence accumulating from further scientific investigations. Simply search the internet to find overwhelming evidence of the degrading force of human encounters and invasive interference associated with military exercises in and on the ocean.</p> <p>Consequently, I must reiterate that the EIS alone is seriously flawed, overall, and that the only solution is to eliminate the destructive military activities that are causing so much damage to the oceans and ocean life. Earth is already in peril, as described in the examples above, and there is no need to continually add to its environmental demise.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Office of Naval Research’s Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy’s project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Milligan-1	<p>Please, stop killing the ocean. It is unfathomable to me that the only route of disposal of environmental stressors is into the Pacific Northwest Ocean, where marine mammals, and by extension, coastal US citizens will suffer the fallout.</p> <p>You can believe that this will not go down without is Pacific</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Northwesterners putting up a fight. You will be hearing from many more of us and in public protest as well.	<p>minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Milliren-1	<p>While I am grateful that the Navy has been forced to consider new marine mammal and other environmental evidence in a Draft Supplemental EIS/OIS for its latest training and testing proposal in the Northwest, I cannot agree with its acceptance of the many detrimental effects of such training and testing. Mine training, torpedo testing, electronic warfare practice, etc. are simply NEVER ACCEPTABLE in our homes or the homes of such precious sea creatures as the Navy says it is OK to harm. Growler jets annoy me or frighten me daily in my home and yard and on my daily walks, no matter what time of day. What can their noise do to wild creatures in our national park or at sea? to humans who seek the solace of wild places for restoration? These jets ARE UNACCEPTABLE--especially when we have been told that there are other facilities in areas nearby (Idaho?) where these practices can take place. Ruining a wild place for the convenience of jets and pilots is NOT Acceptable.</p> <p>Sound/being able to hear is of critical importance to many marine species who depend upon sound to communicate, find mates, find food, avoid predators and even simply navigate. Limiting marine animals' ability to hear or recognize certain frequencies affects their very survival, their ability to find food, move away from danger, etc. ANY Exploded eardrums, changed behavior is UNACCEPTABLE. 95,943 incidents of temporary hearing loss in harbor porpoises over 7 years, 1,033 incidents of permanent hearing loss -- this is simply UNACCEPTABLE. It is simply NOT SUSTAINABLE to ruin the hearing of one tenth of our harbor porpoises in 7 years. And DOING ANYTHING that could possibly endanger our Southern Resident Killer Whales is TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE. Using your sonar anywhere where any whales could possibly be found is UNACCEPTABLE. You must BAN SONAR in</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the Salish Sea when our Southern Residents are around. PERIOD. Saying there will be no marine mammal deaths "begs credulity."</p> <p>And this is just a mammal discussion. There are millions of wonderful other species in the oceans. What else are you harming??</p> <p>The Navy needs to take its jets and its sonar, its mines and its torpedoes and all such destructive testing somewhere else where there are NO WHALES...maybe the Great Garbage Patch?? (Actually I don't know whether the Great Garbage Patch also catches whales, so you'd better check.)</p> <p>I am totally opposed to your acceptance of harm for humans and other species in the name of war practice. If you must practice war, do it where no life is harmed, do it on computer more often and almost never in the wild skies and seas of this precious only planet we have. War is harmful to all species, and practicing war does not make it OK to kill or harm other species.</p>	
Minaud-1	Je suis contres les essai de sonar qui va perturber une vaste population de mammifère poisson et autre animaux de la mer qui vas finir par s'échouer ou bien mourir dans les océans de cette terre.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Minton-1	I Strongly oppose the Navy's plan to expand Growler flights and engage in a variety of warfare training in Northwest waters, and support the in every detail the letter written by Mr. Don Stillman to the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Mitchell-1	Leave nature alone !	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Mitro-1	<p>If we can simulate conditions for outer space so that astronauts are safe I wonder why we cannot simulate testing rather than use sonar and explosives in ocean that disturb or kill marine mammals.</p> <p>If testing must be done in real life, i.e. oceans is there a way to do the testing in areas where there are no marine mammals and where a migration means that whales, etc. are elsewhere during that time?</p> <p>Your process for meeting and hearing the public input was not open to hearing what the public had to say. You can do a much better job of inviting comments.</p>	<p>Regarding the use of simulation, Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, see the discussion in Section 2.4.1.4 (Simulated Training and Testing Only) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that discusses the need for live training specifically for aircrews.</p> <p>The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.</p>
Mixson-1	<p>I am writing to voice my objections to the proposed increase of Electronic Warfare training over the Olympic Peninsula. I am a resident that can hear, more than see the growlers as they pass over my home on their way to their targeted area. I am not affected nearly as much as my friends who live closer to the main flight paths. Believe me, the Navy is discussed with derision by them. The Navy is not a good neighbor.</p> <p>The electronic warfare portion of these exercises is a major, but less understood concern. I don't know much about electromagnetic radiation, but I DO know that in the wrong combination of strength of the emission and the duration can have adverse health effects on living organisms.</p> <p>I know that training is necessary, but really, do you need this much live training? It is a very expensive option. Jets consume huge amounts of fuel which discharge more carbon into the atmosphere than most aircraft, since the touch and go sequence is comparable to the energy consumed by a drag racer compared to a normal car. I request that the Navy look into other options. I trust that you have already looked into the use of drones for some portions of the training.</p> <p>I have read that The Growler's F-18 airframe is one of the most accident-prone military airframes in existence. Between 1980 and 2014, the F18 sustained 39 accidents; including at least 22 crashes of the EA-18G and F/A-</p>	<p>The alternatives carried forward meet the Navy's purpose and need to ensure that it can fulfill its obligation under U.S.C. Title 10. As explained in Section 2.5 (Alternatives Development) of the EIS/OEIS, the range of alternatives considered by the Navy must be reasonable alternatives. To be reasonable, an alternative must meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. A curtailment or reduction in the number of training and testing activities would not meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, and would therefore be unreasonable.</p> <p>Regarding aircraft mishaps, non-anticipated accidents or emergencies are not included in the NEPA analysis.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	18 E,F since 2000. A crash in the Olympic wilderness would potentially ignite a horrific forest fire that firefighters are unable to reach to extinguish. I am a proud veteran, but not a fan of this program.	
Mizrahi-1	This is in our own PNW waters 😞	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Modoni-1	The Southern Resident Orcas are in danger. Only 76 are left from a endangered species. Your testing in the area where they try to survive is wrong. Stop the sonar testing in the Salish Sea.	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Mojena-1	I stand vehemently against any advancements or industry that would put these creatures or the ocean in peril. Once we ruin it, magic and beauty will cease to exist.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Molinari-1	<p>Please know that our Southern Resident Orcas are not only intelligent but unique. They are unlike any other orcas in the world and they are a vital part of our Salish Sea ecosystem. Your sonar tests have been shown to be detrimental to our whales. they hunt with sonar and your tests are a problem in that regard and they cause great pain to the whales as well. Please do your testing in an area where it WILL NOT HARM our whales.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Monge-1	<p>Please stop the Sonar Testing it causes harm and distress to all marine animals. sonar can interfere over hundreds of miles with some marine mammals like whales, dolphins, and walruses that rely on underwater sound for navigating, catching prey, and communicating. sonar can harm the animals by interrupting mating, stopping communication, causing them to separate from calves, and inflicting stress.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Montague-1	<p>The majority of these training exercises do not have to be conducted along our shoreline and could instead be conducted far from shore minimizing the impact on birds, fish, marine mammals, other wildlife and communities. Also, it would be far safer for a lot of people if the training was away from</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	populated areas. There is no evaluation for other locations which could significantly reduce the harmful impacts of these exercises. Training around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas could and should be avoided.	where the ships and aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Mooney-1	I read the Anacortes American article asking for comments on training test plan and wanted to register our comment. We attended a film “Plane Truths” shown at our local senior center. As you are aware of the group “Sound Defense” they are organizing against your testing plan and the Growler. We sat through the film and we disagreed with a lot of the statements made in the film. We live with the planes, fly directly over our property, as we are on the bad weather flight plan. Of course, in the audience, we had pilots, that tried to explain why the area was chosen for testing, how the pilots must test their skills in flying the Growlers. As you know the “Sound Defense” group are only interested in protest and aren’t interested in listening, in fact a local doctor got up and spoke about noise, relating different comparing items in our everyday life. The “Sound Defense” people in the audience cleared the room. Pat & I are in favor of your testing we like “The Sound of Freedom.” We must be prepared for what may come our way in America. Don’t leave our area, tired of “not in my backyard.” I am speaking out against “Sound Defense.”	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Moore D-1	This EIS is quite alarming. The only EIS alternative that is acceptable is the No Action Alternative. The other options given are unacceptable to the environment on the Olympic Peninsula. Alternatives 1 and 2 would cause unnecessary harm to Olympic National Park and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. The length of the EIS, the great area it affects, and the many people it affects requires a 90-day comment period so the EIS can be examined thoroughly. There should be another 30-day extension of the comment period. The noise from multiple jet flights over the western and northern parts of the Peninsula will affect the health and economy of the Peninsula and the state of Washington. The search pattern of jet Growler flights looking for emitters would roar above the ocean beaches; the Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges; Washington State Department of Natural Resources land; Quinault, Quileute and Hoh Reservations; and thousands of acres of private land, including the towns of Forks and Amanda Park.	The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period. The Navy’s proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA’s designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA’s designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The Navy admits to 85–100 decibels of noise per pass. That is enough to cause hearing loss and contribute to other health problems. People in Forks have recorded 94 decibel flights under the current operations. While noise is known to affect people and no studies have been done on the iconic Olympic elk, it is not difficult to reason they would be similarly affected. The military training in the Marine Sanctuary would damage the ocean beaches, the marine animals of the coast, including the nesting areas of many shorebirds, migrating whales, and the birds that use the Pacific Flyway. The Navy has denied flying over Olympic National Park. This is untrue. Not only is this untrue, it is impossible not to fly these missions over the Park.</p> <p>I, and many others, are opposed to this degradation of the Olympic Peninsula. For 112 years, Congress and presidents have set aside areas of the Peninsula to protect its valuable environment. Irreparable damage would be caused if the activities are done as stated in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Northwest Training and Testing.</p> <p>The training has been done elsewhere. It can be done elsewhere. Wild places are not empty places just waiting for an invasion by the military. Our national security must also include environmental security.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Moore M-1	<p>I am very concerned about the continued testing the U.S. Navy conducts along the Pacific Coast. The effects the testing, particularly sonar testing, has on these creatures has not been adequately addressed. Many very notable marine biologists not connected with the Navy have cited these effects over the course of many years and yet the testing continues. My grandfather and three of my uncles served in the Navy. It saddens me to know that the Navy does not consider humane treatment of marine mammals important enough to take meaningful steps. It makes those of us outside of the military lose a lot of respect for your branch.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Moreno AI-1	<p>The intent of this testing will be used for evil causes, and it does not help the U.S. with any issues going on in our country. It's pure selfish intent. Instead of investing money on Sonar to kill an enemy, we should be using that money to stop global warming, and save our already dying marine life.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Moreno An-1	Stop using sonar systems in our oceans! You know you are putting the health of our oceans and planet at risk! Do you not care about the people and animals of the world?	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Morgan F-1	I am 100% in favor of the Navy. However, I want you out of my Forest! This is a place I came to for peace and quiet and clean air and water. Navy games do not belong here.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Morgan N-1	<p>I am the son of a Navy Seabee, went to college in Lacey, WA on a Seabee scholarship as a Civil Engineer. I love our US Navy, and am proud of the work that is done. It is a vital part of the Puget Sound economy but I must ask that the growth in the flight operations over the Olympics be carefully looked at and an alternative explored. The impacts that these flights perform are much greater than what the US Navy knows.</p> <p>I was born and raised on the corner of Olympic National Park and am very familiar with how much flight traffic has grown in the last 20 years. I worked in the Bogachiel Rain Forest in National Forest and in the National Park for 2 years from 2014. It is the drainage directly north of the Hoh River and right over the training areas. Your Growlers are correctly named, because of the deafening noise they bring to an area that is truly a wilderness. I would hear nothing for an hour and then a deafening boom on ridges and</p>	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>valleys. This went on for the 2 years I spent doing trail work there. If you must do flight operations, why must they all be over this pristine area of the Olympics? Could they not be spread out or over desert areas? Over the ocean? It is crazy to conduct war games over an area that is so biologically dense, just for the sake of flight training.</p> <p>Please consider an alternative or at the very least do not increase more growler flights. As the person who reads this comment that is buried behind a desk of government paperwork, please take a hike into the Bogachiel and Hoh Rain Forest and see the impact.</p>	
Morris K-1	<p>Would you knowingly allow your grand children to be exposed to sounds that result in permanent hearing damage?</p> <p>Would you knowingly allow your grand children to be exposed to sound waves that result in learning disorders?</p> <p>Where do you draw the line when it comes to public health and the health of your family and your children's future?</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Morris N-1	<p>Endangered Orcas and many other whales forage and travel in the training range. It is impossible to detect their presence in time to stop any exercises underway. Based on studies by NOAA, the area within the naval training and testing range is an important forage area for the whales. It is recommended that the Navy move the training range westward beyond the continental shelf or time the train when there are the fewest Orcas, May-Oct. Gray whales migrate northward primarily between March and June along the US west coast and the coastal waters off Southeast Alaska, British Columbia, Washington, and Oregon. Researchers have recommended delaying or postponing training to late October and choose areas outside the migratory routes for these marine mammals. Sonar is known to cause death and serious physical pain to marine mammals such as dolphins and whales. Mid frequency sonar is linked to the strandings of various species of cetaceans and baleen whales. Serious physical damage and whale mortalities have been reported in the past by strandings of beaked whales off the Bahamas ; further investigation revealed the connection to the Navy's use of sonar. Sonar disrupts foraging and feeding behavior of Orcas and other cetaceans and the prey fish. "Fish show permanent and temporary hearing loss, reduced catch rates, stress, and behavioral reactions to noise" [Weilgart, L.S. 2007, THE IMPACTS OF ANTHROPOGENIC OCEAN NOISE ON CETACEANS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT, CAN. J. ZOO. 85(11):1091-1116 2007, doi:10.1139/Z0f-101]. In Washington State the endangered Southern resident Orcas (Jpod) were reported to</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>have serious behavioral changes due to the US Navy's USS 'Shoupe' using its mid-frequency sonar in the San Juan Island region (Noren, D.P. et al. 2009, "CLOSE APPROACHES BY VESSELS ELICIT SURFACE ACTIVE DISPLAYS BY SOUTHERN RESIDENT KILLER WHALES," Endangered Species Research; Vol.8: 179-192, http://www.int-res.com/articles/esr2009.</p> <p>Long gone are the days when the Navy thought it okay to use whales as targets in naval exercises. Today the Navy must strive as much as possible, to protect our marine life. Dolphins, whales, sea turtles, and many other species in the ocean environment are valuable to the entire ecosystem of the ocean now and for our future generations. It is as important for our military forces to advocate for the safety of marine life (such as dolphins, whales, sea turtles and many other species), as it is for them to believe they must patrol the oceans for the safety of the United States and engage in war games.</p> <p>The Navy awards one of its medals of merit, the 'Dolphin pin,' to submarine officers. In this spirit, to choose to honor Naval submarine officers with this distinction, should also behoove the Navy to respect all species of marine mammals as well as the dolphins, and help protect their habitat in the oceans along with the myriad marine life species with which we share the oceans of the Earth.</p>	
Morten-1	Do something to SAVE us!!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Mosher-1	<p>Moving to the PNW 3 years ago presented me with the appreciation of marine life.</p> <p>Out beautiful majestic marine animals deserve to recognized as something to be protected. For years we learned about these amazing animals in Michigan. I had no idea how much in harms way they have been until I moved here. They represent the state of Washington. Please protect them from this devastating testing. I want my Grand children to see them thriving in our waters.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Muchowski-1	It is unacceptable to continue the use of active sound navigation and ranging, known as sonar, and explosives while employing marine species mitigation measures. The disruption of marine life and disturbance of marine mammals is unacceptable.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Muchowski-2	<p>Unfortunately for many whales, dolphins and other marine life, the use of underwater sonar (short for sound navigation and ranging) can lead to injury and even death. Sonar systems—first developed by the U.S. Navy to detect enemy submarines—generate slow-rolling sound waves topping out at around 235 decibels; the world's loudest rock bands top out at only 130. These sound waves can travel for hundreds of miles under water, and can retain an intensity of 140 decibels as far as 300 miles from their source. These rolling walls of noise are no doubt too much for some marine wildlife. While little is known about any direct physiological effects of sonar waves on marine species, evidence shows that whales will swim hundreds of miles, rapidly change their depth (sometime leading to bleeding from the eyes and ears), and even beach themselves to get away from the sounds of sonar.</p> <p>In January 2005, 34 whales of three different species became stranded and died along North Carolina's Outer Banks during nearby offshore Navy sonar training. Other sad examples around the coast of the U.S. and elsewhere abound, notably in recent years with more sonar testing going on than ever before. According to the nonprofit Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), which has campaigned vigorously to ban use of the technology in waters rich in marine wildlife, recent cases of whale strandings likely represent a small fraction of sonar's toll, given that severely injured animals rarely make it to shore.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, and the "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June 2017)" (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Mueller-1	<p>The Sinkyone Council and its member Tribes continue to oppose the Navy's training and testing activities, and are demanding stronger protections for the ocean and the Tribes' cultural ways of life.</p> <p>The points listed below highlight the defects of the current draft SEIS.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The Navy should work meaningfully with the Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities. 2.The Navy should prohibit use of sonar within the 50-mile mitigation area. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals. 3.The "best available science" referenced in the draft SEIS should be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy's NWTRC. 4.The Navy's monitoring program should be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species. 5.The Navy should expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing. 6.The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing. 	Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.
Mullee-1	<p>Please do not do blasting of any kind anywhere in the ocean.</p> <p>Our sea life has so much to deal with already.</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	They are going deaf, they can't use their eco location, so they die. Please keep our oceans safe for all sea life.	Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Muller-1	Ces pratiques sont inadmissibles. Respectez la vie sous-marine. Translated: These practices are inadmissible. Respect the underwater life.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Mulvey-1	End this now.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Mundwiler-1	This practice is dangerous and totally unnecessary. The job of the military is protect not to destroy not just the civilian population and our interests abroad but also our priceless national treasures, public lands, coastlines not to mention the tourism industry. Even someone completely lacking a conscience and indifferent to the suffering of a critically endangered wildlife population should at the very least be able to acknowledge the economic value of Marine life in terms of the tourism dollars they generate. If you don't have a heart at least have a brain and keep your hands off the Salish sea. If Sea World can build tanks big enough for whales, the navy can build tanks big enough for testing their equipment. It would generate some nice revenue for your defense contractor buddies in the private sector.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Munevar-1	Espero que los gobiernos, los políticos, dejen de pensar en sus bolsillos y actúen para no seguir permitiendo que miembros de familias sean arrebatados, que seres tan inteligentes y hermosos como son las orcas y delfines dejen de estar viviendo confinadas a una caja minúscula, toda una vida de dolor, angustia y sufrimiento para satisfacer la ignorancia de personas. Queremos los tanques libres de delfines, de orcas. Libres y salvajes los queremos.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Munoz-1	Stop test! Your harming our sea life	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Murdock-1	Please do not emit your sound into the ocean it will deafen our orcas, all life is sacred and should be treated as such. Would you want to be deafened? Please and thank you	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Murphy-1	<p>The community of central and north Whidbey Island has little to no confidence that the Navy cares one bit about their opinions or the local communities. The Navy turns a deaf ear to the impassioned pleas to stop torturing us with the incessant, debilitating noise that makes life a living hell. Property values have plummeted. People who have grown up in the same house are now faced with the reality of trying, without success, to sell their family homes because the dramatically increased noise is so appalling and infuriating. The Navy should move their practice flights to the desert away from any populated community. ...this is just common sense! LISTEN to what the community is saying!</p> <p>Also, please stop with the underwater sonar testing that is harming our precious marine mammals and also stay away from our Olympic national park. This world needs what's left of serene, unmolested nature and our tourism industry is important to our economy. The Navy has no right to destroy this too.</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p> <p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Murray-1	<p>The Navy's job is to protect the national security of the United States. That means keeping us safe here at home. Safeguarding our national security means protecting the environment where Americans live and work, and ensuring that not only humans, but the living nature that surround us, are able to thrive peacefully in a healthy environment, free from dangers caused by loud noise, electromagnetic pollution, sewage pollution, etc. The Navy is our neighbor. All we ask is that the Navy be a good, responsible neighbor and steward of the environment that we all share.</p> <p>With regard to the supplemental analysis comparing the Growlers to Prowlers noise equivalency, I saw no acknowledgement or mention of the Washington State Department of Health's well founded critiques and recommendations regarding how to protect the human rights of those subject to adverse impacts.</p> <p>The supplemental discussed the ongoing population collapse of the Puget Sound's Marbled Murrelets, but did not factor in the impact of electromagnetic warfare practice on the bird's ability to navigate/find their way home. I suspect that many migrating birds are negatively affected as well.</p> <p>The Navy is now inflicting fatal (internal organ-damaging) sound pollution throughout our ocean basins with high-frequency sonar which impairs marine mammal navigation -- rupturing their eardrums and starving large, intelligent and sentient creatures such as whales, dolphins, seals & sea lions. Have critical areas for the survival of the endangered Southern Resident Orca Whales of the Salish Sea been set aside? Has the deafening sonar been banned from the Puget Sound and Haro Straits?</p> <p>The Navy's massive "takes" of marine mammals and their levels of testing and training for war are helping to make our oceans barren. Laying waste to our ocean and its living creatures is an environmental crime and is certainly not keeping Americans free or safe!</p> <p>The best estimate for the number of gray whales in the eastern areas of the North Pacific is around 21,000.</p> <p>However the numbers of 'takes' allowed to the Navy in the areas of the Pacific where gray whales might be found is 62,550. Multiple, aggravated harassment incidents to the same animals throughout their range of movement is apparently standard operating procedure for the Navy.</p> <p>The Navy's massive "takes" of marine mammals and their levels of testing and training for war are helping to make our oceans barren. Destroying the planet is not keeping Americans safe!</p> <p>Please remember that people everywhere use and depend on the oceans,</p>	<p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	for a living, and that healthy oceans are invaluable to human life. The US Navy must take responsibility for the fact that its deadly, toxic sound pollution and other dangerous, noisy electromagnetic training activities will have serious, long term consequences for the health and safety of American civilians through the misuse of our oceans and their precious sea life — this essential resource is NOT a blue desert, but a living, vibrant part of nature. It is NOT something that can be endlessly exploited. Please respect and protect our oceans. The Navy has the responsibility to do its job while guarding ocean life (which is part of ensuring our National Security) and the well being and quality of life for US citizens here in the State of Washington.	
Musgrove-1	I live on the Coast of Mendocino County. I am a biologist. Climate Change is fluid and getting worse all the time. It is affecting all ocean species. Will the SEIS take into account that the high gray whale mortality as well as other species?	The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.
Musser D-1	I realize that there are budget restrictions and timelines to be met, but when the efforts to solve a problem become immoral there is no excuse. Dumping waste in the oceans is terrible for the environment, regardless of what how the law is interpreted. Shame on those that are responsible. It sickens me that such attitudes are held by those I would hope to respect.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Musser R-1	To whom it may concern: The plight of the Southern Resident orca is well known, therefore I do not feel I need to go into details of their struggle. I will simply point out that they hunt by sonar and any testing in the waters where they reside would be detrimental to their health. Testing could disrupt them for a short time, or even worse, cause long-term damage, hindering their abilities to capture much needed prey to survive. They are starving to death. Please take your testing away from their home, Our home! Thank you for your consideration.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Myers D-1	Please stop underwater sonar testing. These frequencies have negative effects of marine animals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Myers St-1	<p>This is a very slick and well-produced presentation—but hardly even-handed. I strongly support a “No Action Alternative” as mentioned in page 3 of your brochure.</p> <p>We need to drastically reduce our military spending and re-direct those resources to peaceful and productive programs. There is no way to keep us “safe” when we meddle in so many countries.</p> <p>I spend a lot of time here at the Performing Arts Center in support of drastically underfunded programs and events. It makes me sad to see it used by taxpayer funded “overkill” presentations. It gives the impression of “how much can we spend” on this, rather than how much it should cost. I resent this mis-allocation of resources.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Myers Su-1	The Olympic Peninsula is a refuge for all creatures and humans. No jets over the Olympic peninsula Park!!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
N		
Nadeau-1	<p>I am writing to express my concern regarding the testing of sonar type equipment and weaponry given previous negative impacts on the delicate mammalian sea life. The Navy already has data that proves whales, dolphins, porpoises and any other creatures that utilize echo location are irreparably harmed (or even killed) by such testing. While I appreciate the need for national security, there must be another body of water that are not home to these valuable creatures besides our oceans that could be utilized to test these machines.</p> <p>Thank you for considering the negative impact that this could cause on our environment prior to conducting the tests.</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Nagata-1	There has been more and more evidence that underwater sonic blasts have harmed and killed marine mammals. Similar blasts used in underwater oil	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	exploration is now being seen to destroyed zooplankton in large areas on which much of marine life depends on. The Navy has not done enough research on the environmental damage done during these tests. Our oceans are suffering enough from rising temperatures and acidity, plastic pollution, agricultural and mining runoff...sonar tests are just another nail in our coffin. Please stop. I'm a US taxpayer who is pissed at how my tax dollars are used!	and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Nagy-1	These harmful military practices are unacceptable.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Nawn-1	<p>Navy impacts on Southern Resident orcas were in fact recognized as an issue by the Orca Task Force in Washington state.</p> <p>In fact, concerns about the Navy's use of sonar equipment impacting the Southern Residents was raised in the very first Orca Task Force meeting</p> <p>In addition, potential impacts from Naval activities are recognized as a threat to Southern Resident orca survival and recovery in both the U.S. and Canada Southern Resident orca recovery plans.</p> <p>2. Given the small size of the endangered Southern Resident orca population today, and the fact that they travel in groups, harm to a single individual orca can easily mean a population-level effect.</p> <p>Advancing this EIS now for activities in an area that is on the cusp of being designated as critical habitat is irresponsible.</p> <p>The EIS should include two additional studies related to impacts on Southern Resident orcas: Wieland et al. 2010 and Emmons et al. 2019.</p> <p>The Navy should explore the use of newly available apps and technology that provide real-time information on whale presence in the Salish Sea and along the coast. Using this technology could expand the ability of the Navy's marine mammal observers to be aware of and respond to the presence of Southern Resident orcas.</p> <p>9. Additional information is needed on the anticipated timing of the proposed activities.</p> <p>The EIS should detail the times of year during which the proposed activities will take place. Any overlap in their seasonal movements and the Navy's testing and training activities will increase impacts on these species.</p>	<p>Wieland et al., 2010 was incorporated in Section 3.4.1.7.4 of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS as recommended by the commenter.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the information from Emmons et al. 2019, as this research was funded by the Navy. The research results were published too late to be considered in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and have been included in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>As stated in Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities), because of the nature of training and testing requirements for forces that must be ready to deploy at all times, activities could occur throughout the year. The Navy added additional details on seasonality and day/night requirements of its activities to Appendix A (Navy Activities Descriptions) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy did consider seasonal movements and behaviors of marine species in its effect analysis. The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species either seasonally or year-round in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitats, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).</p> <p>The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on Southern Resident killer whales and other marine species in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitat areas, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures specific to Southern Resident killer whales. For example, in the NWTT Offshore Area, the Navy developed a new mitigation area, the Juan de Fuca</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Information about timing should be made public in the EIS and the Navy should seek to adjust the timing of their activities to minimize such overlap. The Navy must consider the current crisis facing the endangered Southern Resident orcas and make new adjustments in its testing and training activities. Despite being listed under the Endangered Species Act for nearly 14 years, this unique population is not recovering and is continuing to decline. It is obvious that status quo actions, including the Navy's training and testing activities, are not serving the Southern Resident orcas. Given their highly endangered status and continuing decline, the Navy should be considering how to reduce impacts and increase protections for Southern Resident orcas.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of our input and concerns as you finalize the EIS.</p>	<p>Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, which encompasses waters off Cape Flattery. The Navy's mitigation now includes annual limits on hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and prohibits explosive Mine Countermeasures and Neutralization Testing in the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. All other explosive activities are required to be conducted 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. In addition, the Navy developed a new mitigation to issue annual awareness notification messages to alert ships and aircraft to the possible presence of increased concentrations of Southern Resident killer whales seasonally, which will further help avoid potential impacts from vessel movements and training and testing activities on this species.</p> <p>The Navy developed new mitigation for Navy biologists to initiate communication with the appropriate marine mammal detection networks in NWTT Inland Waters prior to conducting explosive mine neutralization activities involving the use of Navy divers, Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training, Civilian Port Defense – Homeland Security Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Exercises, and Small Boat Attack Exercises. This mitigation will help the Navy plan activities in a way that minimizes the potential for exposure of Southern Resident killer whales, as described in Section K.3.3 (Mitigation Areas for Marine Species in NWTT Inland Waters). The Navy will also continue to assess the practicality of other available monitoring techniques as technologies advance.</p>
Neddermann-1	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS). I am very concerned about impacts on the Southern Resident orcas, which are at serious risk of extinction.</p> <p>Navy impacts on Southern Resident orcas were in fact recognized as an issue by the Orca Task Force in Washington state.</p> <p>The EIS inaccurately claims that "Navy actions were not the sources for any of the identified threats" in the report by the Southern Resident Orca Task Force (Office of the Washington Governor, 2018) (page 3.4-46).</p> <p>In fact, concerns about the Navy's use of sonar equipment impacting the Southern Residents was raised in the very first Orca Task Force meeting (5/1/2018 meeting minutes). Recommendation 25 in the final report was "Coordinate with the Navy in 2019 to discuss reduction of noise and disturbance affecting Southern Resident orcas from military exercises and Navy aircraft." It further continued: "The governor should meet with the U.S. Navy's Commanding Officer for the region that includes Washington</p>	<p>The Task Force Final Report did not identify Navy sonar among the major threats. The major threats identified in the report are a lack of prey, disturbance from noise and vessel traffic, and toxic contaminants in the waters they inhabit. The Navy, as acknowledged by the Governor's Task Force in 2018, was not previously requested to participate in the Task Force, and the Navy was not made aware of conversations held during meetings in 2018. The Navy has since been invited to take part and, as a result, a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Task Force's working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>state to address the acoustic and physical impacts to Southern Resident orcas from Naval exercises in waters and air of Washington state. The governor should request the Navy participate on the Vessels working group in Year Two and identify actions to reduce the Navy's impacts to Southern Resident orcas" (emphases added) (Office of the Washington Governor, 2018).</p> <p>In addition, potential impacts from Naval activities are recognized as a threat to Southern Resident orca survival and recovery in both the U.S. and Canada Southern Resident orca recovery plans.</p> <p>Why not let our region be known for it's healthy wildlife, amazing views instead of destructive and annoying noise and planes?</p> <p>Why not let history show that we the people, including the Navy, did everything in our power to save the orca whales and be a friend to other species. With the way the world is heading that will be far more important than playing war games. There won't be a planet to war over if we destroy our habitat, and we will not have much of a legacy to leave if we are responsible for killing off amazing creatures. Let us, together, do everything in our power now! Please, I implore you, do not expand the growler program.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of our input and concerns as you finalize the EIS.</p> <p>Sincerely, Audrey Neddermann</p>	
Nelson-1	<p>Please don't destroy what precious little wildlife we have in Puget Sound. Because of so many environmental factors, our region is going to suffer. Marine wildlife is dieing from climate change and human impact. Please consider that you're testing is going to be so invasive and, so destructive, that there will be little marine legacy left for our children.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marin-species-monitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Ness-1	Knowingly performing sonar testing that debilitates the hearing of those animals that rely on it for sustaining life is deplorable. The concept of know better, do better is applicable here. Educated individuals such as yourselves know better. So, in turn, do better. Leave this planet in better shape than when you arrived for our children.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Neuman-1	Please discontinue the sonic and other testing in the Olympic Peninsula and park. It is wrong to so disturb such a rare and pristine place. Much of the world's wild places are under extreme assault as well. This unique and beautiful area, North America's temperate rainforest, needs to be preserved. I would love to move to this area but would never do so while the Navy has access to conduct these destructive tests. Our country needs to be protected, but there must be another place where these tests can take place. Thank you for your time and consideration.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the ships and aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Newkirk B-1	I feel the Navy should of held a meeting in Oak Harbor – San Juan Islands as this noisy & pollution affects all of these areas greatly. All I have read on sonar is very dangerous for sea life (killer whale – salmon etc.). It's very hard to believe that we need to use actual explosives. Why not use simulators? Please leave us alone. Don't expand training on the coast.	The Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, see the discussion in Section 2.4.1.4 (Simulated Training and Testing Only) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that discusses the need for live training specifically for aircrews.
Newkirk G-1	The training is not needed here and should go to where you were already doing it in Idaho, California. You are endangering Washington State's air, water, animal habitat. We do not need your death and destruction in our state. The U.S. Navy is a danger to the planet earth.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the ships and aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Nguyen D-1	The preferred Alternative 1 proposal for training and testing in our oceans is unacceptable. The report minimizes the long-term negative impact on marine mammals stating that there may be permanent hearing loss etc. when hearing loss would practically equate to death for such sea life. I specifically oppose the sonar, electromagnetic, lasers, and explosives that leave by-products in our ocean. Even if kept at the water's surface, this type of testing would incapacitate animals living in the wild as it disrupts their physical abilities, environment, and food chain. This is unacceptable and the Navy certainly has enough funds to complete training in a way that	The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	does not further destroy OUR PLANET. The oceans are a vital life source FOR ALL OF US. This is not about cute animals being harmed, this is about further negatively impacting the life source for all living things on this planet, including us. We have the technology to use alternative testing facilities and Congress continues to feed our military with billions of dollars. This action to expand testing is not necessary for proper training of our military.	
Nguyen T-1	I think there should be some consideration to not conduct this testing in the Puget Sound where it's known the whales and wildlife in the area are incredibly affected by the sonar and the underwater noise pollution. There must be other options that are more remote and not as damaging to the local wildlife.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Nicholas-1	<p>Our son served in the Navy during the Iraq war and we are well aware of the need to the Navy to be trained and prepared, but I feel there are other places or methods of carrying out the mission of preparedness that won't destroy the peace and beauty that we have here in NW Washington.</p> <p>The Olympic Peninsula relies largely on tourism to support the businesses and the jobs in an otherwise depressed area. The biggest draw of this area is the beautiful, wild lands of the Washington State forests and the Olympic National Park. They are renowned for the peace and quiet that they offer and bring in over 3.5 million visitors a year to the Park and to the towns around the National Park who want to experience the serenity and grandeur it offers. ("Visitation to 922,651-acre Olympic National Park has risen steadily since 2012, according to NPS statistics. There were 2,824,908 recreation visits to Olympic in 2012. Visitation rose to 3,085,340 in 2013, 3,243,872 in 2014, 3,263,761 in 2015, 3,390,221 in 2016 and 3,401,996 in 2017. May 11, 2018" Peninsula Daily News) Allowing training and other flights over these pristine areas would be damaging not only to the wildlife and to the human inhabitants, but to the tourism industry. Imagine you are a foreign visitor standing on Hurricane Ridge, enjoying the serenity and the panoramic views that you came hundreds, if not thousands of miles to enjoy only to have your senses assaulted by military aircraft on maneuvers. Do you think they would enjoy that intrusion? Would you?</p> <p>Another concern of mine is that we already have a lot of air traffic in and</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>around the Sequim/Port Angeles area. Daily we have large Coast Guard and Rescue helicopters flying over our house. We live south of the Sequim airport and experience noise and low flyovers from small aircraft at all hours. We live in an area where almost every community has a small airport and personal aircraft that use them daily. In addition, we are sometimes in the flight path of commercial airliners. This is all on top of the loud military jets that already periodically rumble over the area. If you add even more air traffic it will make this area much less desirable, less safe, and would likely have a negative effect on property values as well as the mental and physical health of the large senior population. Fifty-five percent of the people in Sequim are 55 or older. Many are veterans and aircraft noise is already a factor against the quality of life here for many.</p> <p>I hope that the U.S. Navy will listen to the public's call to preserve the peace and tranquility in and around our National Park and forest lands, rather than wage a war on the senses. Just because the population density is low here doesn't mean our quality of life isn't important. Most of us have moved here from other parts of the state or country to escape the congestion and noise of the cities and to be immersed in nature and enjoy all that the Olympic Peninsula offers in the way of relaxation and recreation. The tourists come here for the same thing. Additional flights over our area will have detrimental effects on the tourist experience and on the residents' quality of life.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	<p>Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Nicholson-1	<p>This is not a time to be adding threats to marine mammals. The effects of sonar on these beings is horrific. I'm stunned that anyone would think to prioritize sonar activities (for any reason) over the health and well being of live beings in their home. This is egregious. Your comment form instructs to leave a substantive comment. Substantive... as loud as your sonar that kills marine mammals? Sonar you want to unleash in the home waters of the Southern Resident Killer Whales? Quite frankly, I'm tired of the onus being on us, to reign in the irresponsible and bad behavior of groups like yours. Navy sonar has been well documented in recklessly killing and causing suffering. If you're still asking for substantive comments, then have you heard the previous substantive comments and studies others have done on your behalf?</p> <p>Defense? You're killing everything worth defending. Put an end to that please, rethink.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Nicholson-2	<p>I/We have just learned of an EIS put out by the U.S. Navy on March 29, which is very disturbing to me/us. The only EIS alternative that is acceptable is the No Action Alternative. The other options given are unacceptable to the environment and life on the Olympic Peninsula. Alternatives 1 and 2 would cause unforgiveable and unnecessary damage to Olympic National Park and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. Alternative 2 is the most extreme.</p> <p>The length of the EIS, the great area it affects, and the many people it affects requires a 90- day comment period. This, so the EIS can be examined properly and thoroughly. Please ask the Navy for another 30-day extension of the comment period.</p> <p>The noise from multiple jet flights over the western and northern parts of the Peninsula will chase residents and visitors away. This will affect the health and economy of the Peninsula and the state. The search pattern of jet Growler flights looking for emitters would roar above the ocean beaches; the Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges; Washington State Department of Natural Resources land; Quinault, Quileute and Hoh Reservations; and thousands of acres of private land, including the towns of Forks and Amanda Park. The Navy admits to 85–100 decibels of noise per pass. That is enough to cause hearing loss and contribute to other health problems. While noise is known to affect people and no studies have been done on the iconic Olympic elk, it is not difficult to reason they would be similarly affected.</p> <p>The military training in the Marine Sanctuary would do damage to the ocean beaches, the marine animals of the coast, the nesting areas of many of Washington's shorebirds, migrating whales, and the birds that use the Pacific Flyway. The Navy has denied flying over Olympic National Park. This is untrue. Not only is this untrue, it is impossible not to fly these missions over the Park.</p> <p>This degradation of the Olympic Peninsula's environment is unacceptable. For 112 years, Congress and presidents have set aside areas of the Peninsula to protect its valuable environment. Irreparable damage would be caused if the activities are done as stated in the Navy EIS/OEIS March 2019 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Northwest Training and Testing. Please stop this plan by the Navy. The training has been done elsewhere. It can be done elsewhere. Wild places are not empty places just waiting for an invasion by the military. Our national security must also include environmental security.</p>	<p>The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Nickelson-1	<p>We just learned of an EIS put out by the US Navy on March 29 and appreciate your reviewing our comments on it.</p> <p>First, an EIS as long and complicated as this one, the large affected area, and the many people it affects requires a full 90-day comment period, so that people can thoroughly examine all the consequences of this proposed action. Please request another 14-day extensive of the comment period, currently only through June 12.</p> <p>We are lifelong residents of Washington State, and routinely use the Olympic Peninsula, including Olympic National Park and Olympic National Forest, for camping, hiking, boating, bird and other wildlife watching, and photography. This proposed action will not only extremely adversely affect our recreation, but more importantly, will negatively affect the people who live there, including several Native American tribes, as well as adverse effects on both terrestrial and marine wildlife.</p> <p>The extremely loud noise from multiple jet flights over the western and northern parts of the Olympic Peninsula will destroy the wilderness that residents, tourists, and wildlife need, and that the Park and National Marine Sanctuary were created to protect. The Navy has admitted that the noise can be 85-100 decibels per pass of each jet, and search patterns may be flown for 16 hours a day up to 260 days per year (5,000 Growler jet flights per year). This level of noise can cause hearing damage, as well as disrupt normal bird, wildlife, and marine mammal behavior, especially during breeding season. The EIS does not adequately research the adverse effects this level and duration of noise will cause to all the wildlife living on the Peninsula, but especially those that are listed as threatened or endangered.</p> <p>Flights will be conducted over the National Marine sanctuary, and marine mammals are well documented to be very sound sensitive. This will clearly adversely affect the very marine mammals the sanctuary was designed to protect.</p> <p>Finally this proposal will adversely affect the economy of the Peninsula, which is heavily dependent on tourism dollars. People routinely spend \$297 million per year in communities near the park, which supports over 3,500 jobs. Tourists will simply not come to a place where they are being buzzed and deafened by jets.</p> <p>We strongly support the NO Action Alternative. The other options will cause irreparable harm to the people and environment of the Peninsula. The Navy has trained for decades in other areas (Idaho, Nevada) that are not as environmentally sensitive. Our national security does not require the</p>	<p>The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	destruction of unique and irreplaceable habitats (including the only temperate rainforest in the United States). Thank you for seriously considering our comments in this matter of great importance.	
Nickum-01	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. Please see attached for the full comment letter from 10 organizations: Seattle Aquarium, Washington Environmental Council, Whale Scout, Wild Orca, Orca Network, Endangered Species Coalition, Defenders of Wildlife, Natural Resources Defense Council, Whale and Dolphin Conservation, and Friends of the San Juans. The attached letter details our specific concerns about impacts on the Southern Resident orcas, which are at serious risk of extinction, and provides inputs, clarifications and additional scientific literature that should be considered in the analysis.	See responses below.
Nickum-02	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS). The 10 organizations listed below would like to submit the following inputs, clarifications and additional scientific literature that should be considered in the analysis. We are specifically concerned about impacts on the Southern Resident orcas, which are at serious risk of extinction. The DSEIS indicates that the Navy plans to increase the frequency of several activities, including warfare testing and at-sea and pierside sonar testing, within Southern Resident orca habitat. We strongly believe this iconic species is currently, and will continue to be, directly affected by such training and testing activities. 1. Navy impacts on Southern Resident orcas were in fact recognized as an issue by the Orca Task Force in Washington state. The DSEIS inaccurately claims that “Navy actions were not the sources for any of the identified threats” in the report by the Southern Resident Orca Task Force (Office of the Washington Governor, 2018) (page 3.4-46). In fact, concerns about the Navy’s use of sonar equipment impacting the Southern Residents was raised in the very first Orca Task Force meeting (5/1/2018 meeting minutes). Recommendation 25 in the final report was “Coordinate with the Navy in 2019 to discuss reduction of noise and disturbance affecting Southern Resident orcas from military exercises and Navy aircraft.” It further continued: “The governor should meet with the U.S. Navy’s Commanding Officer for the region that includes Washington state to address the acoustic and physical impacts to Southern Resident	The Task Force Final Report did not identify Navy sonar among the major threats. The major threats identified in the report are a lack of prey, disturbance from noise and vessel traffic, and toxic contaminants in the waters they inhabit. The Navy, as acknowledged by the Governor’s Task Force in 2018, was not previously requested to participate in the Task Force, and the Navy was not made aware of conversations held during meetings in 2018. The Navy has since been invited to take part and, as a result, a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Task Force’s working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor’s Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>orcas from Naval exercises in waters and air of Washington state. The governor should request the Navy participate on the Vessels working group in Year Two and identify actions to reduce the Navy's impacts to Southern Resident orcas" (emphases added) (Office of the Washington Governor, 2018).</p> <p>In addition, potential impacts from Naval activities are recognized as a threat to Southern Resident orca survival and recovery in both the U.S. and Canada Southern Resident orca recovery plans.¹</p> <p>¹ Fisheries and Oceans Canada. 2018. Amended Recovery Strategy for the Northern and Southern Resident Killer Whales (<i>Orcinus orca</i>) in Canada. Species at Risk Act Recovery Strategy Series, Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Ottawa, ix + 83 pp; National Marine Fisheries Service 2008. Recovery Plan for Southern Resident Killer Whales (<i>Orcinus orca</i>). National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Region, Seattle, Washington.</p>	
Nickum-03	<p>2. Given the small size of the endangered Southern Resident orca population today, and the fact that they travel in groups, harm to a single individual orca can easily mean a population-level effect.</p> <p>Each individual orca in the current population matters if the population is to avoid extinction. There has been a net loss of 12 individual Southern Resident orcas since 2011. The population has continued to decline since the 2015 NWTT EIS. In 2016, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) declared that Southern Resident orcas are one of the marine species most at risk of extinction nationwide. The final EIS will need to be updated with the latest number of Southern Resident orcas alive today, which is currently fewer than the 77 stated in the draft.</p> <p>The DSEIS states that "the use of sonar and other transducers during training activities as described under Alternative 1 will result in the unintentional taking of killer whales incidental to those activities" (page 3.4-190). The DSEIS Fact Sheet Booklet states that 99.84% of all estimated takes of marine mammals would be Level B harassment, disrupting natural behavior patterns such as feeding, surfacing, nursing, breeding, sheltering or migration to those point where those patterns are abandoned or significantly altered. These—and especially feeding, breeding, and nursing—are all critical activities for the Southern Resident orcas now, given that they have produced only two surviving calves in the last three years, at least two orcas are visibly emaciated, and nutritional stress is recognized as a primary threat to the population. Up to 69% of all detectable pregnancies between 2008 and 2014 were unsuccessful, and low availability of Chinook salmon appeared to be a significant cause of late</p>	<p>There are several sources of abundance numbers for marine mammal species. For consistency, the Navy uses abundance numbers of Southern Resident killer whales (as well as other marine mammal species) provided by NMFS in the most recent Stock Assessment Report. The Navy tracks this species closely and will continue to use the most recent available data.</p> <p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>pregnancy failure (Wasser et al. 2017); Level B harassment by Navy activities that interferes with both feeding and breeding or displaces orcas from preferred foraging areas is of significant concern and will further contribute to the Southern Resident orcas' low reproductive success. Table 3.4-40 in the DSEIS estimates two behavioral impacts to Southern Resident orcas per year from sonar and other transducers. It is unclear whether that means just two individual orcas will likely be affected; if so, we question whether that is realistic given that pods of orcas travel together. We are particularly concerned about new and increased impacts to Southern Resident orcas from mine explosives, which can cause injury or death, and the use of mid-frequency sonar, which, according to the Navy's own estimates, can impact the orcas beyond 16km from the source (DSEIS, Table 3.4-13, p. 3.4-150); this is well outside the reasonable area that marine mammal observers are able to survey to record marine mammal sightings and initiate mitigation measures. In fact, military exercises have been documented to impact orcas right here in the Salish Sea (see next section).</p> <p>In a population with strong family ties, the loss of one orca also directly affects the others' chance of survival. When a female resident orca dies, it increases the mortality risk of her male offspring under age 30 by 3.1 times, and the mortality risk of her male offspring over age 30 by 8.3 times (Foster et al. 2012).² In late 2018 and early 2019, for example, it was reported that male Southern Resident orca K25 was observed to be doing poorly after the death of his mother, K13.³</p> <p>3. There are documented cases in this region of U.S. and Canadian naval activities, including active sonar training and explosive testing, causing direct harm to the Southern Resident orcas.</p> <p>In 2003, an active sonar training exercise conducted by the U.S. Navy in the eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca and Haro Strait caused one of the Southern Resident killer whale families (J pod) to stop foraging and exhibit abnormal behaviors and movement, change direction multiple times, and group together in shallow water where they are at increased risk of stranding. In a video recording of the incident, sonar can clearly be heard above the water.⁴</p> <p>More recent incidents involving testing of sonar and explosives by the Canadian Navy in Southern Resident orca habitat are examples of the potential impact of the activities proposed in this DSEIS. A juvenile Southern Resident female was stranded in 2012 with evidence of trauma consistent with an explosion or high-pressure impact, a week after the</p>	<p>Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Canadian Navy had been conducting sonar exercises in the region. An exact cause of death was not determined, but experts in underwater noise who continue to review her case believe that the most likely cause of death was an underwater military explosion.⁵ In 2017, explosives detonated by the Canadian Navy near a group of Southern Residents (L pod) caused the whales to group together suddenly and flee the area. These examples show that just one incident of training and testing activities impacting Southern Residents can cause significant harm, death, or displacement from preferred habitat.</p> <p>² Foster, et al. Adaptive Prolonged Postreproductive Life Span in Killer Whales. Science, Sept. 14, 2012, 337:6100, pp. 1313.</p> <p>³ https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/environment/i-am-worried-and-i-am-afraid-two-more-puget-sound-orcas-predicted-to-die-in-critically-endangered-population/</p> <p>⁴ See video from Center for Whale Research, available: https://youtu.be/O9gDk29Y_YY; and “Navy sonar incident alarms experts,” Kitsap Sun, May 8, 2003, https://products.kitsapsun.com/archive/2003/05-08/142143_navy_sonar_incident_alarms_expe.html</p> <p>⁵ See: “Could Naval activities threaten orca recovery?” Beam Reach, http://www.beamreach.org/2012/03/05/naval-activities-threaten-orca-recovery</p>	
Nickum-04	<p>4. Other agencies and operators are taking new, meaningful steps to reduce noise and disturbance affecting Southern Resident orcas. The Navy must also increase its protections, or it will become responsible for a larger share of the cumulative impact and potentially negate some of the benefits of the other actions being taken.</p> <p>In 2019, Washington state has taken big steps to reduce impacts on Southern Resident orcas from other vessel types, recognizing that noise and disturbance have significant adverse consequences for this endangered population. In May 2019, Governor Inslee signed into law a bill that increases the distance that vessels must stay away from the Southern Residents and enacts a 7-knot speed limit within a half nautical mile of these orcas. The legislature also allocated funding for a new hybrid ferry and funding to convert some ferries to hybrid-electric power. Washington State Ferries is also doing a baseline noise inventory and developing solutions to address noise and frequencies of concern. Meanwhile, in 2019, voluntary ship slowdowns will continue and expand for the third year through the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority-led Enhancing Cetacean</p>	<p>The Navy is fully aware of the plight of the Southern Resident killer whales. In 2019 a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Governor’s Southern Resident Killer Whale Task Force working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor’s Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales.</p> <p>The Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals in areas that are particularly important for biological life processes, such as feeding and migration.</p> <p>Procedural mitigation measures already in place and proposed to continue include ceasing activities that could be harmful to marine mammals when marine mammals are detected within defined mitigation zones.</p> <p>The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Habitat and Observation (ECHO) Program – a Canadian program that directly benefits Southern Resident orcas in the inland waters. The Navy should increase its own mitigation efforts so that there is still a significant net benefit to the Southern Residents in terms of reduced noise and disturbance when all these other entities are increasing their protective measures.	Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.
Nickum-05	5. The designation for Southern Resident orca critical habitat is likely to change later this year. The Navy should not make final decisions about training and testing in the potential new critical habitat areas off the coasts of Washington, Oregon and California until this designation has been made. NMFS has committed to proposing a rule with an expanded designation of critical habitat off Washington, Oregon and California by early October 2019 – an area encompassed by the NWTT range. Advancing this SEIS now for activities in an area that is on the cusp of being designated as critical habitat is irresponsible. The Navy should wait until NMFS makes its final designation for expanded critical habitat before pursuing activities that would adversely affect the area. Changes in the Navy's mitigation measures are likely to be necessary so that the proposed action does not "result in destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat."	The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Nickum-06	6. Recent variations in Southern Resident orca presence in the Salish Sea are complex and should not be an excuse for exercising less caution in the inland waters. The DSEIS states that "foraging during the spring in Salish Sea by Southern Resident killer whales has declined in recent years as they shift their range and forage for Chinook salmon or other prey species elsewhere in response to reduced prey availability in that historically used inland waters foraging area" (p. 3.4-26). These inland waters are a place where foraging areas were very important historically; they also represent areas where recovery gains could be made if there are adequate protections. Even spending time elsewhere, Southern Resident orcas are not getting enough food and are showing signs of malnutrition. The inland waters foraging area is still critically important if they are going to survive and thrive. In recognition of this fact, state and federal governments are actively working to restore salmon populations in the inland waters. It is difficult to predict orca presence on a long-term or even annual basis, and the Navy should not assume that the shift outside of the Salish Sea in the spring and summer is a permanent change. The Southern Resident orcas are still sighted in the Salish Sea frequently. In fact, Olson et al. 2018 noted that K and L pods have been increasing the	The statements quoted from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS are part of an establishment of the environmental baseline the Navy then uses to estimate potential impacts resulting from the Navy's activities. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The commenter incorrectly asserts that the Navy suggests that protective measures in the Salish Sea are less important; however, the Navy has not suggested that and does not consider that to be true. The mitigation measures developed for both NWTT Inland Waters and the NWTT Offshore Area for the Proposed Action represent an increase over the mitigation developed for the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>duration of their stay in the inland waters by staying in the Salish Sea through the fall and into the early winter.⁶ The Navy should consult with orca biologists to gather other recent information, in addition to reviewing recent published literature on Southern Resident orca presence in the Salish Sea.</p> <p>The DSEIS implies that changes in the Southern Residents' presence in the Salish Sea mean that protections there are less important than they used to be. In fact, it should be reason for an extra layer of caution. Reducing noise and disturbance in the heavily-trafficked inland waters could enable the Southern Residents to forage there more effectively and therefore spend more time there as they have historically. Recent information on foraging locations should not be interpreted as a reason to decrease or discontinue mitigation efforts to avoid impacts to Southern Residents in the Salish Sea. Additionally, the Navy should consider that when the Southern Resident orcas are not in inland waters, they are likely to be in their offshore area, which is subject to additional training and testing activities that do not occur in the Salish Sea. The Navy should consider additional mitigation and monitoring in the orcas' offshore habitat given the potential increased use of this area and the unique activities—such as active sonar—that take place in this portion of the NWT range.</p> <p>⁶ Olson, JK, J Wood, RW Osborne, L Barrett-Lennard, S Larson. 2018. Sightings of southern resident killer whales in the Salish Sea 1976-2014: the importance of a long-term opportunistic dataset. Endan. Species Res. 37:105-118. https://doi.org/10.3354/esr00918</p>	
Nickum-07	<p>7. The EIS should include two additional studies related to impacts on Southern Resident orcas: Wieland et al. 2010 and Emmons et al. 2019. Wieland, M., A. Jones, and S. C. P. Renn. 2010. Changing durations of Southern Resident killer whale 23 (<i>Orcinus orca</i>) discrete calls between two periods spanning 28 years. Mar. Mam. Sci. 26(1):195–201. This study found that the Southern Residents make a behavioral adjustment as a result of vessel noise, as measured through an increase in mean durations of discrete calls. “Because they are adjusting their vocal behavior, we must consider the very real possibility that engine noise is hindering their ability to communicate, and may well impact their efficiency at using acoustics to forage and navigate, as well” (Wieland et al. 2010). These findings should be incorporated into 3.4.2.1.1.4 on masking (page 3.4.103, which talks about other species but not killer whales) and into the odontocete discussion on page 3.4-120.</p> <p>Emmons, C.K., M.B. Hanson, and M.O. Lammers. 2019. Monitoring the</p>	<p>Wieland et al., 2010 was incorporated in Section 3.4.1.7.4 of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS as recommended by the commenter.</p> <p>The Navy-funded research presented in Emmons et al. 2019 was considered in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, but the report was not cited because it was still in the process of being edited by the authors and had not been finalized. The report has since been finalized and is cited in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy does not frequently conduct training or testing activities in the location of the Cape Flattery Offshore hydrophone since that area is highly utilized by commercial vessel traffic, making it an undesirable location for the Navy to conduct activities, especially sonar training or testing.</p> <p>The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on Southern Resident killer whales and other</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>occurrence of Southern Resident killer whales, other marine mammals, and anthropogenic sound in the Pacific Northwest. Prepared for: U.S. Navy, U.S. Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, HI. Prepared by: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Northwest Fisheries Science Center under MIPR N00070-17-MP-4C419. 25 February 2019. 23p.</p> <p>This report states that there were 148 mid-frequency active sonar events detected between 2011 and 2017, with the peak overlapping with occurrence of the three killer whale communities (including Southern Residents). This is concerning because, as the DSEIS states, exposure to mid-frequency sonar has been directly linked to separation of a killer whale calf from its group (page 3.4-102); the separation and loss of a single calf would be a serious blow to the small population, given that there are so few calves and the southern residents have had limited reproductive success in recent years. Exposure to mid-frequency sonar has also been directly linked to mass strandings of cetaceans (page 3.4-127). In addition, the DSEIS states that newer high-duty or continuous active sonars have more potential to mask vocalizations, particularly for mid-frequency cetaceans like killer whales, and “longer-term consequences could include potential decrease in recruitment” (p. 3.4-102). The Southern Resident orcas cannot afford any further decrease in their already very low recruitment rates. The findings from Emmons et al. 2019 regarding seasonal use of different offshore areas by Southern Resident orcas and other whales should also be used to minimize adverse impacts by shifting sonar and explosives testing and training by season and by location.</p>	<p>marine species in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitat areas, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures specific to Southern Resident killer whales. For example, in the NWTT Offshore Area, the Navy developed a new mitigation area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, which encompasses waters off Cape Flattery. The Navy’s mitigation now includes annual limits on hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and prohibits explosive Mine Countermeasures and Neutralization Testing in the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. All other explosive activities are required to be conducted 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. In addition, the Navy developed a new mitigation to issue annual awareness notification messages to alert ships and aircraft to the possible presence of increased concentrations of Southern Resident killer whales seasonally, which will further help avoid potential impacts from vessel movements and training and testing activities on this species.</p>
Nickum-08	<p>8. New whale report alert systems should be used for real-time monitoring and early warnings to build on the limited capacity of lookouts. The Navy should explore the use of newly available apps and technology that provide real-time information on whale presence in the Salish Sea and along the coast. Using this technology could expand the ability of the Navy’s marine mammal observers to be aware of and respond to the presence of Southern Resident orcas. For example, the Whale Report Alert System (WRAS), developed by the British Columbia Cetacean Sightings Network, alerts mariners to the presence of whales so that mitigation measures may be enacted to reduce the risk of disturbance and collision. Orca Network, Whale Scout, and other organizations in Washington also contribute to a Whale Sighting Network with close to real-time reporting in the Salish Sea.</p>	<p>The Navy developed new mitigation for Navy biologists to initiate communication with the appropriate marine mammal detection networks in NWTT Inland Waters prior to conducting explosive mine neutralization activities involving the use of Navy divers, Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training, Civilian Port Defense – Homeland Security Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Exercises, and Small Boat Attack Exercises. This mitigation will help the Navy plan activities in a way that minimizes the potential for exposure of Southern Resident killer whales, as described in Section K.3.3 (Mitigation Areas for Marine Species in NWTT Inland Waters). The Navy will also continue to assess the practicality of other available monitoring techniques as technologies advance.</p>
Nickum-09	<p>9. Additional information is needed on the anticipated timing of the proposed activities.</p>	<p>As stated in Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities), because of the nature of training and testing requirements for forces that must be ready to deploy at</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	The SEIS should detail the times of year during which the proposed activities will take place. The Southern Resident orcas have exhibited seasonality in their movements, and information from tagging studies, coastal surveys, and passive acoustic monitoring allows some degree of prediction for when and where they may be traveling and foraging. Any overlap in their seasonal movements and the Navy's testing and training activities will increase impacts on these species. Information about timing should be made public in the SEIS and the Navy should seek to adjust the timing of their activities to minimize such overlap.	all times, activities could occur throughout the year. The Navy added additional details on seasonality and day/night requirements of its activities to Appendix A (Navy Activities Descriptions) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy did consider seasonal movements and behaviors of marine species in its effect analysis. The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species either seasonally or year-round in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitats, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). The duration of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS is for the foreseeable future, while the Marine Mammal Protection Act permits would be in place for seven years.
Nickum-10	10. Increasing the Navy's testing and training activities at this time is counter to what the endangered Southern Resident orcas need right now to have a chance at recovery. Without bold and immediate actions, the Southern Residents are likely to go extinct within our lifetimes. Everything we can do now to protect the Southern Resident orcas is critical. In a time when we should be acting to address and decrease threats facing the population, including reducing noise and disturbance, the Navy's proposed activities increase the risks from ocean noise, vessel strikes and disturbance, potential direct harm and injury to Southern Resident orcas, and displacement from preferred habitat. The Navy must consider the current crisis facing the endangered Southern Resident orcas and make new adjustments in its testing and training activities. Despite being listed under the Endangered Species Act for nearly 14 years, this unique population is not recovering and is continuing to decline. It is obvious that status quo actions, including the Navy's training and testing activities, are not serving the Southern Resident orcas. Given their highly endangered status and continuing decline, the Navy should be considering how to reduce impacts and increase protections for Southern Resident orcas. Thank you for your consideration of our input and concerns as you finalize the SEIS.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Niemi-1	The Navy has to be aware of the detriment sonar testing has on our oceans cetaceans. Do not do any sonar testing in the Salish Sea, we need to protect the Orca and all cetaceans, not put their lives at risk.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Nieto-1	I only want to express my opinion against sonar testing in the ocean, because it harms marine animals. I disagree with any type of weapon testing in the ocean, as well as our misunderstanding of the ocean as humans, since we seem to think it is our dumping place and our limitless source of food. Look where it has got us. Please, we must change, we must learn to respect life, we must use our intelligence with sensitivity or else we cannot argue being superior to any other life form, but on the contrary, the stupidest and cruelest animal on Earth.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Nigon-1	I've seen pictures of dead whales with blood around their ears beached near where sonar is happening. I've read numerous articles about Hawaii and their trying to limit sonar use to protect the whales. It makes me shudder knowing how sounds travels underwater that marine life is subjected to this in their natural environment. I've been on whale watch boats and seen the whales, once up close and eye to eye. It was unforgettable. Please stop! There must be remote areas where sonar wouldn't harm so many sea creatures.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Nijkamp-1	The sonar testing in the ocean that is currently happening is extremely harmful to marine mammals in various ways. Please stop harming and disturbing them!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Nishime-1	I 100% am against sonar testing that leaves many marine animals in distress! Can you imagine blowing a blow horn into a dog's ears and giving them hearing loss, and then saying that it is a valid military practice?	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Especially in this climate, the animals need rights too. And at the end of the day we need to help them survive so they can sustain the very waters we rely on. There needs to be a level of co-existence. The military does not need the reputation of being the world's bullies.	Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Niski-1	Please do not do this! Our planet is in peril and it's inhabitants are going extinct due to habitat destruction and this includes our oceans. Your time would be better spent cleaning our oceans than assaulting it's inhabitants. The Puget Sounds southern resident Orcas are especially vulnerable with only 75 members left and your sonar training will be the final nail in their coffins. I beg you please do not do this.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Niski-2	Please do not do this! Our planet is in peril and it's inhabitants are going extinct due to habitat destruction and this includes our oceans. Your time would be better spent cleaning our oceans then assaulting it's inhabitants. The Puget Sounds southern resident Orcas especially only have 75 members left and your sonar training will be the final nail in their coffins. I beeg you please do not do this.	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Nixon-1	There is an entire ocean just seconds from your take off area!!! Why oh why not use IT?? All this pain and risk of alienation, anger, potential damage to all life forms we depend upon out here could be avoided and you could still do your training. For those of us who moved cross country here to retire in peace, this noise is much more than annoyance, it is assault and an imprisonment imposed upon us that we cannot escape. And IT IS AVOIDABLE!! We are still a nation of the people aren't we? Take it way offshore and we are all ok!!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Nixon-2	I am absolutely appalled that there is even a proposal about adding such terrible noise and disruptive air power to our area here in the Northwest. It amounts to destruction of all the peace we moved from Indiana out here for!!! Please please make other plans!!!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Nobblett-1	STOP IT NOW !!! You are threatening the lives of an Endangered species and should be ashamed of yourselves ! There is simply NO NEED our SRKW are already fighting for their lives and you threaten their existence again ! Ashamed to be human!!!!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Nobblett-2	<p>... appalling that in 2019, I have to fill in forms, call, email, post on social media to protect our oceans and all Trying to live in it !!</p> <p>I would expect the Navy, any Navy to be the leaders in conservation - and not running riot rough shot without a care for the creatures in the ocean</p> <p>Have you learnt nothing ? Protect Protect Protect !!!!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Nolet-1	<p>Sonar testing is damaging to local marine mamals such as the pod of endangered southern resident orcas. Although I understand the requirement of the navy to practice drills for coastal waters protection, this is unacceptable behaviour when it is so close to marine animals that are so entwined in our ecosystem. It is mandatory that the navy consider the effects on the ecosystem when running these tests and drilld such as taking the testing and drills elsewhere off the coast or working with local biologists and organizations to find ways where all parties can benefit/ are not being harmed.</p> <p>Kind regards from a local biology student and concerned citizen.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Nordquist-1	<p>We're writing to you about the Navy's EIS/OEIS March 2019 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Northwest Training & Testing. As constituents of yours and residents of the Olympic Peninsula, we find the proposed increase in Growler jets and the use of this area as an electronic warfare training area to be extremely disturbing.</p> <p>The only EIS alternative that is even faintly acceptable to us is the No</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Action Alternative. The other options given will create unacceptable negative impacts to natural ecological systems, and to residents and visitors of this area. The likely negative impacts to Olympic National Park (ONP) and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (OCNMS) are significant. Alternative 2 in particular is profoundly atrocious. The ONP and OCNMS were established by Congress to protect the unparalleled wildlife, ecosystems and landscapes of this corner of the country, and to provide ways for visitors to learn about and appreciate these treasures. The intrusions of hundreds of deafening warplanes into these protected spaces are an affront to your institution that protected them, and to the hundreds of thousands of residents and visitors who are subjected to these disturbing intrusions.</p> <p>We are asking you to help stop this abuse of our national parks, national marine sanctuaries, national forests, private lands, and overall airspace. Please exercise your authority on our behalf to reign in the Navy's unnecessary, costly and misguided expansion of training into the Olympic Peninsula region.</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Norman D-1	<p>This is terrible and disturbing to hear. No being should be subjected to this damaging and terrifying noise in their natural environment. This is their home. This sonar needs to stop to maintain their well-being and existence. Stop sonar testing.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Norman R-1	<p>Our pristine wilderness is of far greater value than any supposed military need to violate her sacred places with ugly needless sound, and aims of dominance and war. Here we see the sacred, violated. This is wrong, a</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	parasitism upon the sacred. No planes are permitted in this area...how ugly amd wrong...no foolish boat of weapons and hate is welcome here, in this sacred place. Leave. Leave us in paece, and never return. Sanity, has spoken.	The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Norris-1	We can not continue to put marine mammals and the ocean's inhabitants at risk with these tests. With the increase of plastic and ocean pollution at an all time high, and a decrease in fish to sustain these animals, further stress and trauma is absolutely unnecessary. Our Whale populations are diminishing and we are seeing them wash up on shore at record numbers. Please consider how sensitive these creatures are and help protect their wellbeing. No more testing in our waters. Thank you.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Nouza-1	I am 100%opposed to this idea. Our killer whale populations are in severe decline and their numbers are drastically threatened. We need to preserve and protect this species and this plan is not beneficial to dwindling orca populations.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Nugent J-1	I am against any sonar testing done in our ocrean waters here in Northern California off the Mendocino Coast line. As you must know the Gray Whales are dying in large numbers up here. Because there is not enough food for them and the large frieghters are going to fast. Also the Common Murre bird has been dying at a great amount. Last week we found 59 dead birds on the Manchester State Beach. Yesterday we found 22 more dead Murre birds on the beach or in the tide. We don't want you to test in our fragile enviroment. Please keep me informed if you decide to test here because I will start a petition to stop your sonar testing. I know many people here will be against it	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Sincerely, Joyce Nugent	
Nugent K-1	There is NOT substantial evidence that the training practices MUST be performed over the delicate ecosystem of the Olympic peninsula. Please stop!	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Nunez-1	Please stop conducting these tests, you are harming animals and causing damage.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Nutter-1	THE DELETERIOUS AND LETHAL EFFECTS OF SONAR ON MARINE MAMMALS ARE WELL DOCUMENTED. THE NAVY MUST NOT TEST SONAR AND WEAPONS ALONG THE PACIFIC COAST'S WHALE MIGRATORY PATH. THE NAVY MUST LEAVE A 100-MILE TEST-FREE CORRIDOR ALONG THE ENTIRE PACIFIC COAST NOT ONLY FOR GRAY WHALE BUT ALSO FOR HUMPBACK AND BLUE WHALE MIGRATION THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE YEAR! The Navy must stop using sonar within 100 miles of Pacific Coast from Washington to lower California. Leave a 100 mile corridor with no testing of any kind to protect the gray whales during their migration (Nov-May) & the humpbacks & blue whales from May to October!	The Navy's mitigation involves numerous distance-from-shore restrictions for active sonar, explosive, and non-explosive training and testing activities. For example, the Navy will not conduct explosive training or explosive testing (except explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing) 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures, including development a new mitigation area known as the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. It would not be practical for the Navy to prohibit all training or testing activities within 100 miles from shore for the reasons described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), Chapter 5 (Mitigation), and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Nutter-2	1) HOW WILL SEIS ADDRESS THE WILDLIFE EMERGENCY JUST ANNOUNCED BY NOAA? There is a wildlife emergency globally and it is occurring in our oceans and is clearly present in the Pacific Ocean along the northwest coast where the Navy plans to do its weapons testing. https://www.paradisepost.com/2019/05/31/feds-declare-emergency-as-gray-whaledeaths-reach-highest-level-in-nearly-20-years/ https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grey-whales-stranded-westcoast-1.5119056 https://www.advocate-news.com/2019/05/24/major-die-off-of-common-murresunderway-along-the-mendocino-	The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	coast/?fbclid=IwAR1jCzAbxz10sGgCxiUWjmWiUqMVP5f7_uo6vlpJF7Dhvc4A7TSgn19HVXk	
Nutter-3	<p>2) HOW WILL SEIS LIMIT HARM TO MARINE LIFE CAUSED BY SONAR AND EXPLOSIVES AND THEIR TOXINS? There is irrefutable evidence that sonar bursts or leads to burst eardrums and that explosion underwater of mines and missiles are full of toxins that are detrimental to marine life. SEIS states that "military expended materials will sink to the ocean floor" and will be incidentally ingested by bottom feeders. The Navy and Fisheries Service estimate that over the current plan's five-year period, training and testing activities will result in thousands of animals suffering permanent hearing loss, lung injuries or death. Millions of animals will be exposed to temporary injuries and disturbances with many subjected to multiple harmful exposures. U.S. Navy training exercises in the Pacific could kill, injure, or harass whales, dolphins and other marine mammals 12.5 million times over the next five years, according to the Marine Mammal Protection Act permits and final regulations. Explosions, sonar and ship strikes during Navy exercises could harm blue whales 9,248 times over the next five years and the short-beaked common dolphin 6.8 million times under the incidental take permit issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service. Gray whales are bottom feeders. Should the SEIS take this into account? Until NOAA's study of the die off on the gray whales is complete, will any disruption of the ocean by sonar and explosive activity be halted?</p> <p>https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533 Advances in Research on the impact of antisubmarine sonar on beaked whales:</p> <p>https://www.biologicaldiversity.org/news/press_releases/2015/pacific-sonar-testing-04-01-2015.html</p> <p>https://www.biologicaldiversity.org/news/press_releases/2018/navy-trainingexercises-12-20-2018.php</p> <p>https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2018/12/27/2018-27342/taking-and-importing-marine-mammals-taking-marine-mammals-incidental-to-the-us-navytraining-and</p> <p>https://news.nationalgeographic.com/2016/03/160331-car-parts-plastics-deadwhales-germany-animals/</p> <p>https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/03/whale-dies-88-pounds-plastic-philippines/</p> <p>https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/04/dead-pregnant-whale-plastic-italy/</p>	The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Nutter-4	3) HOW CAN SEIS GUARANTEE PROTECTION OF THOUSANDS OF WHALES AND OTHER MARINE MAMMALS FROM SONAR AFTER FAILURE TO USE THE	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	BEST AVAILABLE SCIENCE TO ASSESS THE EXTENT AND DURATION OF IMPACTS TO WHALES AND OTHER MARINE MAMMALS? https://earthjustice.org/oews/press/2013/court-rules-that-federal-agency-failed-to-protect-thousands-of-whales-and-dolphins-from-navy-sonar	and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Nutter-5	4) HOW WILL THE NAVY GUARANTEE LOOKOUTS WILL SIGHT WHALES IN THE AREA BEFORE USE OF SONAR AND EXPLOSIVES? The Navy claims they have lookouts watching for whales before the use of sonar and explosives and it is "very unlikely" to impact the feeding and migration of gray whales. How does the SEIS take into account whales "snorkeling activity" (surfacing quietly and exhaling without any visible blow) and fog and rough seas that make it near impossible to spot whales? A blue whale (the largest species on earth) was killed by a slow moving vessel in broad daylight on a clear day off the Mendocino Coast without being sighted! https://www.pressdemocrat.com/news/2272706-181/fort-bragg-blue-whale-likely	As described in Section 5.2.1 (Procedural Mitigation Development), the Navy's analysis assumes that due to limitations such as those mentioned in the comment, Lookouts will not be 100% effective at detecting all individual marine mammals.
Nutter-6	5) HOW WILL THE NAVY GUARANTEE ITS COMMITMENT TO THE TRIBES THAT IT WILL NOT CONDUCT ITS WARFARE ACTIVITIES WITHIN 12 MILES OF THE COAST? WILL IT EXPAND THIS COMMITMENT TO INCLUDE USE OF SONAR? Tribes Letter to Naval Facilities Engineering Command Northwest, May 3, 2019.	The Navy does not conduct training or testing within 12 nautical miles of the coast of Oregon, Northern California, and much of Washington.
Nutter-7	6) THE SEIS MUST NOW REQUIRE A 100-MILE WIDE NAVY WEAPONS TEST-FREE CORRIDOR ALONG THE PACIFIC COAST DUE TO MULTI-SPECIES WHALE MIGRATION NOW OCCURRING YEAR ROUND. Gray whales migrate between Alaska and Baja, California from November to May, and blue whales and humpbacks are now being sighted farther north along the Pacific Coast probably due to ocean warming and altered food sources. https://whalesanddolphinsbc.com/sightings-in-2019/2019/06/humpback-whales-have-returned/ https://www.sfgate.com/local/article/blue-whales-whale-watching-monterey-bay-summer-13161860.php	Please see response to Nutter-1.
O		
Oberweiser-1	I am opposed to the U.S. Navy's proposed expansion of its war training exercises off the coast of the Pacific Northwest and near the Arctic Circle. The Navy's proposed expansion of the use of low frequency sonar is already illegal according to a decision in 2016 by the Ninth US Circuit Court of Appeals. The Ninth Circuit court ruled that the National Marine Fisheries	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Service (NMFS) had illegally approved a permit authorizing the Navy to use its high-intensity long-range sonar - called low-frequency active sonar (or LFA) - in more than 70 percent of the world's oceans.</p> <p>The decision said the the low frequency active sonar LFA systems the Navy uses violates the Marine Mammal Protection Act and negatively impacts whales dolphins and walruses that rely on sound to navigate the seas and communicate with one another.</p> <p>I disagree with the assertion in the Draft supplemental Environmental Impact Statement that "long term consequences for the species or stocks would not be expected."</p> <p>U.S. Navy training exercises in the Pacific Ocean could kill, injure, or harass whales, dolphins and other marine mammals 12.5 million times over the next five years. That's according to Marine Mammal Protection Act permits and final regulations - https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2018/12/27/2018-27342/taking-and-importing-marine-mammals-navy-training-and-testing-activities-in-the-hawaii-southern issued by the Trump administration.</p> <p>The proposed "precautions" against sonar exposure to marine mammals are inadequate. Sonar can travel much farther than on board observers are able to see. Designed for submarine detection over vast expanses of the deep sea, Low frequency active sonar (LFA) has the capacity to expose thousands of square miles to dangerous levels of noise.</p> <p>There are numerous recorded instances of major behavioral change by whales, porpoises and dolphins both along the U.S. coastlines and abroad that occurred when the Navy sonar was being used in training exercises nearby.</p> <p>More low frequency. active sonar in the path of whales' migration will seriously affect the mothers' abilities to communicate with their calves that were newly born in Mexico and are making their first major swim. These mammals are already endangered.</p> <p>According the Scientific American article at: https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/does-military-sonar-kill/?redirect=1, "These waves can travel for hundreds of miles under water, and can retain an intensity of 140 decibels as far as 300 miles from their source. These rolling walls of noise are no doubt too much for some marine wildlife. While little is known about any direct physiological effects of sonar waves on marine species, evidence shows that whales will swim hundreds of miles, rapidly change their depth (sometime leading to bleeding from the eyes and ears), and even beach themselves to get away</p>	<p>Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>from the sounds of sonar."</p> <p>In a new study just published in the journal Proceedings of the Royal Society B (https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533) scientists have found that naval sonar in certain frequencies is scaring whales so badly, or inducing a "flight or fight response" that their fear alters their diving behavior and quickens their heartrate, which in turn gives them the bends.</p> <p>"In the presence of sonar they are stressed and swim vigorously away from the sound source, changing their diving pattern," lead author Yara Bemaldeo Quiros, a researcher at the Institute of Animal Health at the University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain, told AFP. The Pacific Northwest area's of the United States including Northern California, Oregon, Washington and Alaska are very dependent on the tourist and fishing industries for their economies to prosper. One of the most anticipated tourist attractions of the Pacific Northwest is the twice yearly migration of the Gray Whales from the Arctic Circle Down the coasts of Canada and the United States to Mexico in Baja California. The sight of the Gray Whales and many other marine mammals along the coastlines of the Pacific Northwest are also a large part of the tourist draw.</p> <p>I am calling upon the U.S. navy to stop using low frequency sonar anywhere near the Pacific Northwest coastline.</p> <p>I also oppose the releasing of 20,000 tons of environmental "stressors," including heavy metals and explosives, into the coastal waters of the U.S. Pacific Northwest.</p> <p>If the life in the ocean is killed by polluters including the the military, there will be no civilization for the world's armed forces to defend.</p>	
O'Brien T-1	<p>The Southern Residents have two more little orcas to feed, the calf born in December and the one born a few weeks ago. There are also two orcas slipping away due to the extreme lack of prey, J17 and J53. J17 is demonstrating "peanut head," a condition that indicates a significant loss of blubber. NOAA Fisheries are monitoring both orcas. Southern Residents are currently hunting for prey off the coasts hoping to find their primary food, Chinook salmon, which is also endangered and showing continued declines. Adding to the myriad human caused problems, the Department of the Navy has plans for doing training and testing in the very waters where our orcas are hunting.</p> <p>We respectfully request that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's EIS clearly indicates that the Southern Residents will be harmed by their testing and training activities, and that this is not 	<p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>acceptable. Our Southern Residents need quiet in order to “hear” their prey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the navy acknowledge that in 2003 during a training session, the J pod quit foraging and instead spent time and calories trying to leave the area instead of hunting and eating. Do not repeat this grave error. In pursuing these activities, the Navy violates the Endangered Species Act which should be protecting the orcas. The designation for the orcas’ critical habitat is under review and the Navy should not be allowed to move forward until the designation is final. Please, please, please respect the Southern Resident Orcas’ Endangered Species status and take steps to mitigate further harm. Please protect the critical habitat of the orcas and prohibit testing and training in these waters. Please ban sonar and explosives in these waters. Cease and desist any and all activities that can harm marine life. <p>Our resident orca are treasures on the brink of extinction. Please do your part to mitigate any further harm.</p> <p>Many thanks! Tina</p>	<p>revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p>
Oconnor K-1	<p>I attended the "informational" presentation that was put on by a marketing firm representing the Navy's proposal for more testing along the Northern California Coast, up through Oregon, through Washington, into Alaska. Those of us in attendance actually thought there would be a question and answer platform.</p> <p>There was not. We could neither hear each other, nor the presenters, whose voices actually got softer in volume as this sham continued(a technique used to keep crowds calm, although it had the reverse effect that evening)</p> <p>The glossy pictures of happy sea life was an insult. This WAS MARKETING AT IT'S WORSE.</p> <p>I have read volumes on the ACTUAL damage cased by Naval Training and Testing. Small villages along the Alaskan coast, including Cordova, that have not only suffered devastating loss to their salmon, but now have large levels of toxic chemicals in their once pristine waters.</p> <p>YOU HAVE to know that what you are trying to sell us is LIES.</p> <p>IF the Navy is doing all of this to protect us, what good is it going to do if our oceans and environment has been devastated?</p> <p>Quoting journalist, Dahr Jamail, "The Navy is increasingly focused on possible future climate-change conflicts in the melting waters of the north and, in that context, has little or no intention of caretaking the</p>	<p>The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	environment when it comes to military exercises." But then, according to POTUS, and the republican party, there is no climate change....	
O'Connor L-1	Please don't do this,.! Consider why it is being done! Is it REALLY nessesery????	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
O'Connor M-1	<p>It makes no sense to test sonar off our U.S. Northwest Coast. Why?</p> <p>1) There is no question that the marine life will be badly harmed including the grey whales who use this pathway for migration and depend on ecolocation. It has been proven time and again that sonar frequencies interfere with ecolocation. When marine life is damaged so is human life.</p> <p>2) The U.S. already has more weapons than any other country on the planet. It is absolutely not necessary to test for new weapons which will take funds away from much more pressing issues.</p> <p>3) The planet is in crisis now loosing species by the day with catastrophic climate change challenges around every corner. Spending resources on testing weapons at this point in time is immoral and fits the definition of insanity.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Oconnor P-1	It is imperative that the Navy stop sonar testing immediately! It is clearly disruptive and dangerous to orcas, dolphins, whales and likely all sea creatures. We need to check our human arrogance and have respect for all inhabitants of our planet. We must protect and preserve these beautiful and valuable animals. The Navy MUST STOP SONAR TESTING!	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Octavia-1	I hope some people could help them.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Odland J-1	I oppose sonar being used in the Salish Sea. This is a dangerous practice against our Orca population and other sea mammals. Please find another	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>way to complete the testing that you need to complete. This is not a safe practice. Thank you.</p> <p>Julia Odland</p>	<p>and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Odland K-1	<p>I do not support this proposal because of the harm that will be caused to marine life, namely southern resident orcas, who are endangered species! Harming an endangered species goes against the rules of the ESA. The sonar noises could have detrimental impacts on marine life. Many scientists hold that these endangered orcas cannot take anymore disturbance; their population is close to collapse.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
O'donnell Ka-1	<p>STOP the sonar testing. It is harming the whales.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
O'donnell Kr-1	<p>To The Navy: Stand Down your Growlers and Underwater Training. It is killing life.</p> <p>Growler Noise is toxic to our health, our environment and economy. Studies show this harms humans, especially children. Real-time measurements taken at Ebey's Reserve near Coupeville show damaging levels of noise, up to 115 decibels—well past the 85-decibel level that begins to cause permanent hearing loss. (National Institutes of Health (nidcd.nih.gov/health/noise-induced-hearing-loss))</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Our water is toxic. Central and South Whidbey islanders have no access to fresh water apart from the aquifer underlying the island. This natural reservoir makes Whidbey Island habitable. One Growler crash could contaminate all of Central Whidbey's water supply and its single-source aquifer. •New studies reveal safe levels of these toxins is a tenth of the current EPA standard. Coupeville water is above the new limits. (https://theintercept.com/2018/02/10/firefighting-foam-afff-pfos-pfoa-epa/)</p> <p>The run way is unsafe: The runway itself is unsafe. The 5,400-foot runway, built prior to 1943 to accommodate aircraft built in the 1940s, is nearly 3,500 feet too short for Growler jet "touch and go" operations, which require 8,800 feet. The runway cannot be extended. For 32 years, the runway has failed to meet Navy runway safety standards.⁸ Thus, the Navy is putting its own pilots in danger by asking them to train on an inadequate runway. •Our pilots should have the best possible training, and the Navy should provide a training site that provides realistic carrier landing and takeoff conditions in a way that does not needlessly endanger pilots or civilians. •A single Growler costs \$85-100 million. These very expensive weapons, paid for by taxpayers, should be deployed in an area equipped to handle their needs. At present, the runway cannot do that.</p> <p>Stand down. Utilize simulators. Fly planes in un-populated areas. Recognize the inner-connection of life. Strive for peace and quiet.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kristi O'Donnell</p>	
Oen-1	<p>There is no proof that the training flights cause any harm to anything or anyone.</p> <p>Keep training and flying! We appreciate the Navy and all you do to keep us safe.</p> <p>THANK YOU!!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>
Oetker-1	<p>Protect the animals!!!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
O'hara A-1	<p>Our military readiness is important, yes, but this training's negative impacts to our region are too great.</p> <p>I support only the NO ACTION proposal. Keep this training in the current training areas or find a less populated area for these trainings.</p> <p>This plan would allow for up to 16 hours a day, 260 days a year (not including training flights to off coast vessels) of flights in the 80-100 dB range, a range that causes hearing loss at continued exposure, and aggravates health.</p> <p>These ~5,000 yearly flights would be over populated areas including Whidbey Island, Port Townsend, and Sequim, as well as over and impacting protected natural land and marine areas including the Olympic National Park, Hoh Rainforest, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, Washington Islands National Refuges.</p> <p>In addition to negatively impacting the quality of life of our residents, and damaging our wild and protected areas, this plan would harm our economy in the form of tourism. Washington State tourism is a \$20B industry, benefiting local businesses, providing jobs, and bringing tax revenue. Much of this tourism involves people visiting the proposed impact area to enjoy peaceful island getaways, fishing, whale watching, or hiking in our national forest. How many will want to spend their holiday (and money) on a getaway that involves 100 dB flights overhead?</p> <p>This proposal involves too much harm to our region at too great a cost, and even if only a year-long test, would cause too much harm to our people, our region, and our economy, the very things our military is supposed to protect.</p> <p>If the current training areas are not sufficient for readiness, then a new plan needs to be developed, that does not impact such a populated and touristed region.</p>	<p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977.</p> <p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
O'hara L-1	<p>There has been research into the effects of sonar on marine creatures. Here following is some information about this: A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas. []</p> <p>"For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival," Calambokidis said. []</p> <p>Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations. []</p> <p>Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times. []</p> <p>Therefore, it is imperative that the Navy should not use or experiment with sonar which could damage the hearing of marine creatures.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Ojeda-1	C'est inacceptable, il faut changer les choses !!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Oliveira-1	I'm 100% against navy sound tests underwater that have been proven to be harmful to sea animals putting their survival in risk. The whole world needs to become more empathetic and respectful of the nature we still have or it is getting too late for the safety of the planet.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Olivier-1	Our environment is crashing and all efforts should be put towards sustaining life of all kinds. These sonar military testing projects will devastate the already fragile sea life we have left in our beautiful Pacific Northwest.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The answer to the world crises is peaceful and respectful living, although it is not like our government is acting. We should have projects that sustain beauty and life for at least the next 7 generations.</p> <p>The number of dead gray whales washing ashore the west coast should be signal enough for the serious problems the planet's sea life is experiencing. We don't want these war games-we want peace games!!! Please no more environmental destruction and death.</p>	<p>EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p>
Olsen-1	<p>I've been visiting the Southern Resident orcas for over 20 years. They are incredible creatures. Right now there is so much noise from tankers. Adding sonar is know to cause death, disorientation, and stranding. There has to be a better way to test. Please find another way without damaging these incredible creatures</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Olson A-1	<p>I am 100% in favor of the No Action Alternative</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Olson D-1	<p>To whom it may concern, I am a child of a military family. I appreciate the intended efforts of the US military, to serve and protect. I also believe that any actions, like sonar testing which is acknowledged for debilitating our marine life, needs to stop. Our marine waters and marine life are just as important to protect as people. We are slowly impacting our ecosystem and it is slowly crippling everyone. Unfortunately, it tends takes loud cries</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	and devastation for awareness and correction. Please refrain from further testing. Thank you and with appreciation.	populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Oltman-1	<p>I want the U.S. Government to protect it's citizens.</p> <p>With the introduction of the EA18 war jets in 2016, life changed here on the Quimper Peninsula.</p> <p>Forty years I have lived here. 16 miles from NAS Ault Field, 10 miles from OLF.</p> <p>Witnessing daily this thoughtless deliberate disregard for my community, the Navy clearly does not seem to be interested in protecting it's own soil, seas, skies, and the air we breathe. We the people are the collateral damage. The Navy refuses to measure what is intolerable and real from the war jets. I invite you to spend a day here, early morning until late evening, five days a week, and experience the true destruction being caused.</p> <p>Invitation open. Please call as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Oltman-2	<p>MR. RICK OLTMAN: Well, where I live in Port Townsend is 10.6 miles as the crow flies from OLF, that's outlying field and (inaudible) -- it's the outlying field where they fly. And I think it's about 16 and a half miles from Abbott Field (sic), and I can hear the jets take off from my house at OLF, and do their flight pattern crystal clear over ten miles away from my house as the crow flies.</p> <p>And I can hear that -- for example, last night up until 10:00 o'clock last night. There's been times when it's been 2:00 in the morning. And then the rest of the day, depending on what's going on between Monday and Friday, I can hear jets take off from Abbott Field towards Discovery Bay, Protection Island area, and they can be either over the top of my house, which is easy to see a jet of course, or they can be 6, 7 miles away in the (inaudible) sea and I can hear them crystal clear because I'm a quarter mile back from the waterfront. And I'm listening to this every single day when they're flying, so I don't miss a jet unfortunately.</p> <p>Um, what else, that's mostly what I want to say. It's actually -- it's totally driving me mad. And it isn't just myself, I have hundreds of neighbors along this perimeter with this noise echoing, and all this started occurring in 2016 I think, when that first jet appeared in our neighborhood.</p> <p>I've lived there since 1979, and this was never part of my life until 2016 when they started changing all the Prowler to the Growler. And so it's like what in the heck is this thing that is just destroying the peace and quiet of one of the most amazing places on Earth. And now we're living with this</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>thing that's flying over our head, probably burning 1300 gallons of fuel on average. And I think they're probably burning anywhere between a million and two million gallons a week of fuel, that would be Island Navy Airbase (sic), and all that stuff is ending up in my community.</p> <p>So, of course I'm not very happy with this because it's -- psychologically it's driving me mad. And I'm going to do everything I can to try to resist this and try to protect my community from this expansion that's occurring. That's -- I really don't know what else to say right at the moment. So, I don't have -- you can stop right there. It's just really sad what's going on here because we're seeing this huge expansion and what I see now is these jets destroying -- we are the collateral damage, our communities.</p>	
Oneill-1	<p>Please cancel the sonar tests scheduled. There must be a better way to conduct these tests that won't do damage to the innocent sea life. They will do irreparable damage to many mammals and other sea life. This test will leave the sea life exposed to it helpless and they will die a slow painful death. PLEASE DO NOT DO IT! Please reconsider.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Ong-1	<p>I am 100% against sonar testing. Please spare a thought for the marine animals! Our future generation does not want to live in a world where we only see whales, dolphins, seals,etc washed ashore on beaches.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Onstott-1	<p>To the United States Navy...a group of good people. You have an obligation to help keep our part of the world safe, that includes the marine and land animals as they are part of us. Our lives depend on the ocean as much as we do bees. These tests are very harmful for any marine life but mostly to our Southern Resident Killer Whales. With the large amounts of deaths amongst MF cetaceans as the sperm whale, many of these sperm whales are ending up on the PNW coast. These tests are sure to pump those numbers up. Your report is very clear that these test noises effect MF</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>cetaceans and with the national knowledge that our SRKW are starving, it is questionable how these tests are having so much debate. A new calf has been born, one that most likely any marine life lover would want to thrive and live a happy full life. Even with all the love and support Orcas have within their family bonds, any defects this baby has is felt through the whole family. If these tests impair its hearing, it will lack the tools it needs to help the family survive. If the eyes have been damaged, that is more work for the struggling elders. They are still foraging for food that is rare to find, any possible injuries to a new calf could have many effects and downfalls for the whole family. There are 2 orcas that have peanut head...even one day more without adequate food will be devastating and may be hard to bounce back from. The SRKW have no leniency on their lives, they need to hear the little food they have everyday. Please think of the long term effects as well as the short term effects these tests offer. SeaWorld killed half this family, their legacy is crap. Our Navy does not symbolize death and destruction from what I understand, but if these tests kill just one SRKW that will be your legacy. If these tests injure or impair any of the orca, the lasting effects will be immeasurable.</p>	<p>Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Opsata-1	<p>Please stop sonar testing. It is hurting and killing marine mammals, causing hearing loss, and hemorrhaging and blood in their inner ears and around their brains. This is not just an assault on animals but to also to the people. In an attempt to protect the people you are hurting the very land we aim to protect.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Orcutt-1	<p>I would like the NW Training and Testing Supplemental EIS Statement to address the substantial effect of the increased noise pollution from increased training over the Olympic Peninsula, Olympic Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas. These areas are renowned for their quiet and pristine environment. This noise pollution will affect all manner of marine mammals which are now theoretically protected by the Marine Sanctuary. The EIS needs to evaluate and mitigate the effects of this added noise. Please review the EIS to address these concerns.</p>	<p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to aircraft noise over the Olympic Peninsula and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary can be found in Chapter 3 and Appendix J of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Orlando-1	<p>Please cease and desist. The scheduled training exercises to be held on June 12, of this year, will negively effect the existing orca population, in the north west. Thank you for your consideration on this matter.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Orr-1	Stop the destruction of our environment with more, louder military jets over national parks and National Reserve lands. All animals and humans are bearing the brunt for the military to save some fuel rather than training in a more desolate area. No more jets. The Navy is not working fairly with local citizens or environmental groups to not raise the number of flights by 400%. Why oh why do they have to plot courses over these national treasures? Why move all the the F18 Growlers to one location in the US where these critical tactical resources are most vulnerable?	The Navy is not proposing to increase Growler flight activity by 400 percent. The decision about where to base EA-18G aircraft goes beyond the scope of this project.
Osburn-1	I attended the meeting at the Red Lion, Arcata, CA on 2 May 2019. I came away very disappointed by the format of small stations in a very noisy room. I found it very hard to hear questions asked by others and the answers given. The separate stations made it difficult to understand how one connected to the other. I believe a presentation given by several different people in different areas of expertise and question periods after each speaker would be more cohesive.	The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.
Osenbach-1	I oppose the expansion of growler flight testing at Whidbey Island NAS. I also oppose any increase in anti-submarine warfare testing and surface ship sonar testing. Proceeding with any of these actions goes directly against advise from legal, environmental, and former military advisers.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Many parts of the beautiful Pacific Northwest are protected in order to provide safe habitat to endangered or protected species unique to our area, such as the Southern Resident You are an important part of our community and it is extremely important that you take that seriously. Please consider doing further environmental impact studies, or heading the advise already provided. Thank you.	minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Ossipova-1	I am AGAINST sonar testing!!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Oswald-1	This testing will harm orcas who depend on and are very sensitive to sound waves	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ottenbacher-1	please dont allow underwater sonar testing, it has been proven to harm underwater marine animals in the Ocean. Please do not do this, we already have enough threats to our marine life with pollution, plastic, predators, and inhumane people like Taiji, Japan who hunt, slaughter and terrorize	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	dolphins and whales. Please our dolphin/whale population is counting on us to protect them	EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Otter-1	Please save the whales and dolphins.. if you continue it will effect them in a horrible way.. like diseases, stranding, desorientated, not finding food, lack of communication with each other.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Overton-1	Underwater sonar testing should not be used due to the hearing loss and damage it causes to marine mammals. How CRUEL and INHUMANE. Shame on you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Overy-1	<p>I'm a 100% disabled veteran and while I understand the navy needs to train and test they dont need to do it where it will harm orcas, whales, and other ocean life.</p> <p>Please move this testing. Please do not use your sonar equipment that harms whales and ocean life. Research and court rulings have been clear about the harm that testing and instruments like these do to ocean life.</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the ships and aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Owen C-1	Please disarm. Please respect native rights and requests. Let's set an example and help the world to cool.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Owen M-1	Please consider our wildlife They are being destroyed	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Owyang-1	Please do not allow the navy to do sonar testing. It is harmful to marine mammals. The southern resident orcas are already endangered and sonar testing will further risk their livelihood. Thank you. Sheryl	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Oxley-1	Just leave them to be wild, free and happy, to live the life they deserve	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Oyler-1	I am asking for NO Navy sonar testing in the Salish Seas as it can damage the hearing of the critically endangered southern resident orcas. Please do not conduct the testing in those oceans. Thank you	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Ozkan-1	i dont agree	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
P		
Pace-1	As someone who lives in the Puget Sound Region and cares deeply about marine health, I cannot support sonar testing in our waters. This is a grave endangerment to already endangered marine mammal species and could cause ecological crisis. Please conduct experiments elsewhere in dead zones, or the great lakes (where there are no species that would be endangered by these tests) Thank you	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the ships and aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Pacifico-1	Many scientific researches appoint to the fact that submarine explosions have a very negative impact on cetaceans and marine life in general. These explosions disrupt their orientation system, making them loose family and	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	territory. Marine creatures are already suffering from a wide variety of threats caused by humans, do we really need to also go throwing bombs on their habitat? We are all seeing the poor animals stranded by the thousands on beaches all over the planet... Please be responsible and do what's right for our Earth and its incomparable nature. Thanks and regards.	Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Pacioretty-1	I am 100% opposed to the use of sonar and and testing as is being used and proposed by US Navy and other affiliates. It has been proven to be harmful to marine life, which many species populations are already and great risk.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Page-1	Stop sonar testing, it's dumb	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Pagnoni-1	Stop sonar testing	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Pain-1	Hello I wish to register my objection to disturbance of marine life from underwater sonar testing. This is a cruel interference into their natural world which severely impacts their behaviours and ability to survive. They need protection to merely survive.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Paladino-1	In the 2019, when the information runs at the Internet speed and it's broadly available to ANYONE, is utterly unacceptable that tests and activities clearly lethal to our planet are yet allowed... don't let the power of money lead your sensibility. Fight against this filthy mechanism! React!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Pan-1	I'm a seasonal employee at Kalaloch Lodge, having worked here last summer and returning this year. I'm living on-property with my partner. We are hearing jet fighters daily! The military is transforming what's known as the quietest place in America to a grotesque, discomfoting experience. Today, the jet fighters were so close to the ground that objects in our home started rattling. We went outside to see a neighbor also went outside to check on the noise. Looking up, we saw three (3) jet fighters in the sky! It was and continues to be nerve-racking to not know why this is happening. Are there war games taking place? Are we in imminent danger? We have unresolved questions while the noise is impacting our daily lives.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year. When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context: 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>averaged over a 365-day year).</p> <p>3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day.</p> <p>4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.</p>
Pang-1	Please do not further underwater sonic testing!! These sounds harm our marine ecosystem, damaging the sensitive hearing systems especially of echolocating animals and often lead to their demise. What you are doing is as much a violence as directly attacking these animals with guns & knives. We've already fished out oceans to the brink, it is absolutely unacceptable to continue the assault as though nothing were happening.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Pansini-1	The Orcas have a hard enough time finding food in the PNW. The last thing they need is more unnecessary disruption from humans. There is an entire Ocean available to the Navy - pick another spot and give the Orcas some space! I am 100% against your underwater sonar testing! Go elsewhere!	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Parden-1	Please do not do the sonar testing - it's is harmful to the dolphins and whales and causes them harm.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Park G-1	I would hope that the US stays true to its status as an upholder of ethics for all animals of the globe, of which we are one	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Park H-1	Dumping toxic waste to the waters of piglet sound is unacceptable.	The Navy's proposed activities do not include dumping of any materials. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.
Park J-1	There is NO military testing that is more important than the impact on the biology and the environment, especially when it is avoidable. The critically endangered Southern Resident Orcas and all the Salish Sea Marine inhabitants are in harms way from your practices. It has already been proved that underwater sonar testing causes harm to marine animals, and yet you continue. A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated 11,233 harbor porpoises live in these water along with 76 Southern Resident Orcas. These animals use sound extensively, and you are limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies. You are causing temporary and permanent hearing loss to thousands of animals, on top of potential impacts we are not even aware of. Not only is this cruel and unnecessary, it's will further throw off the ecological balance.	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Parks J-1	I'm 100% against underwater sonar practicing in the Salish Sea and it needs to stop. The Navy has openly admitted such practices causes hearing loss for all marine mammals. The critically endangered orcas of the southern resident pods are struggling to survive and thrive, sonar prevents them to hunt and eat which they spend 96% of their day doing. They are starving and the navy is part of the problem. Sonar also causes them to be in distress and in pain, the Navy needs to stop with the sonar especially since we've just confirmed a new baby from the J-Pod and this baby really needs	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	to get to adulthood. No more underwater sonar practicing, I can't stand the sound and know it is 100 times worse for marine life.	Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Parks N-1	<p>I vehemently oppose the Navy's plan for weapons testing and training, proposed to begin in 2020 in Puget Sound, along with coastal waters from northern California through Washington state, and Alaska. The scale of proposed air combat maneuvers, submarine tracking and detection exercises, electronic warfare practice, mine training, torpedo testing and extensive use of sonar would inevitably have enormous and unacceptable impacts--observed or not--on marine mammals, other sealife, and the ocean itself.</p> <p>It seems ludicrous to believe that computer modelling of the responses of marine mammals--living beings constantly on the move in highly variable waters subject to endlessly changing conditions--could reasonably be expected to achieve credible results. Did the Navy employ super-computers and a slew of experts and expend millions of taxpayer dollars to do this? I would think not, yet the public and NMFS is meant to be seriously persuaded by the numbers.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the Navy's data compiled for its application to the National Marine Fisheries Service for permits to "do incidental harm to marine mammals" hint at the shocking impacts from the proposed sonar testing: more than 750,000 "Behavioral responses," some 522,000 incidents of "temporary hearing loss," and about 1,400 occurrences of "permanent hearing loss".</p> <p>The Navy and the NMFS, with their combined centuries of research on marine mammals hardly need reminding of the absolutely essential role sound plays in the survival of marine mammals. Permanent hearing loss is a death sentence for marine mammals, and "temporary" (how long is that??) loss can likewise be lethal. The euphemism "accidental takings" cannot disguise the virtual certainty that tens, even hundreds of thousands of animals will die gruesomely from Navy personnel practicing their weapons on our marine life. IF ANOTHER NATION'S FORCES ARRIVED IN U.S. AIR SPACE AND NATIONAL WATERS AND PERPETRATED SUCH ASSAULTS, IT WOULD BE CONSIDERED AN ACT OF WAR!</p> <p>Like other citizens, I am grateful for military protection of our country and I understand that requires a certain level of "readiness". My father is a decorated WW2 Navy veteran, and my husband an Air Force Vet. But we</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marin-species-monitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	are not in a physical state of war, and yet the majority of U.S. Pacific waters are virtually under siege by Growler jets and Navy ships! The Navy has received hundreds of thousands of comments and messages from the public, protesting the scale and intensity of Navy war weapons testing, yet every EIS and permit application pertinent to Pacific expansion has passed review, with no compromises, no scaling back, no acknowledgement of the burdens endured by humans, wildlife, and other helpless entities. And what about you, Navy employee reading this comment (assuming someone IS reading and tabulating this)?? How does it feel to work for a public agency that makes a mockery of Americans' right to public review and appeal of policies? Do you want your children and grandchildren to be able to experience the presence, grandeur, and mystery of marine mammals and a healthy ocean? If the Navy continues the intensity and scope of its death tactics in our oceans and seas, in the face of so many other threats to ocean life, that possibility may dwindle into dust.	
Parks S-1	It is vital that the multiple environmental concerns for both human being and the wider landscape be taken into account in the decisions being made about flight training in the Whidbey and Northwest Region. The present plan degrades the primary features that make this region a part of a great America. It is unlikely that if the consequences of the current plans had been evaluated in relationship to alternative sites that the decisions would have proceeded in the ways that they have. All who hold responsibility for the governance and safety of our region and nation must take responsibility and exercise the leadership and courage to make better, more strategic, and wiser choices.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Paropkari-1	A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas. □ “For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival,” Calambokidis said. □ Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy’s calculations. □ Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a “behavioral reaction” (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Parr-1	Sonar testing leads to the death of whales and marine life and therefore I am opposed to sonar testing by the US Navy in the Salish Sea. Please stop it.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Parr-2	Navy sonar is having a devastating effect on whales and all marine life which is unacceptable. Please change your practices.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Paskewitz-1	I vote no on sonar testing as it will effect the whales in our community	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Paterek-1	Happy Climate Change Happy Global Warming Your grandchildren will have grandchildren	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Patino-1	Sonar testing is destroying marine life. Those tests need to stop all together. For good.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Patrick-1	It's so sad to see thousands of these beautiful creatures being killed in the oceans Ingrid Alpha Just let them know how sad it is to see thousands of these beautiful creatures being killed in the oceans around the world because of sonar testing. It's their home the sea not ours to destroy! the world because of sonar testing. It's their home the sea not ours to destroy!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Patterson B-1	Please do not partake in any sonar or other tests that can/would interfere with the development and livelihood of our Southern Resident Orcas. Their wellbeing is being compromised by anything that interferes with their sonar and abilities to find chinook salmon. I understand the importance of testing but am hopeful there can be a compromise and other locations in which to continue with Naval operations. We are in a tenuous situation and we must provide an optimum environment in which our orcas need to survive.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Patterson Sa-1	I am against this further project proposed by the navy. Although I was unable to attend the presentation on fri may 3rd, I heard how badly it was organized in that it was very disjointed.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Patterson Su-1	Please put a stop to underwater sonar testing in the Salish Sea and surrounding areas. This area is home to at least 11,233 harbor porpoises	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	and 76 ENDANGERED Southern Resident Orcas. These beautiful animals use their sense of hearing to not only feed themselves but also for sense of direction which affects their breeding habits and ability to survive. These animals are prone to suffer total hearing loss which would leave them disoriented and in harms way. Who are we to sacrifice their lives for the possibility of protecting ours.	and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Patti-1	I am writing this to voice my choice to protect the Wales from the harm the navy will cause if this exercise is done. I see no benefit and only Harm if the Navy is to proceed.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Patton-1	I believe sonar testing is harmful for environment. It affects marine life whales & dolphins, confuses them, causes strandings, and death. This is a senseless, harmful use of the tax payers dollars. The grey whale migration has been impacted and will see more impact if the Navy continues this. Upsetting the balance of marine life will impact human life. Also sonar emits 235-decibel pressure waves of unbearable metallic sounds. The vibrations can rupture lungs and cause brain hemorrhage.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Patwell-1	We have enough weapons to kill everyone many times over, but our wildlife is endangered. Stop killing our wildlife!!!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Paul-1	<p>Using studies conducted as far back as 1984 as source material for your EIS/OEIS draft is wholly unacceptable. So far this year, 70 gray whales washed ashore on the west coast, five times the average rate. NOAA has declared a wildlife emergency. The SEIS at 3.4.282 states that "military expended materials will sink to the ocean floor". At 3.4.302 the SEIS states that "for the most part," this material will be ingested by bottom feeders, Gray whales are bottom feeders. The SEIS needs to take into account the already stressed gray whale population. Scientific studies have shown that explosives and SONAR are detrimental to marine animals. For whales and dolphins, listening is the way they see and communicate and is integral to their survival. Under these circumstances, will the Navy provide updated studies in the OEIS reflecting the current crisis? Until NOAA's study on the die-off on the Gray Whales is complete shouldn't any disruption of the ocean by sonar and explosive activity be halted?</p> <p>https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/gray-whales-stranded-west-coast-1.5119056</p> <p>https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533</p> <p>The economic considerations are well-stated in the letter of opposition to sonar testing off the coast of Mendocino County by the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors in their letter to you dated April 21, 2019. To paraphrase: sonar and explosive testing off the Mendocino coast is detrimental to the fragile oceanic ecosystem on which we rely. The wide variety of sea life is a key economic source for our county and must not be damaged in any way.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy uses the most current marine mammal population data available from the National Marine Fisheries Service. The 2008 and 2010 references cited in the comment were not used by the Navy to determine current populations.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Will you please slow down this process to allow enough time for current scientific data to be added to your SEIS?	
Paulsen-1	Navy needs to be a better neighbor. Not good fit in this pristine part of America with their noise, pollution, lowering quality of life for both people and especially whales in the surrounding sea.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Paulson-1	<p>I have attended several of your public meetings and have always come away dispirited and unconvinced that the Navy can, in any substantive way, mitigate the damage and carnage to marine species caused by sonar testing. Its interference with mating (and other) calls, disruption at foraging sites, disorientation and the potential for panic-induced decompression sickness/death in some species are just a few of the critical problems associated with these types of testing.</p> <p>Other marine biologists not associated with the Navy have said the reduction in reproductive rates caused by such activity is an invisible reality as it leaves no bodies behind. And that current estimates of whale populations are +/- 50%; that's how little is actually known of their true numbers.</p> <p>Your mitigations are inadequate. Lookouts would be a laughable solution if it weren't actually tragic, when, perforce, so much of their lives and activities are outside of, and below our view. As for acoustic tracking, your own literature acknowledges they must be vocalizing for it to be effective.</p> <p>All of these invasions, physical and acoustic, are wrought on species who have no choice or agency in the matter - they cannot read our maps or minds - our "safe" zones are not necessarily theirs.</p> <p>In a world now set firmly on a path to soon lose 1 million species of plants</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	and animals due to our idiocy regarding fossil fuel consumption and willful ignorance of the magnitude of the climate alteration about to break on us, it seems incredibly shortsighted, inhumane and indeed, evil.to deliberately undertake actions that will so negatively impact and hasten the demise of so many other orders of being. They have much to teach us - too bad we're so bent on playing with our toys, defending against exactly whom? and strewing agony, displacement and death in our wake. Soon we'll see whales only in marine parks, sea turtles on souvenir coffee cups, penguins in cartoons and on kids' pajamas. For what? "Safety" in a world that destroys itself is not safety at all. We are dismantling creation and the Navy is a chief participant.	
Pavesi-1	Please end the sonar testing and training activities. It is extraordinarily painful for our co-earthlings. #DoNoHarm	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Payne-1	The Navys' idea That they can bomb and practice with torpedoes, and use sonar underwater like it doesn't matter MUST END NOW!!! Bombing our only planet near earthquake fault lines can only be seen as psychopathic! Hurting the animals created to be here alongside us in any way is an absolute atrocity. Wake up you who think you do what you do to protect when you are the destroyers. You need to protect the earth and it's animals not the war loving fear mongering politicians you have believed. Wake up wake up wtf UP!!!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Pedigo-1	Our governor is going to run for president under a platform of reducing climate change and protecting the Orca whales. I have written him asking how can he deal with climate change when one of the largest producers of greenhouse gas is practicing at the NW corner of his state. I also question the veracity of protecting the Orca's and many other species, endangered or not, when, again, the same perpetrator above, of so much environmental destruction is allowed to operate unimpeded? The present excuse of the military to operate as it has is it is protecting us	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	(which is a lie as it has simply painted a big bulls eye on our area). My question how valuable is that 'protection' when it undermines the natural environment that is the force of all life on this planet? My late partner asked her 2nd graders a question; which is more important people or dirt? We need to get our priorities straight and put the natural environment (dirt) at the top of the list. Military activities should, at best, come second.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Pellizzari-1	END SONAR TESTINGNOW	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Penley-1	Underwater sonar testing has been proven to cause harm to marine animals yet you continue to do it! Our marine life has enough to contend with (plastic, ocean warming, busy shipping lines etc.) without being deafened and disoriented by your sonar testing ending all to often in their death. Please stop all your testing and give whales, dolphins and all other marine life a chance to survive!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Pennington-1	Everyone knows how sonar is important to navy, BUT the living beings in the ocean can't protect themselves from human disrespect. Please please find another way another area of vast ocean to do your work. Leave the whales and others alone to live as God Almighty intended or you will find yourself answering to Him. Guaranteed!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Penty-1	I am a canadian citizen living in Victoria on canadian soil. I can feel the sound of the growler jets in my chest while sitting inside my home. I know whitby island is close to Vancouver island, but I'm not sure how you're allowed to pollute canadian airspace and soil with that much noise. Its reasonable to hear jet sounds if you're on island beach across the water from the base, but the noise and vibration of the jets are invading people's homes.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Percival-1	<p>PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY THE HABITAT FOR MANY MARINE ANIMALS WITH EXTENSIVE SONAR TESTING!</p> <p>As reported in the Seattle Times: "Many marine animals rely on sound to communicate, locate food, avoid predators and navigate. Exposure to sound could change their behavior, said John Calambokidis, a research biologist and founder of Cascadia Research Collective. Intense or repeated exposure to certain frequencies of sonar could also affect animals' ability to hear sounds in those ranges, he said.</p> <p>THOSE HIGH FREQUENCIES SOUNDS ARE ENOUGH TO DRIVE ANY BEING INSANE!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Perea-1	Knowing how sonar impacts ocean life and continueing to use it is wreckless and careless. We must coexist with all creatures in the chain of life. A broken chain is a weak chain that will impact humans in detrimental ways. Wise up and stop using sonar!	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Peregrine-1	<p>I'm sorry, but no matter how much you sugar-coat your new war-games off my coast here in N. Mendocino County, I oppose them...I have been a whale watcher here for over 50 years. We cannot assume that these mammals are lesser than humans. They have extraordinary senses, and damaging them is not acceptable. I'm sure you know that 9 whales have been found dead in the Bay Area recently.</p> <p>The ocean is a unique habitat for thousands of creatures, many of which are already stressed to the point of diminishing populations. We need to be working on restoration, not further damage. May you put your unlimited funds & people-power into preservation of habitats & species, not contribute further to the decimation. You can & could do this - we need to shift our priorities at this time!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Person-1	Please don't destroy our marine life with your sonar and weapons testing. Just no. You know it's wrong. You know animals will be killed for no good reason besides somebody making money. Just don't.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Persson-1	☹️☹️☹️☹️☹️	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Peters-1	<p>The proposed training area has, as of April 15, 2019, been closed to commercial dungeness crab fishing to prevent entanglements with marine mammals. This is causing great economic hardship to local fishermen. High intensity Navy sonar has been proven to cause serious harm to the same marine mammals that are being protected by the crab fishing closure. It makes no sense to close the fishery to protect the whales only to have Navy sonar continue to do damage to the whales. I am not protesting the fishery closure but I am protesting the Navy's use of the same area causing counterproductive results.</p> <p>Hopefully, with the whole Pacific Ocean to work with, the Navy could find a less disruptive area to do its training.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1 - Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the ships and aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Petersky-1	<p>With our oceans already under degradation due to global climate chaos, the Navy's plan to release 20,000 tons of environmental pollutants, including heavy metals and depleted uranium, into the coastal waters of the U.S. Pacific Northwest is irresponsible.</p> <p>I am concerned that the mid-range sonar frequency that is most often used in testing will be harmful to marine mammals. We are already putting our local whale and orca populations under high stress.</p> <p>Further, I am requesting the U.S. Navy use its considerable resources to avoid flying over the Olympic National park, and instead train in other designated military areas. The unique qualities of Olympic have been recognized as a national park, wilderness area, International Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Site. Warplanes do not belong above one of the most quiet, wild and protected areas in the country. Please use a training alternative that would avoid noise over and around the Olympic Peninsula.</p> <p>Thank you for recognizing my concerns.</p>	<p>The Navy does not propose the use of ordnance containing depleted uranium. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft and ships are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Petersmark-1	<p>My favorite moments are out in nature.</p> <p>My finances depend on our natural spaces and National Parks.</p> <p>My health depends on cascadia and the salish sea.</p> <p>I am a hiking guide who has the privilege of accompany people, some for the first time in their lives, to our National Parks. Every trip we take a moment to appreciate the beauty and silence that we can only found out in nature. And then that moment, every time, is interrupted by an airplane overhead.</p> <p>Sound and light pollution are just as volatile as litter to our natural</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	ecosystems. I see firsthand the impact we are having on those ecosystems as we infiltrate them with our pollution more and more. Please consider the impact that will be made on our LIFE sustaining ecosystems for the sake of military training. As a proud citizen of this country, I cannot standby as we cripple the health of our future for short term gains.	
Peterson-1	The U. S. Navy has made our house in Coupeville virtually uninhabitable. Now the Navy intends to bring this excruciating mind-numbing noise to the quietest place on earth, our beautiful Olympic National Park. There are other training options that do not involve turning our peaceful park into a war zone. If the reader of this comment does not think this is a "substantive comment," then that reader is clearly neither a hiker nor a person who appreciates the intrinsic value of beauty in the natural world. The Navy is currently being sued for scraping tons of paint off an aircraft carrier and dumping it into Puget Sound. Come on, Navy! Be a patriot! Show that you give a care for the citizens you are supposed to be protecting. My father was an Army pilot. He's buried in the Willamette National Cemetery. He loved the Pacific Northwest and would be appalled at what the Navy is doing to the environment of Washington State.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Pether-1	The marine life that live in this area would suffer greatly. Particularly the Southern Resident Orcas who are already under siege from lack of food, pollution such as oil, etc and noise pollution and then all the people wanting to go sight seeing to see orcas. To put these animals under further stress with this assault on their senses would be detrimental to their health and survival. An orca calf was born recently. These calves haven't survived lately due to all the things mentioned about. Please don't let this be the SR orcas' swan song. Thank you.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Pether-2	The Southern Resident Orcas are already under threat from lack of food, pollution and noise. The sonar noise from the navy is significantly increasing their likelihood of long term survival. Orcas need their hearing to survive. The Navy knows sonar damages the hearing if the orcas so why use it? These SR orcas need protection, not more assault! The science is there -	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	sonar damages the orcas hearing. The Navy should stop using sonar now. It doesn't make sense!!! The Navy is polluting the orcas home with sonar that's deafening. This must stop now. Thanks	3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Petti-1	This public comment is being submitted in regards to the US Navy's Northwest Training and Testing plans. The environmental impact report for this notes the use of live ammunition and sonar bursts. Sonar and live ammunition technology is incredibly detrimental to marine life. The coastline is immensely important for an array of reasons, not only limited to marine life. Multiple governmentally recognized indigenous Tribes have deep spiritual and cultural connections to this region. There is no actual need for this training and testing to happen on the coast, or specifically in that area. Carrying out these actions would result in devastation to a very delicate ecosystem that serves as a hub for a unique diversity of life, as well as harm the culture and spirituality of the surrounding communities. I remain opposed to the Navy's training and testing activities. The Navy's future activists must be carried out in a more considerate and protective way towards environmental, cultural, and spiritual aspects of the area that is being effected.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Philbin-1	The Southern Resident Killer Whales are a critically endangered population of an icon symbol of the Pacific Northwest. They currently face threats from toxins, vessel noise and lack of prey availability. We don't need to introduce more stress on this critically endangered population. Give them the space and peace they deserve. I am against US Navy sonic testing in the Salish Sea. This is an unacceptable and harmful practice that endangers all marine life. I don't not support the US Navy's plan to conduct sonic testing in the Salish Sea. Listen to the people of the Pacific Northwest, this is our home, the whales are our people.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Phillips Dan-1	I am absolutely against the Navy doing sonar testing in the Salish Sea!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Phillips Dar-1	If the oceans die, we die.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Phipps-1	I am totally against sonar testing.It is harmful to sea mammals and must stop! NO TO SONAR TESTING.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Pine-1	<p>I have lived in Port Townsend Wa. for 28 years and the noise from the Growler aircraft is much louder than previous aircraft. The pollution in the form of hydrocarbon emissions is intolerable and also disregarded by the Navy.</p> <p>The number of growlers and associated aircraft which make up an expeditionary force puts our communities at risk for a first strike nuclear war. That is not acceptable !</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The marine life that is being damaged by sonar, bombs, electronic warfare weapons and naval activity is not fully realized by the navy. That is also not acceptable.</p> <p>The Navy's noise studies are a farce and they know it ! You say we need to make substantive comments? When you make up your own studies and lie to the people who pay your salaries why should we be required to play by your rules?</p> <p>You are destroying the drinking water on Whidbey Island and your only recourse is to provide bottled water to the people living there!</p> <p>When you are done playing war games here (I pray for that day) and walk away leaving us to clean up your toxic mess then we will become another blip on your radar screen as you look for another host to latch onto and infect.</p> <p>Your attempt to green wash your misdeeds and present yourself as a good neighbor are laughable!</p> <p>Finally I would like to say that some day you will receive the same treatment that you are inflicting on the world and when that happens you will know what karma is. Your ability to lie and deceive the public is astounding and unfortunately very successful.</p> <p>As I lay awake at night and listen to the horrific noise your planes create,EVERY NIGHT, I think back to pre growler times and am truly thankful that I got to live here then and witnessed a time of relative quiet! Here's hoping for a Naval free future for us all.</p> <p>Jay Pine</p>	<p>minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Pinette-1	<p>I'm 100% Against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. ☐</p> <p>A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas. ☐</p> <p>"For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival," Calambokidis said.☐</p> <p>Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations.☐</p> <p>Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times. ☐</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Pinneo-1	<p>Alternative 1 seems the best one, but only with significant new restrictions (not present in the draft EIS) to protect whales.</p> <p>The US Navy should voluntarily limit all active sonar and explosive training and testing within Puget Sound and other enclosed waters (eg Straits of Juan de Fuca) to the minimum duration and intensity necessary to achieve training / testing. Active sonar & explosions should also be deconflicted to locations and periods of minimum marine mammal activity / residency, to avoid disrupting, injuring, or killing marine mammals - specifically whales and dolphins. This minimization should also apply to known migration / resident routes offshore, during the periods of known migration. Species of special concern (resident orca, beaked whales, right whales, and blue whales) should receive preferential deconfliction.</p> <p>The EIS should include all known migration / residency periods of those marine mammals, as the general statements made in the draft do not provide sufficient data to assess if the Navy has provided maximum deconfliction in Alternatives 1 or 2.</p> <p>The Navy has not acknowledged that active sonar not only disrupts but also kills whales, per the draft EIS page 3.4-85: " These effects could hypothetically extend from physical injury or trauma to a behavioral or stress response that may or may not be detectable. Injury (physical trauma) can occur to organs or tissues of an animal (Section 3.4.2.1.1.1, Injury)... " The words "could hypothetically" should be removed.</p> <p>And the Navy has not fully mitigated this existential threat to whales even after judicial restrictions were enforced in some locations (2016, Channel Islands, 2nd source below).</p> <p>There a growing body of evidence linking mass whale deaths to naval active sonar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2006/04/060428094046.htm; - https://ceobs.org/the-other-war-against-whales/: "In 2016, the Ninth Circuit court ruled in favour of the NRDC and the other challengers. In its decision, the three-judge panel found that the lead government agency had unlawfully ignored reasonable safeguards recommended by the government's own scientists to reduce or prevent harm from the sonar system, resulting in a 'systematic under-protection of marine mammals' throughout 'most of the oceans of the world'. It found, among other things, that protecting marine mammal habitat from Navy sonar is 'of paramount importance' under the law." - https://www.nrdc.org/experts/michael-jasny/us-navy-implicated-new-mass-stranding-whales 	<p>The alternatives carried forward meet the Navy's purpose and need to ensure that it can fulfill its obligation under U.S.C. Title 10. As explained in Section 2.5 (Alternatives Development) of the EIS/OEIS, the range of alternatives considered by the Navy must be reasonable alternatives. To be reasonable, an alternative must meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. A curtailment or reduction in the number of training and testing activities would not meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, and would therefore be unreasonable.</p> <p>Regarding aircraft mishaps, non-anticipated accidents or emergencies are not included in the NEPA analysis.</p> <p>The details of marine mammal migration/residency periods is found in Section 3.4.1. The Navy considered this information in its analysis of impacts from sonar and explosives.</p> <p>The language in Section 3.4.2.1 quoted in the comment is correct as written. No change is necessary.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Naval commanders considering "national security exceptions" to the planned alternative should publicly identify and justify the threat that requires non-mitigated active sonar or explosive activity. It is not enough that the US Navy maintain defensive and offensive advantage over potential adversaries - they must do so without unnecessarily destroying the life in the oceans they sail.	
Pirani-1	Please do not conduct sonar testing near the hunting waters of the Southern Resident Orca population. These orcas are already in the decline due to lack of food supply, caused by us humans. Conducting these tests will have an awful impact on these whales, especially the two in the pod with rapidly declining health due to starvation. If sonar testing is absolutely necessary, please conduct it elsewhere!	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Pirttilahti-1	Minusta ihmisten tulee kunnioittaa luontoa ja sen eläimiä. Ääni, mikä kuuluu sonarista meressä on kauhea. Kuinka kukaan voi kuvitella, että sellaista ääntä pitää merten eläinten, herkkien delfiinien ja valaiden kuunnella? Minusta armeijan ei tule muutoinkaan testata mitään alueilla, missä on eläimiä tai ihmisiä. Video jonka näin, tekee pahaa itsellenikin, herkkänä ihmisenä. Miettikää, jos itse joutuisitte kuuntelemaan samaa kimakkaa ääntä kodissanne? Lopettakaa, ihmisen ei tarvitse olla osa merta, mutta eläinten pitää. Riittää, että jätteet syydetään mereen, ei enää enempää melusaastetta. Olen myös sitä mieltä, että suuret valas- ja delfiinkuolemat johtuvat pitkälti laivaliikenteestä ja juuri armeijan toimista. Pyydän vielä, lopettakaa, olkaa inhimillisiä. Kirjoitan tämän suomeksi, syystä, että olen suomalainen ja yhtä huolissani kaikista maailman meristä kuin Suomea ympäröivistä. Video link: https://www.facebook.com/PNWProtectors/videos/vb.137665943575419/422289918354459/?type=2&theater	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Pizza-1	You've got to stop this insanity of the sonar testing going on when they're killing and harming and causing deafness and disorientation and inability to communicate and upset within their entire pods of all mammals, the whales the dolphins the killer whales, everyone!!!! This is insanity and this	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	is upsetting to all of us and this is a crime, this Hass to be stopped -I this is unacceptable! There are other ways to do this that do not harm our marine mammal life! We all care and you need to as well and you need to stop this now !!!!!!!!!	EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Plant-1	The cetaceans in the Salish sea are already suffering enough noise pollution, amongst other threats such as ship strikes, entanglements and malnourishment. Give these animals a break, do not begin sonar testing. Imagine having to deal with that in your world. It's torture.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Plocher-1	No testing should be done that harms sea animals in any way. Testing should be pursued via simulations or bodies of water that do not have sea creatures in them (e.g. Salt Lake). Imagine what impact it would have if a human being were subjected to this kind of testing. Sea animals need to have same rights of humane treatment.	The Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, see the discussion in Section 2.4.1.4 (Simulated Training and Testing Only) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that discusses the need for live training specifically for aircrews.
Plott-1	Please stop using sonar. It hurts all kinds of mammals. Please stop.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Plumley-1	Please stop the sonar testing. It is severely damaging marine life	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Podzalne-1	I'm concerned for the health and safety of marine mammals, whose sensitivity to sonar and other percussive disturbances we know causes permanent damage and even death. Many of these creatures are already suffering serious population declines and face a host of challenges from overfishing and pollution. I realize tests are necessary, but I ask they be kept to a minimum and be performed far away from at risk marine mammals. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Pohl-1	<p>The EIS is failing to take into consideration the total footprint of impact and is only focused on the deployment site. A recent Study by Lauren Kuehne Research Scientist University of Washington measured and tracked noise profiles in the Olympic National Park area just outside the Impact area. a 1200 fold increase from the baseline of noise in the area was recorded as a result of increased air traffic noise. 85 percent of the recorded noise came from military aircraft correlated to the activity from Ault field. The Navy should be required to expand the EIS to include the Olympic National Park as well as the flyways over which they operate, not just their target area. Furthermore the studies show the following for consideration:</p> <p>However, based on reviews of literature it is understood that negative health effects of unwanted noise begin to manifest (typically as annoyance and related stress responses) in humans when levels rise above 40 db(A) (21). Concentration, memory, cognition, and mental health status can be impaired when noise levels reach 40 - 55 db(A) (20–23). Levels above 55 db(A) are associated with serious cardiovascular health effects, including hypertension, stroke, and risk of ischemic heart disease (20, 21). When noise is experienced in wilderness areas, perception and psychological effects of disturbance can be exacerbated based on the expectation of quiet (24, 25), as well as intermittence and lack of predictability of events (26). Vulnerability to detrimental impacts of noise is believed to vary across individuals and groups (e.g., higher impacts on children and elderly), but these relationships are only poorly documented at present (20).</p> <p>A majority of the research related to noise and wildlife has recently been summarized by Shannon et al. 2016, which documents the diverse consequences of noise disturbance from 119 studies on birds, mammals, fish, reptiles and amphibians, and invertebrates. These documented</p>	<p>The Navy has expanded the noise analysis to include the transit of aircraft to and from the Olympic MOA.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment.</p> <p>The Navy reviewed Shannon et al. 2015, which documents the effects of noise on wildlife, summarizing numerous articles on varied species. The analysis conducted by the Navy was specific to species, so those specific research articles are referenced in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, not the summary provided by Shannon et al. 2015.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	impacts include: avoidance of noisy areas, changes in behavior, increased physiological stress, reduced reproductive success, declines in abundance and occupancy of sites, and changes in species communities and interactions. Research at community and ecosystem scales has demonstrated that noise disturbance can result in shifts in entire bird communities (11, 12) and even alter and disrupt ecosystem functions (13). Although studies that examine impacts on fitness (vs. behavior) of animal are rarer, at least four studies document reductions in breeding success of birds due to different types of noise disturbance (14–16).	
Pohl-2	An omission in the EIS that has yet to be addressed. This is regarding the details of CO2 Emissions as well as other climate change inducing gases. Studies have shown that the impact of the increased Growler activity will be greater than the Island County and San Juan county (including Washington Ferry Systems) total. Reporting is required by Washington State RCW 70.235.020 and HB 1110 - 2019-20 Reducing the greenhouse gas emissions associated with transportation fuels are not being addressed. See attached for more information.	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area. There was no attachment included with this comment.
Pohl-1	Will you please obtain comments from Whidby Island residents and Naval Air station pilots and personnel? I am happy knowing the Olympic Peninsula is protected in the event of a terrorist attack. Maybe these folks who cannot endure Growler noise may want to relocate out of Washington State. I put up with the temporary noise. I watched a fighter bomber jet do a mock sorte' bomb/rocket attack on the Clallam County courthouse watch tower in early 2000 or so. It came screaming close to the tower then headed back to Whidby Island. Thank you for protecting our country.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Poirier-1	Please stop practicing your sonar system near any marine life. Specifically, the Orca Whale's ecosystem is so fragile and once it's threatened and gone, lives can never be replaced!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Poole-1	The danger posed to marine life by the proposition of us sonar is ludicrous and unnecessary. Any approval of this would ruin entire ecosystems and quality of life.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Pope-1	I hope studies have been done and not just a thoughtless decision to do this. You know the Southern Resident Orcas reside in the Salish Sea and are endangered. How can this be done in an area with an endangered species? Cant a test be done further out to sea? Think this through!!!!	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the ships and aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Porter B-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I come from a military family and have supported the Navy since moving here in the late 80's, but no longer... • The Navy is destroying the special nature and environment of Whidbey Island and surrounding communities with their unconstrained, day and night Growler flights. They are systematically and deliberately harming the communities they are supposed to protect. And they don't care enough even to listen to us anymore. • The Growlers and their brain-scrambling, conversation-ruining sound tsunamis are INTOLERABLE. The sound is BRUTAL, relentless and harmful to health, hearing, environment, property values, and to our families. • Example: We cannot have our 1-year-old grandson visit and subject him to sound levels of >110 dB (comparable to a chainsaw with no hearing protection- imagine it or come to hear and experience it for yourself!) You 	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>are welcome to visit us when they fly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My wife is undergoing chemotherapy; rest and sleep are impossible, even with windows closed, when the Navy decides to fly whenever and wherever they want. • We cannot schedule our lives with so little notice; they make abrupt changes to their schedule and we have to just shut up and endure it! • The Navy is clearly trying to deceive the people, congress and themselves by using a deliberately misleading and dishonest computer model, using time-averaged sound values to hide the truth. This would never survive a moment in the scientific literature- the Navy chose to average the much longer times of our quiet community with their excruciatingly intense flights and concluded, there is no problem. Ridiculous. This is a deliberate, self-serving attempt at deception. We need real time area-wide scientifically-sound noise monitoring with violations linked to action to stop this community battering. • Other than leaving, there is no escaping the penetrating auditory trauma. We cannot be in our garden, be outside or enjoy walks without ear plugs and noise cancelling earphones. If caught outside and away from home without them, such as in a kayak, your ears will ring for hours. This means your hearing was damaged. • The planes fly very low and loud over schools, hospitals and towns. They are often only 150 feet above the trees, and right over our homes. And there are multiple eagle nests in the trees that they fly 150 feet above; I have photos of a close encounter with two eagles during a training exercise. • Our property values will drop. They are scaring away tourists! We and others have had vacation rental cancellations for potential visitors- this affects our personal finances as well as the community economy which depends so much on tourism. <p>The Navy has chosen to disconnect from the community and do what they wish, with no accountability to these communities. They continue to expand the Growlers as they wish. There are alternatives, but they don't want to even discuss them... they don't care...</p>	
Porter L-1	<p>I have only one thing to say ... STOP all sonar and explosives actions !! It has now been proven that this harms and kills our sea creatures ... Our oceans are in crisis, and what you are doing, and have been doing for years is totally unacceptable</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Porter R-1	I strongly disapprove of the Navy proposal to fly 5000 Growler jets over the Olympic National Park and Marine Sanctuary. People do not Come from around the world to visit the Olympics to hear earsplitting noise while enjoying this exceptional marine ecosystem, stunning temperate rainforest and spectacular undeveloped coastline. And I do not approve of "incidental takes of threatened and endangered marine animals." The noise alone would disturb the wildlife of the Olympic Mountains.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Portis-1	This sonar testing can have a significant negative impact on the ability of orca whales and dolphins to recognize communication signals from their own species. This can ultimately result in hearing loss, which will result in long-term negative consequences to their ability to survive and thrive. With so many threats to ocean wildlife, specifically marine mammals, as it is, they need to be protected from further harm.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Posada-1	The already stressed population of orcas and salmon will be harm badly by the dumping of toxic waste.	In the course of the Navy proposed activities (listed in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of the EIS/OEIS), some expended materials are left behind in the ocean. The potential impacts of these actions was thoroughly analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the EIS/OEIS. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.
Poss-1	As a 19-year-resident of Whidbey Island, I'm asking that the Navy considers moving its Growler operation to the JBLM site where the local population won't be as impacted by the deafening sound of the jets as they are in Coupeville. I live north of Langley and can hear the continual sound of the jets from where I live day and night. Whidbey Island's appeal is its vistas, its	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	serenity and the formerly quiet peace it affords. The same holds true for the Olympic National Forest, the San Juan Islands and the Skagit Valley. Please raise your awareness and consider the long-term benefit of preserving the legacies of remnant prairie, old-growth forests, our marine environment and our sense of community over the short-term gain of flying planes. I drove an elder to the Whidbey General Hospital yesterday. The sound of the planes flying overhead was deafening. I could hear the roar from inside the examining room. The technician said she had trouble hearing the elder's heartbeat through her stethoscope. Please consider that people need quiet beautiful places to recreate and be a good neighbor and move the Growler operation to JBLM. This link to a recent editorial says it perfectly: https://www.southwhidbeyrecord.com/letters/suggests-jblm-as-site-for-navy-landing-practices/ Please be as neighborly to us as we are to each other.	http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Powell B-1	I was unable to attend any of the public meetings. I read carefully the last EIS you published several years ago and was disappointed at the lack of good science and the ignorance and complacency in the report that lead you to assume that 100+ testing maneuvers would have a negligible impact on the health of the oceans, and bays and of the mammals and other life – vegetable and animal – that live there. I have not read the most recent EIS because I believe it would waste my time—unless you have suspended all sonar weapons testing, disruptive maneuvers & war games and all other polluting activities you're engaged in. I'm adamantly opposed to your plan. The oceans are at a critical turning point—the overfishing—pollution and shipping are going to kill a vital resource. People will die and if you are practicing peace through preparedness – you are mistaken. Stop now – turn your efforts to study and repair of the oceans – before we don't even know what we've destroyed. P.S. If that is the conclusion of the latest EIS – good for you – but I'm doubting it is.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Powell N-1	Please, no new jets on the Olympic Peninsula and no new flights with existing aircraft. I feel strongly that even the current "training" program is misguided. What you are doing damages me and my family, our environment and our local businesses. What you are proposing will do even worse damage. I have paid attention to military strategy for over 50 years and I sincerely believe that your current plan will net negative results in the long term. Please stop.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Powell S-1	The orca population in the Puget Sound is already facing extreme challenges. Efforts are under way to save them from starvation due to the collapse of their primary food source, salmon, and other environmental degradations. Increased military operations in this sensitive area may well push them into extinction. Please leave the sound out of your plans!	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Power-1	<p>Disturbing wild life in Olympic National Park is inexcusable! These parks are vital for people and animals in today's busy, noisy world. Plus having ground vehicles roaming around providing info on bombing in a sanctuary is incredibly stupid. There are, or should be, strict prohibitions of anyone creating any noises loud enough to both animals, and humans too, of course! There are nearby places, mid-state, that are almost desolate; surely using these sites is more logical and humane.</p> <p>There is evidence the excessive jet noise over our waters (Olympic Coast National Marine) has been shown to interfere with these sea creatures communications with each other! This has been shown already in studies by NOAA.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Powers-1	<p>The Navy promised very limited growth in the fleet of planes on Whidbey originally. Now the growth in fleet size and noise levels are hundreds of times larger than planned. And the Navy is resisting monitoring. And the Navy wants to use Olympic National Park and environs for testing. Whidbey is the wrong location for this type of base and exposed training plans for many reasons.</p> <p>Humans suffer. The noise levels are injurious.</p> <p>The park suffers. Preservation of the park environment requires quiet.</p> <p>The economy suffers. Tourism and overvalued are negatively affected.</p> <p>All types of birds, fish and marine mammals are affected by the pollution and noise levels. Sonar is especially tough on whales. Runoff from the bases in the area are toxic to all living organisms.</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p> <p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	The base and training should be immediately moved to a less populated and environmentally sensitive location. Other ways of training might be considered. We would all thank you.	
Powers-2	I beg you. Please do not expand the growler training. Many reasons: 1 The ecological impact of the noise is huge. Marine mammals and birds are negatively affected. 2 Historical areas on Whidbey and in Port Townsend will be damaged and public use impeded. 3. The Olympic National park is a public treasure and its usage impeded. Environmental impact there also. 4. Residents' hearing will be damaged by the noise pollution. And having no monitoring will avoid proof. 5 Tourism and property values will be negatively affected. Please come up with a different, less widely damaging plan.	The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Powles-1	I am 100% opposed to the Navy conducting sonar testing in the ocean. There is already unacceptable levels of noise and other disturbances for the living creatures that make the ocean home. It is ignorance and arrogance that allows this sort of thing to continue. Please have respect for the life in and of the sea! No more interference with a world down there that we depend on for our very lives!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Prata-1	Please stop the sonar testing because it's proved that they are very dangerous to whales, orcas, dolphins and other cetaceans. The information is available on many studies made, such as: https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/full/10.1098/rspb.2013.0657 https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/1365-2664.12955 https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmars.2017.00295/full And many others. Please understand that the planet is like a ship. I guess you agree that no one wants to destroy and sink its own ship. That would be foolish, correct? Earth is all of us and we are connected by our and others actions. The NAVY contribution can only be important if life continues to exist, you know that, right?	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Thank you for giving me a chance to send you my opinion about this subject.	
Pratt-1	Marine mammals need their hearing to survive. Sonar causes marine mammals distress, behavioral issues, and loss of hearing. There is no need for this cruelty. Haven't we already done enough to harm our oceans and the animals living in it? Please stop underwater sonar testing, I am 100% against this and anybody who has half a heart and understands the harm it causes to marine mammals would be against it too.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Preece-1	I am writing to say that I am 100% against the testing of Navy sonar as it is known to cause deafness in marine mammals. Watching videos of Washington's already endangered orcas swimming away from Navy sonar testing deeply saddens and enrages me. Protect the marine life.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Preston-1	Training flights are needed and should continue. If there is a way to not disturb Orca that would be great. When I am hiking it is fine to hear a jet roar by, it is a reminder that we have freedoms to protect. This state offers unique training terrain and should be allowed to continue.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy has conducted active sonar and explosives training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area.
Prioletti-1	These testing are unacceptable, harsh, and inconsiderate of these beautiful hatless wild animals! Needs to end ASAP	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Provost-1	THIS SONAR SOUNDING IN OUR SEA ANIMALS MUST STOP!! THIS TESTING DISRUPTS THEIR LIVES CAUSING EXTREME DISTRESS AND HEARING LOSS! MUST BE STOPPED NOW!!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Prudence-1	<p>Please do not test sonar and electromagnetic blasts in our oceans. We must protect marine life from damage, death, and stress caused by these explosions and loud sounds. They deserve to live without harassment or damage.</p> <p>The ocean is an acoustic world and these sensitive beings rely on their sense of sound for survival. They communicate with each other, use sound to find mates, and to search for food. Whales communicate over hundreds of miles. The sound blasts even interfere with their immune systems. They have no where else to go to escape these devastating noises. The seismic blasts have been found to kill 2-3x adult and larva zooplankton, which the entire marine ecosystem relies on.</p> <p>https://www.nature.com/articles/s41559-017-0195</p> <p>Please protect our marine life and stop all seismic and electromagnetic blasting.</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Pullaro-1	<p>Please balance your needs to perform Sonar Testing! It is life threatening to our future sealife. Please I need to show my grands, not yet, to this beautiful world we live in. Please save it, STOP, please.</p> <p>Thank you 🐬🐳🐋 #DolphinProject #KeikosLegacy</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Putney-1	Please stop testing and training near cetaceans. Our oceans the lives that are struggling to exist there need protection as well. We've done enough damage to these ecosystems, and the suffering this unnecessary testing does is wrong.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Putter-1	This is unkind and the world is in need of kindness. Surely in our modern society, these outdated methods can be replaced with something more environmentally friends. It's not only the whales that are suffering due to this practice, whales are the highlighted species as they are the biggest of ocean creatures, all ocean creatures are affected by this and it needs to be stopped before we have nothing left of before the delicate balance of nature is so unbalanced that there is just nothing left for generations to come. Surely people care about their grandchildren experiencing the same creatures as we did growing up as kids, surely the navy employs people with hearts and families. Stop destroying this planet for mankind's need for money, extinction plays a far more important role than the need for money	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Pyles-1	Please don't add more strain on our coastal waters, we are already in an environmental crisis and it would be ridiculous for the navy to not respect our environment.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Q		
Q-1	There are endangered species that will be heavily affected by this sonar testing. Please reconsider your actions and the environment around you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Quackenbush -1	<p>The Pacific Northwest has become the last bastion of pristine and abundant beauty. Orcas Island in the archipelago of the San Juan Islands--a National Monument--has become a symbol for quality of life. This identity is an attraction for visitors worldwide who are seeking a place unviolated. These visitors keep us thriving economically--a critical issue with wide repercussions.</p> <p>The numbers of Growlers in our skies now have negatively impacted our community's quality of life by their noise pollution. By proposing to purchase 36 additional growlers and quadruple growler test flights at Whidbey Island Naval Base, the Navy is not protecting us, it's proposing to destroy Washington State's economy.</p> <p>The marbled murrelets, an important indicator species, will be eradicated if this proposal becomes a reality. More study of them and other potentially affected inhabitants of our land, air, and water needs to be done.</p> <p>For the reasons above and many more I don't have time to list, I am opposed to this project.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Quarto-1	I urge the halting of the training of Navy pilots over the Olympic National Park and WA coastline! The ongoing Navy Growler aircraft training missions should not disturb the peace in order to prepare pilots for war. Both people and wildlife are negatively affected by these noisy, disturbing flights, and there are alternative warfare training sites much better suited for this kind of activity. The reason for establishing a national park in the first place is to preserve its unique nature, tranquility and beauty of the place, while maintaining the park's unique features and wilderness experience. The	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Navy Growler training flights are not preserving the peace, but openly and irreparably declaring war on the very nature of the Olympic National Park, its visitors and wildlife and all the Park has to offer. These training missions must stop there so those millions of visitors to ONP can again experience the peaceful joy and quiet that they came there for!	where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Querceto-1	whales and dolphins see with their ears, mapping out their vast, dark underwater environment with an exquisite sensitivity to sound. And for many years now, the growing amount of manmade noise in the ocean has been blinding them. One particularly devastating source of that noise is used by naval vessels to detect submarines and other objects beneath the surface. The intense, high-volume, and far-ranging sound waves blasted by active sonar are traumatic for marine mammals, and evidence has been mounting for more than a decade that they pose an existential threat to many species. Please stop the testing that is hurting/killing these animals!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Quinlan-1	Do NOT do anything that will injure the whales and other marine mammals!!!! They are IMPORTANT !!!!! Do not do this.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/• The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org• The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr• The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology• The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Quinn-1	absolutely imperative to not test in our waters. have you ever heard how loud these sonar blasts are? it will destroy life in the ocean as we know it. humans are responsible for nearly one million species going extinct. please do your part and protect the oceans	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
R		
R I-1	I'm against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. Please stop it !	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
R J-1	I'm against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. Please stop it !	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Racine-1	If you know that something is wrong, or harmful, you stop doing it. Your rights end where another's begin and just because they cannot speak for themselves in a way that you understand does not mean that they don't count. Shame on you	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Radford-1	I am against sonar testing. This is very harmful to any cetaceans in the water. It can be heard by them for miles. Stop sonar testing	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Rafael-1	<p>Thank you for providing this forum.</p> <p>I urge you to cease the sonar testing which has grave dangers on the already under populated souther resident killer whales. These highly intelligent sentient beings have extraordinary hearing and sensors which affect they social behaviour. As such their day to day lives are bring gravely affected by these sonar activities. We need orcas In our seas. More importantly we need healthy orcas who are able to contribute living their lives properly and as Mother Nature Intended.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Raging-1	<p>God Help America (sing to the tune of God Bless America)</p> <p>God help America</p> <p>We need you BAD!</p> <p>Cause our leaders are cheaters</p> <p>And they're making the world really mad.</p> <p>Climbing mountains, crossing oceans</p> <p>And invading foreign soil...</p> <p>God help America</p> <p>No blood for oil, God forgive America, no blood for oil.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Rakofsky-1	<p>I am opposed to the Navy's proposal to expand their testing of weapons and sonar into the ocean off the Mendocino Coast. The proposed use of sonar can lead to the bursting of sea mammals' eardrums. Additionally the underwater mines and missiles the Navy would explode contain live ammunition, which is full of toxins. Testing these in the ocean of the Mendocino coast will jeopardize the area where marine life congregates to feed on the great upwelling of nutrients and threaten the entire food web of the ocean.</p> <p>The Mendocino Coast is part of the Marine Protected Areas because of our ocean's biological diversity. This should protect the marine mammals from sonar testing, but it hasn't seemed to stop the Navy from moving forward with their plans.</p> <p>Research from the Proceedings of the Royal Society B and other reputable agencies have shown that naval sonar has devastating effects on marine life. The sound emitted by sonar is so intense that marine mammals will swim hundreds of miles, dive deep into the abyss or even beach themselves to flee from the sounds that are literally unbearable to them.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Before the 1960s whales stranded on our beaches was a rare occurrence. However when the US Navy began using MFAS or Mid-frequency Active Sonar to detect submarines, beaching of whales increased and eventually became much more common. Research shows that the beached whales found in the Canary Islands, where MFAS was being used, had nitrogen bubbles in their blood which can cause something similar to decompression sickness, which results in hemorrhaging and damage to vital organs. Northern California is one of the most nutrient rich productive coastlines in the world. It is also part of the migratory route of gray whales, humpbacks, blue whales and Killer whales. Our coast is also home to dolphins and porpoises and, of course, many varieties of fish.</p> <p>The proposed trainings by the Navy is likely to harm dozens of protected species of marine mammals as the sound level of the sonar can be as high as 140 decibels, which is 100 times more intense than the level known to alter whale behavior.</p> <p>I urge you to stop the Navy's proposed war training expansion off the Pacific Northwest coast.</p>	
Ramey-1	<p>As a concerned citizen who regards the Olympic National Park as a national treasure, I ask the US Military to please not conduct training exercises in or around our national park areas or along our shoreline. Please instead conduct them far from these areas and the shoreline minimizing the impact on children, adults, birds, fish, marine mammals, all wildlife and the communities. Training exercises around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary as well as other sensitive areas should be avoided. These are places which should be protected by all Americans; they should remain a safe haven from the impact we experience when subjected to the effects of military training exercises. I object to the plan to do any military training exercises in, over, or around National Parks and all places where people and wildlife should be free from being subjected to anything military related.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Ramos-1	<p>Beached whales and dolphins are potential byproducts of these harmful tests.m that are in substantiated and unnecessary. Please stop.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ranoa-1	Please stop the sonar testing and consider the marine animals that you are hurting. You would want harm being done to you or your family right? Return the respect and stop this please.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ransom-1	It is obvious that fleeing marine mammals during the testing that end up with ruptured ear drums and end up dead on the beach is proof enough that the navy sonar testing is causing irreparable damage to these animals. War is not the answer to evolution. The United States has always supported the Military Industrial Complex that Eisenhower warned against. Do we have to continue preparing to kill people in countries 1/2 way around the world in both hemispheres as well as killing our oceans mammals, flora and fauna of these great lands will become collateral damage. Another great extinction is under way according to a large number of scientists as we speak unless the Navy (and other military) turns this ship around. Please think about this, one small step to avoid more suffering, more killing. The journey of change starts with the 1st. step. Stop the sonar testing.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ransom-2	Humans share the planet with other creatures. We see the whales migrate up and down our coast twice a year. We must not harm them through selfish war training. If America is truly great we should shift our attention to respecting others right to live by example. The fishing industry needs to do there part too.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Rashid-1	<p>It is very clear to me that the sonar testing is harmful to - not only - the southern right killer whales in the Salish sea but harmful to many other marine animals.</p> <p>The Navy are aware that these tests can irreversibly damage the hearing of these creatures and yet persist.</p> <p>What they are engaging in is wilful, conscious animal abuse and the practice must stop. Just because the dreadful noise can not be heard above water does not lessen the impact of the damage caused.</p> <p>State funded Animal abuse from a military organisation. This must stop.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Rasker-1	<p>The research is in, and sonar will kill and/ or beach whales.</p> <p>As the world is facing a climate crisis, whales are being challenged with unhealthy habitat, and lack of food.</p> <p>We as a nation can not add to the stresses already posed upon these mammals.</p> <p>I, for one, do not condone threatening their existence on this planet.</p> <p>The Navy will not have my support for these proposed actions. And, the navy is working for us!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Rasmussen-1	<p>I do not want the US military doing bomb/missile testing in the Pacific Ocean or any other oceans that they're thinking of testing in. Our eco system is so fragile, that kind of testing HAS to have detrimental, negative impacts on our waters.</p> <p>Besides that, I fear war and the only reason for bombs is for killing, maiming, resulting in more of the same and i am totally against it. Trump needs to learn to keep his mouth shut and quit egging other countries on. War is not the answer. Thank you. Jan Rasmussen, a voter, age 69</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Rathbone-1	<p>The Navy predicts that there would be more than 500,000 instances of marine mammal behavioral impacts, harassment, and injuries over five years, including 275,000 instances of temporary hearing loss, and more than 600 instances of permanent hearing loss.</p> <p>Vessel strikes from increased water traffic will increase marine mammal death rate. We have already seen the loss of nine grey whales in the San Francisco Bay area in the last six weeks. The western North Pacific</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>population of grey whales is estimated to include fewer than 200 individuals. We cannot afford to put these animals in greater danger. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Risks to marine mammals, fish, and birds from entanglement in wires, cables, and parachutes, and ingestion of expended military materials and toxic debris will increase. The Navy holds no responsibility to clean up their spent munitions and debris. [REDACTED]</p> <p>The public opposes this. Please cancel this project.</p>	
Rau-1	<p>Please consider the whales, they're already starving, sonar makes the situation worse. I support the whales</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Ravella-1	<p>My name is Julia Ravella. I am currently a student in Environmental Studies at the University of San Francisco, but I grew up in Fort Bragg, California. I am writing to comment my concerns on the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project.</p> <p>I am registering my strong opposition to this project. The science assuring that preventative measures will be taken to limit marine mammal impact needs more research especially since the projected war testing sits in the path of grey whale migration--vital to grey whale reproduction. There is a global history of sonar and other war time activities contributing to suicidal behavior in whales and mass beachings. Beyond the ecological impacts, if the gray whale migration patterns are disrupted it will contribute to the economic instability of coastal towns, like Fort Bragg, that rely on the environmental tourism of the gray whale migration.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Ray D-1	<p>Please end all growler flights along the Salish Sea! The threat to marine life has been documented-</p> <p>The threat to air quality is well documented. The threat to my health (I've been diagnosed with Heart failure -much of it due to air quality) I will have to move if our arrogant military does not stop Training flights.</p> <p>If we continue increased training flights -we may have a strong military to protect us-with nothing to protect except a ruined environment -that cannot support the quality of life we currently enjoy.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)


<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Trusting military leaders -has throughout our history as a nation has not served us well-the examples are numerous. (I.e. The Japanese American Incarceration of 1942 and the Vietnam War etc.)</p> <p>I'd like to know: What is the cost/benefit of increased flights?</p>	
Ray P-1	<p>Please consider the following and cancel your plans for sonar testing. I don't know how to word things to convince you so I have quoted these comments from Alex Larson. And cited a research article beneath that. When I read about the cruel, painful torture these magnificent creatures are subjected to before they ultimately are killed or compelled to beach themselves or die of the bends, it made me sick. Please stop this action before more species of whales are brought to extinction.</p> <p>We have known for a long time that naval sonar has devastating effects on marine life but just exactly how it leads to sickness and death was a mystery till now. In new research published in the Proceedings of the Royal Society B, they discovered that the sound emitted by sonar is so intense that marine mammals will swim hundreds of miles, dive deep into the abyss or even beach themselves to flee from the sounds that are literally unbearable to them.</p> <p>In particular, beaked whales are one of the marine mammals that are often found beached due to sonar testing. Prior to the 1960s, beaked whale strandings were extremely rare. But once the 60s rolled around, the Navy started to use mid-frequency active sonar (MFAS) to detect submarines.  And from the 60s onwards, whales washing up on beachings became a very common occurrence. The paper recently published is a summary of what was discussed at a 2017 meeting of beaked whale experts in the Canary Islands and revealed that sonar distresses beaked whales so much that the marine mammals ends up with nitrogen bubbles in their blood very similar to what divers would call decompression sickness or the bends. The nitrogen can cause hemorrhaging and damage to whales vital organs. The big question that was brought up was how an animal that lives in the ocean and is adapted to perform deep water dives for hours at a time can obtain decompression sickness? Well simply, the sonar is so powerful, the animals dive deep too quickly causing the sickness.</p> <p>"In the presence of sonar they are stressed and swim vigorously away from the sound source, changing their diving pattern," lead author Yara Bernaldo de Quiros told AFP.</p> <p>"The stress response, in other words, overrides the diving response, which makes the animals accumulate nitrogen. It's like an adrenalin shot."</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, and the "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June 2017)" (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The conclusions are drawn from autopsies of dead whales, although a handful of animals were killed by other threats inflicted by humans, such as collisions with ships or entanglement in fishing nets, as well as disease. The authors note that to mitigate the impacts of sonar on beaked whales, we must ban its use in areas where they're found. A moratorium on the use of MFAS around the Canary Islands in 2004 shows just how well this works – no atypical strandings have been seen since. The researchers urge other countries where sonar is deployed, such as the US, Greece, Italy, and Japan, to follow suit.</p> <p>In addition to the above I refer you to this article: “Gas and Fat Embolic Syndrome “ involving a mass stranding of beaked whales Family Ziphiidae) Exposed to Anthropogenic Sonar Signals by A. Fernández, J.F.Edwards, F. Rodríguez Research Article https://doi.org/10.1354/BP.42-4-446 By the American College of Veterinary Pathologists</p>	
Ray P-2	<p>We have known for a long time that naval sonar has devastating effects on marine life but just exactly how it leads to sickness and death was a mystery till now. In new research published in the Proceedings of the Royal Society B, they discovered that the sound emitted by sonar is so intense that marine mammals will swim hundreds of miles, dive deep into the abyss or even beach themselves to flee from the sounds that are literally unbearable to them.</p> <p>In particular, beaked whales are one of the marine mammals that are often found beached due to sonar testing. Prior to the 1960s, beaked whale strandings were extremely rare. But once the 60s rolled around, the Navy started to use mid-frequency active sonar (MFAS) to detect submarines. And from the 60s onwards, whales washing up on beachings became a very common occurrence. The paper recently published is a summary of what was discussed at a 2017 meeting of beaked whale experts in the Canary Islands and revealed that sonar distresses beaked whales so much that the marine mammals ends up with nitrogen bubbles in their blood very similar to what divers would call decompression sickness or the bends. The nitrogen can cause hemorrhaging and damage to whales vital organs. The big question that was brought up was how an animal that lives in the ocean and is adapted to perform deep water dives for hours at a time can obtain decompression sickness? Well simply, the sonar is so powerful, the animals dive deep too quickly causing the sickness. "In the presence of sonar they are stressed and swim vigorously away from the sound source, changing their diving pattern," lead author Yara Bernaldo de Quiros told</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, and the “Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June 2017)” (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>AFP.</p> <p>"The stress response, in other words, overrides the diving response, which makes the animals accumulate nitrogen. It's like an adrenalin shot."</p> <p>The conclusions are drawn from autopsies of dead whales, although a handful of animals were killed by other threats inflicted by humans, such as collisions with ships or entanglement in fishing nets, as well as disease. The authors note that to mitigate the impacts of sonar on beaked whales, we must ban its use in areas where they're found. A moratorium on the use of MFAS around the Canary Islands in 2004 shows just how well this works - no atypical strandings have been seen since. The researchers urge other countries where sonar is deployed, such as the US, Greece, Italy, and Japan, to follow suit.</p>	
Raymond B-1	<p>I recognize that Growlers are a part of our tactical and strategic posture. I recognize that training of Growler pilots and crew is essential to maintaining our actual and perceived military readiness. That said, the question remains what level of training is essential and to what extent can the locus of training take account of differential impacts on environment, including human populations, wildlife, and nature.</p> <p>Is there any level at which the Navy would say the environmental impacts outweigh the requirement for military readiness or is there any impact level at which the Navy would determine that a change in location of training is warranted?</p> <p>The increased Growler activity certainly impacts my life here in La Conner. I have no way to assess whether the levels chosen by the Navy are the minimum level necessary to meet national military preparedness requirements and that the training must be conducted in the assigned areas. Given the difficulty or impossibility of assessing those trade offs. Only the Navy can determine that. I wish I had confidence in the willingness of the Navy to decide on a minimal level of disruption to lives and environment.</p>	<p>The Navy has determined that the alternatives represent the minimum training for the appropriate number of Naval forces to gain the necessary levels of readiness for the commander to be confident of meeting 10 U.S.C. 8062 requirements.</p>
Raymond W-1	<p>Approval of this permit and approving the extension of an additional 2 years is negligent at best.</p> <p>The NAVY has no intention of tracking any marine animals behaviorally affected by their practices to see the long term damage caused.</p> <p>The NAVY has stated that spotters will be used to shut down sonar systems in case of a whale sighting. This is insufficient for 2 reasons. One, the NAVY can not even spot whales close enough to their vessels to avoid boat strikes. And 2, the low frequency sonar the NAVY plans to use travels at a range of whale hearing that has not been studied by anyone including the</p>	<p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>NAVY.</p> <p>The fuel alone expected to be expelled into the ocean from the Jets proposed by the NAVY for use should be reason alone to deny the permit for these activities in any marine environment let alone this particular diverse place.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of further harassing activities should not be allowed with orca, California sea lion and northern elephant seals struggling with mass mortality rates from starvation.</p> <p>NOAA has a responsibility to act as the ocean's shepherd and protector. These activities need to be denied a permit.</p>	
Rayne-1	<p>I am concerned that real time, on the ground decibal measurement of Growler practice flights at OLF have not been included as part of the EIS. The impact of the very loud jet sound on human beings and the environment cannot be accurately understood if the real measurement is not known. Averaged, computer monitored sound levels are not the same as the real decibal measurements, and should not be accepted as such.</p>	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Recek-1	Please stop terrorizing marine life. Stop tha navy testing.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.mil/speciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Recker-1	<p>Hello, thank you for your service.</p> <p>In light of the health and stress to the local orca Jpod in the Salish sea it is unacceptable to be testing underwater sonars within their vacinity. The very nature of sonar makes that vascinity very large. They recently have had a new birth and I think everyone can agree we want it to survive. It was a tragedy what happened last year to the calf and adolescent female.</p> <p>Please stop underwater sonar testing in the local waters of the Salish sea.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Record-1	I am against sonar testing. I'm shocked that this is even a possibility. We need our marine life healthy so WE can continue to live on this planet. 🙏	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Rector-1	<p>The Navy promised very limited growth in the fleet of planes on Whidbey originally. Now the growth in fleet size and noise levels are hundreds of times larger than planned. And the Navy is resisting monitoring. And the Navy wants to use Olympic National Park and environs for testing. Whidbey is the wrong location for this type of base and exposed training plans for many reasons.</p> <p>Humans suffer. The noise levels are injurious.</p> <p>The park suffers. Preservation of the park environment requires quiet.</p> <p>The economy suffers. Tourism and overvalued are negatively affected.</p> <p>All types of birds, fish and marine mammals are affected by the pollution and noise levels. Sonar is especially tough on whales. Runoff from the bases in the area are toxic to all living organisms.</p> <p>The base and training should be immediately moved to a less populated and environmentally sensitive location. Other ways of training might be considered.</p> <p>We would all thank you.</p>	The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Rector-2	<p>Please do not expand the growler training. Many reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The ecological impact of the noise is huge. Marine mammals and birds are negatively affected. 2 Historical areas on Whidbey and in Port Townsend will be damaged and public use impeded. 3. The Olympic National park is a public treasure and it's usage impeded. Environmental impact there also. 4. Residents' hearing will be damaged by the noise pollution. And having no monitoring will avoid proof. 5 Tourism and property values will be negatively affected. <p>Please come up with a different, less widely damaging plan.</p>	The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Reham-1	We must protect all marine life, it's essential for for our survival.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Reid-1	I have several family members in the military and retired from military (Navy specifically) and I understand that many things are done to help ensure safety for our nation. However, sonar testing that causes underwater mammals to go deaf seems reckless, socially irresponsible, and	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	cruel. Please stop the testing and deafening of our marine wildlife. They are already subject to increased underwater noise that causes them distress, we don't need to add painful insult to injury. Please stop underwater sonar testing for the sake our planet. It is callous to not consider alternate methods. It is callous to continue a practice known to cause irreversible damage to these mammals.	EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Reily-1	Knowing that sonar causes major damage to marine mammals, please consider banning its usage in areas of migratory routes or residency. We need to find alternatives.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Reinders-1	The noise emitted by the Growlers is inconsistent with the National Park. I have visited areas in the National Park numerous times, both in the mountains and the coastal strip and had to listen (and watch) Growlers for hours and days. The Navy needs to stop treating the Olympic Peninsula like it is some deserted landmass in the middle of the Mohave Desert where military training operations can be conducted with impunity. We live here. We were here before the Growlers. The Park was here before the Navy and way before the Growlers. The sooner the Navy realizes that the people and the Park aren't going away, the sooner the Navy can start its search for more appropriate training areas. Our country has built and is building bases left and right in foreign countries like Afghanistan and in Africa. \$140 million right now in Africa for a new drone base; but somehow when it comes to bases in this country there is no money for locating them in areas other than one of the fastest growing regions in the country that is surrounded by pristine national parks and wilderness areas? Not adding up for me. Can't even sleep with my windows open at night anymore in Port Townsend due to the Growler noise. Not acceptable.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Reinhardt-1	The U.S. Navy should halt their war training exercises near the path of the annual Gray Whale migration off the U.S. Northwest Pacific Coast. The exercises include massive sonar, huge explosions and harmful chemicals being released into the ocean. The Gray Whales should not have to travel through this deadly environment twice every year. There is really no excuse for this.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Reiser-1	<p>The Sinkyone Council and its member Tribes continue to oppose the Navy's training and testing activities, and are demanding stronger protections for the ocean and the Tribes' cultural ways of life. The adequacy of the assessment of Tribal cultural impacts as well as environmental impacts from the Navy's training and testing activities is especially important because these activities take place in the Pacific Ocean, which holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes and is critically important for the wellbeing of all people and lifeforms on this planet.</p> <p>The Navy should work meaningfully with the Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities.</p> <p>The Navy should prohibit use of sonar within the 50-mile mitigation area. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals.</p> <p>The "best available science" referenced in the draft SEIS should be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy's NWTRC.</p> <p>The Navy's monitoring program should be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy should expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not</p>	Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.	
Rennacker	<p>I strongly oppose Navy Wargames testing and training that deploys explosives, chemicals and sonar in the path of our migrating grey whales, blue whales, endangered pilot whales and other marine mammals such as porpoises and dolphins.</p> <p>Our ocean is suffering from acidification, lack of the nutritive-filled upwelling that brings food for the marine mammals, and a die-off of kelp, the starfish that control the purple urchin population, and the recent deaths of over 15 whales in the Bay Area of California. These are only a fraction of the dead marine mammals who wash up on shore, most die at sea and sink to the bottom. Some recent necropsy studies found that the dead marine mammals suffered malnutrition, wounds from ship strikes and punctured eardrums. These creatures depend on their hearing to find food, communicate with their young and their pods, and die if they are deafened. The Navy proposal to have a man on deck “spotting” whales is woefully inadequate, and with blue whales virtually impossible. Their adopted 12 mile corridor from the shore is certainly inadequate as well. The sound emitted by sonar has devastating effects on marine life, as it is so intense that marine mammals will swim hundreds of miles, dive deep, or even beach themselves to flee the sounds that are literally unbearable to them. The dead whales and other marine mammals are so distressed by sonar that they end up with bubbles in their blood very similar to what divers would call decompression sickness or the bends. The nitrogen cause hemorrhaging and damage to whales vital organs.</p> <p>The big question as to how an animal that lives in the ocean and is adapted to deep dives can obtain decompression sickness? It is the presence of loud sonar (which carries under water) stresses them to the point that they swim away vigorously from the sound source, change their diving pattern, and accumulate nitrogen like an adrenalin shot. We already lose many marine mammals to disease, ship strikes and entanglement in fishing nets. The only way to mitigate the impacts of sonar is to ban the use of sonar in the path of migrating grey whales and in areas where beaked whales are found.</p> <p>Thanks for considering my opinion.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Rennhack-1	Enough has been done already to disrupt the creatures of the ocean. Let them live in peace for God's sake.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Reyes-1	This is very sad and should not be allowed in sure with all the funding the military gets there is other ways to scan.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Rhoden-1	Please stop testing that negatively effects marine life	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Ribinson-1	It would serve the public better to practice war techniques in places that don't hold such high value to the people who live in and near the Olympic Peninsula. The whole point of the military is to protect the peace of the US citizens. I have grown up in Washington state and lately with all the growler flights it feels less peaceful around here than ever. Is there a better location such as an unoccupied desert or middle of America where there is plenty of uninhabited space to practice for war? You are choosing prime real estate and a very valuable National Park to practice war when all we want is peace. Please reconsider your idea to use this beautiful space as a war zone.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Rice-1	<p>This Navy war games and testing that include massive explosives and "active sonar" is nothing new. But there is a reason they need to RENEW their permits regularly to do so. Things change. Values change. Priorities change. Our oceans are ailing...</p> <p>The oceans are getting more ravaged each year, with garbage gyres growing annually (this year measured at the size of the 19th largest COUNTRY in the world, see: https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=1780081968760624), acidification and massive coral reef dye offs, our local lack of bull kelp and urchin infestation compromising sustenance abalone harvests, this year several humpbacks are getting stuck in the SF bay because they do not have the reserves to make the migration to northern waters; not to mention the fisheries-of-no-more all along the entire north coast. All ecosystems of the oceans—outside explicitly protected and small reserves that are patrolled—are ailing, while an accelerated number of species are rapidly going extinct.</p> <p>Meanwhile, "Active Sonar" is a sound blast at 200 decibels. Death by sound for a HUMAN is at 185 decibels. The destructive capacity for miles with that radius is a real and dire concern given the state of ocean health.</p> <p>The Sinkyon Tribe already has a law suit out against the Fisheries for renewing permits with an incomplete EIS.</p> <p>Business as usual has left too much destruction in its wake—thus WHY these permits need reviewing every few years. It is a built in safe-guard to human life and the well-being of the oceans in which environmental, social,</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	and economic well being are intimately intertwined. Unless they hear from you, me and many of us, these destructive permits will be issued.	
Rice-2	<p>The U.S. Navy's plan to expand war training exercises right in the path of the annual Gray Whale migration is WRONG in every way. The war training exercises that include massive sonar, huge explosions and many harmful chemicals being released into the ocean waters will put Grey Whales—and all marine life that coastal citizens depend upon to be healthy and robust for sustenance and well being—in intentional harms way. The Gray Whales will have to travel through this deadly environment twice a year during bi-annual migrations exposing calves and adults alike to unnecessary toxic chemical exposure while the delicate soundscape they depend upon for navigation and pod integrity will be blasted.</p> <p>Some suggest the Navy could move these exercises somewhere else, they don't have to be conducted in the Gray Whale migration path. But everywhere the U.S. Navy or other country's navies have conducted these war-training exercises, there has been extra loss of marine life. A country that already spends nearly \$30,000,000 EVERY HOUR on the military has NO EXCUSE to continue to expand these war games putting an already threatened earth and the ocean ecosystems into more perilous and toxic death traps. NO EXPANDED WAR TRAINING IN OUR OCEANS.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Rice-3	<p>The U.S. Navy's plan to expand war training exercises right in the path of the annual Gray Whale migration is WRONG in every way. The war training exercises that include massive sonar, huge explosions and many harmful chemicals being released into the ocean waters will put Grey Whales—and all marine life that coastal citizens depend upon to be healthy and robust for sustenance and well being—in intentional harms way. The Gray Whales will have to travel through this deadly environment twice a year during bi-annual migrations exposing calves and adults alike to unnecessary toxic chemical exposure while the delicate soundscape they depend upon for navigation and pod integrity will be blasted.</p> <p>Some suggest the Navy could move these exercises somewhere else, they don't have to be conducted in the Gray Whale migration path. But everywhere the U.S. Navy or other country's navies have conducted these war-training exercises, there has been extra loss of marine life. A country that already spends nearly \$30,000,000 EVERY HOUR on the military has NO EXCUSE to continue to expand these war games putting an already threatened earth and the ocean ecosystems into more perilous and toxic death traps. NO EXPANDED WAR TRAINING IN OUR OCEANS.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Richards-1	<p>Regarding the proposed 'training' activities to be conducted off the Northern California coast. I would like to request that you cancel these exercises for the following reasons:</p> <p>#1 Modern computer simulations are more than capable of providing the resulting data that would be gained via physical tests, at a fraction of the cost and with nominal environmental impact.</p> <p>#2 The United States military is the most powerful fighting force on planet earth, with three times the resources of the second most powerful military. Only quantum leaps in technology can put us at a disadvantage, and those are unforeseeable.</p> <p>#3 The 'world' and by this I mean our planetary ecosystem upon which we all depend on for survival is currently undergoing a catastrophic assault known as "The Sixth Mass Extinction."</p> <p>This is perhaps the greatest threat our species has ever faced and this crisis will not be solved through the process of warfare. The solution is simply to cease and desist unnecessary acts of ecological destruction, and allow our ecosystem to regenerate.</p> <p>I would hope you would ask yourself in good conscience: are these tests truly necessary? There's no doubt that they cause harm, the only question is how much? Too much.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and good luck.</p>	<p>The Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. In addition, see the discussion in Section 2.4.1.4 (Simulated Training and Testing Only) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS that discusses the need for live training specifically for aircrews.</p>
Richardson Da-1	<p>A 2016 study published in the Canadian journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbour porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, this does not include the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas. "For marine mammals that utilise sound extensively, Limiting their ability to recognise these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival,"</p> <p>Over 7 years, harbour porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from Sonar, according to the Navy's calculations. Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioural reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times.</p> <p>I would urge you not to allow permits for the use of Sonar anywhere as it has been proven to be very disruptive to marine life, it just is not worth it. Why allow animals to suffer?</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Richardson Do-1	<p>The military does enough damage to humans, culture, industry and environment during war activities with out doing it to citizens and other harmful consequences in the US. I am sure there are other places and plans for necessary practicing than on Whidbey Island where great damage</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	occurs to humans, industry, culture. and the environment. As just a small example I live directly under the flight path of the Growlers during practice and the sound was so loud and potential damaging to the ears that I though I should try to protect my dogs ears and attempt to use ear plugs.	Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Richardson Sh-1	<p>The DEIS "No-Action Alternative" declares that this option would not meet the Navy's mandate for adequate military readiness. This falsely implies that only Alternative 1 & 2 are viable options. The DEIS should outline other training and testing strategies that could be studied and employed to provide readiness. These options could include offshore training, or use of multiple training locations so as to minimize the impacts on any one area, among others. As currently written, this DEIS supposes that the activities outlined in the DEIS are their ONLY options which does not provide a comprehensive cost/benefit analysis of potential solutions.</p> <p>There are several external costs (ex. property value losses, health impacts, productivity impacts) of living with jet noise not addressed in the DEIS. These external costs are imposed without warning or recourse on citizens across the region: in San Juan, Skagit, Jefferson, Clallam, and even Snohomish and Okanogan Counties. The proposed expansion will likely increase these costs and they need to be accessed and mitigated.</p> <p>The impacts of noise disturbance on wildlife are generally very poorly researched, although efforts have been increasing in recent years (Shannon et al. 2016). The lack of research places a burden on wildlife and resource managers charged with evaluating the likely impact of increased military flights on vulnerable ESA-listed species in both the terrestrial and marine environments. The DEIS should include additional testing/analysis to assess contribution of jet noise to ocean ambient noise in the region and analyze what impacts any increase of that noise on aquatic ecosystems in the region.</p> <p>Finally, it is American values and freedoms that the Navy is supposedly working to protect. It is with deep irony that the externalized impacts of Navy training and testing activities are being forced on residents and communities without respect to THEIR individual rights and freedoms. The Navy's externalized impacts must be minimized, and residents/communities fairly compensated for there to be a just and equitable outcome to the Navy's activities - and for America to be truly a place of freedom.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>The wildlife population underneath and around the Olympic MOA have been exposed to military aircraft noise for an extended period. The proposed action does not represent new noise exposure events to the wildlife. Also, the statement that "impacts of noise disturbance on wildlife are generally very poorly researched" ignores the numerous studies that the DoD has sponsored in the past three decades. For example, many of these studies were included in the analysis of impacts to birds found in Section 3.6.2.1.4 (Impacts from Aircraft Noise) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>Impacts from aircraft noise on marine life is analyzed in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For example, aircraft noise on marine mammals is specically analyzed in Section 3.4.2.1.4 (Impacts from Aircraft Noise).</p>
Richardson St-1	Please stop sonar testing as it can be incredibly damaging to the health and well-being of these beautiful orcas. In this time of extraordinary change, we	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	as a human race need to do everything in our power to care for our wildlife. Please do your part by not harming these magnificent killer whales.	Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Rick-1	<p>Communities, and government organizations around the Salish Sea are struggling to maintain and restore Orca populations. Level A and B harassment by the Navy is not acceptable. Ongoing Navy training is already affecting the Southern Resident (USS Shoup in 2003). The Preferred Alternative 1 places the Navy in conflict with the desires of the people of the Pacific Northwest.</p> <p>Through out the NWTT-EIS-OEIS document reference is made to injury to individual animals, but no population effects are anticipated. By that logic a ship running aground would suffer injury but the fleet would be OK. Is the Navy OK with groundings? Effects on individuals matter. Cumulative effects matter.</p> <p>Why are Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program plans being developed now? That should be in place before any changes are made to training and testing activities. With data and analysis from the monitoring program, fact-based policies can be proposed. The draft EIS-OEIS repeatedly uses the phrase "would not be expected" and "are not anticipated". If this document were describing the effectiveness of weapon systems and the health effects on personnel, would that language be acceptable? There is a wonderful image on page 5 of the Northwest Training and Testing Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Fact Sheet Booklet (April 2019) showing a sailor appearing to cover his ears while standing next to a firing Phalanx CIWS. I suspect he is not trying to protect his hearing, but is trying to communicate over headphones. The image does suggest an ad-hoc and wishful thinking approach that is mirrored in the NWTT-EIS-OEIS.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p> <p>The Navy's Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Plan has been in place since 2010. Please see Section 5.1.2.2.1.2 (Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for more information.</p>
Rick-2	Concerning aircraft operation. From a Navy public input poster, "AIRCRAFT NOISE ASSESSMENT - The Navy modeled noise from aircraft training activities in relevant operating areas. The assessment indicates areas underneath aircraft training would be exposed to less than 37 decibels Day-Night Average Sound Level." Seriously?! The "average" speed of a bullet less than 1 mph, but that first 250 mS is a killer. I live on Whidbey Island I KNOW the Navy is being dis-ingenuous with their pronouncements and analysis of aircraft noise. Expanding operation over the Olympic National	The results of the Navy's noise modeling in the Olympic Military Operations Area are accurate, based on the state of the art noise model, MR_Nmap, and is the appropriate method to evaluate aircraft noise in special use airspace such as the Olympic MOA. This model is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Park is not acceptable.</p> <p>This last paragraph is not substantial in terms of the NWTT-EIS-OEIS, but is regarding the image of the Navy. The Navy's actions in the Pacific Northwest are divisive and are harming communities here. In the long run, these policies will not be sustainable. Before that happens though the Navy will have expended the good-will of the people here.</p>	
Ridley-1	<p>When is this country going to wake up! When are we going to stop killing our marine life! Wake up Navy! You should be ashamed of the damage you are creating for our precious Orca's! STOP IT!!!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Rieke-1	<p>I am writing to share that I am 100% against underwater sonar testing, as it has been proven to cause harm to marine mammals, who are an essential part of our beautiful Pacific Northwest ecosystem that makes all our lives possible. Please cease this type of sonar testing immediately.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Riendeau-1	<p>I am writing you today to urge NOT to go ahead with the Sonar Project. It is detrimental to the safety and survival of the Southern Resident Killer Whales. I am opposed to it.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider and study further the devastating effects your Project will have to the Endangered Species. There are only 76 left. Please contact the Tofino Whale Centre in British Columbia. They are the experts.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Riley L-1	Citizens of the Puget Sound area are doing everything we can to ask you to hear us. Please consider that we and all the species that live here need you to be a better neighbor. Less noise, less pollution, less testing. You are supposed to be protecting, not harming us. The WA State constitution mandates that the military is required to cooperate with the citizenry. Having events at which you talk at us but we are not heard us not cooperation.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Riley N-1	I am against sonar testing. Please do not do this. We have done enough damage to our oceans and it's creatures. Orcas need to be able to hear in order to communicate and find prey. They do not deserve to be robbed of their right to live their lives. again, PLEASE do not follow through with the sonar testing. I am fully against it. Thanks.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Riordan-1	I am vehemently opposed to sonar testing...Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Rivera N-1	We all want Orcas and other animals alive!!	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Rivera P-1	Please stop the Navy sonar testing! If they know its damaging to their hearing then they need to stop! These marine animals deserve to live a 100% natural life in their waters. No need to damage their hearing. Do it in a pool or something.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Rivers-1	Knowingly endangering the lives of the southern resident Orcas is inexcusable. As a former resident of Vancouver Island I have seen these animals and more and wish to help keep them safe for their future generations	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Riwny-1	This spring, May 3, 2019 the Navy sent a group of ineffectual people to answer concerns about sonar testing. The site was a school gymnasium with no chairs and terrible acoustics. It was completely unorganized and questions to these people went unanswered. There was only one Navy	The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	personnel in uniform. The Navy should postpone testing until the people who live on our Northwest Pacific shores have answers for many of our questions. I have seen videos of orcas who are completely confused by sonar testing. There is scientific proof that sonar travels 300 miles under water. Please do not begin these new sonar tests until more studies have been completed. Thank you.	and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.
Rizzato-1	No sonar testing! Protect endangered species	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Robbins-1	I am against sonar testing.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Robeau-1	Public participation is an important part of the National Environmental Policy Act process. Submitting substantive and concise public comments is one of the most important aspects of that process.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Roberts E-1	I have lived on Whidbey Island for forty year. I am a lifelong educator. Since the Growler flights began increasing its flights, the quality of life for all living creatures in the surrounding areas has deteriorated dramatically. Normal life under the earsplitting noise of Jets is impossible--and the anxiety and dread while waiting for the next round of touch-and-go's is unbearable. THIS MUST STOP!	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Roberts J-1	Please reconsider going through with the underwater sonar tests. I understand there are things you need to do for your jobs but this would have a substantially negative effect on marine life, in particular our already struggling whale population.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Roberts L-1	There needs to be an alternative that doesn't harm marine animals. Sonar testing has a serious affect on hearing of this marine animals and should stop immediately.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Roberts P-1	Stop harming our marine animals and wildlife. This is a crime and everyone associated should be put in jail for animal abuse.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Robisch-1	For many reasons I believe only the No Action Alternative in the EIS is acceptable and because of the length of the EIS and large area and number of people that will be adversely affected, the EIS needs to have a 90 day comment period. The Navy acknowledges that the Growler jets will generate excessive noise levels ranging from >85 dBA up 100 dBA. Constant exposure to these levels of noise has been proven to have significant adverse health effects such as significant hearing loss, high blood pressure and systemic heart disease. This clearly demonstrates that the Olympic Peninsula is totally unsuited for what the Navy is proposing, because it not only contains significant numbers of permanent residents in towns such as Forks and Amanda Park plus three Native American Reservations—Quinalt, Quileute and Hoh, it also contains large areas that have been designated as wildlife sanctuaries,	The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period. The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). The potential impacts to the economy are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>both land and marine based, plus the highly visited Olympic National Park and Forest. These designations, which began with President Theodore Roosevelt in 1907 and with additional areas being designated by numerous congressional actions, have existed over the past 112 years.</p> <p>The damaging highly excessive noise generated by flying 19 Growler sorties per day for 260 days a year over the Olympic Peninsula will make life virtually unbearable for the local permanent residents along with having a severely negative impact on the local tourist based economy and will completely defeat the purpose of the long established wildlife sanctuaries. In fact the Navy EIS is asking for an extension of a NOAA permit for “incidental takes of marine mammals...and incidental takes of threatened and endangered marine species” [EIS p. ES-4].</p> <p>Given the severely adverse impact this proposal will have on the Olympic Peninsula and the State of Washington I fail to understand the Navy’s position that this important training can only be done out of the Whidbey Island Naval Station and the Olympic Peninsula when it has been successfully conducted for decades over the isolated deserts of Idaho and Nevada using the Mountain Home Military Base which has been designed for this type of training. Furthermore even without the added Growler jets there are already numerous problems developing between the Whidbey Island Naval Station and the surrounding communities which include excessive noise levels and significant ground water contamination which translate into both a depressed quality of life and land values for the local residents. This inappropriate proposal will greatly add to these already existing problems.</p> <p>Therefore, only the No Action Alternative is acceptable for this EIS.</p>	<p>MOA’s designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA’s designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Robyn-1	<p>Sonar testing will result in whale and dolphin deaths. When we kill the oceans we kill ourselves.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Rockafellow-1	<p>This is unacceptable. It is a known fact that this is harmful to marine life so why would you do this? The Southern Resident Orcas are an endangered species. This should not be happening anywhere near them.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		(Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Rockhill-1	Don't test sonar in the Salish Sea. The southern resident orcas are endangered and clearly are distressed by the sonar signals. They are already highly stressed and struggling. Do not add to the significant stressors they are experiencing.	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Rodgers-1	Stop the use of sonar testing that causes harm to marine animals. Who are you to decide that it is okay to harm animals who cannot speak for themselves? Every marine animal plays a critical role in the ecosystem. Continuing these practices because you don't directly see the consequences is ignorant and is a disgrace to our nation. There are other ways to do these things without harming innocent beings. Please consider this in the future.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Rodriguez A-1	Stop any under water drilling or tests. It is truly harmful to sea animals. Consider a very loud siren next to your house that literally wakes you any time you're trying to sleep or rest. I bet the shock would leave you very irritated. These tests are needless especially with all the contaminants in the oceans already. Please stop these tests and perhaps help and clean the oceans and help creatures not the other way around! Thank you for your time!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Rodriguez Al-1	I oppose sonic and any other noise testing in any sea. Please respect the animals who live in the seas.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Rodriguez Mica-1	Leave these animals and our oceans alone!!!!!!!!!!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Rodriguez Mich-1	The massive sonar sounds are punishing to the underwater wildlife world. Especially the whales!!! The fragile pods of orcas are fighting to stay alive! Do not allow whatsoever any testing in these waters! Are you heartless !!	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Rodriguez W-1	As a Navy veteran I'm very upset that the US Navy still uses technology known to harm marine life that depend on sonar. Our whales, porpoises, dolphins and sharks require an atmosphere free of sonar noise. I have watched the series showing that side scan sonar is affecting our marine mammals and I'm concerned that the USA doesn't care although you have the facts and data proving that these tests are harmful. Please stop all sonar testing that we know is devastating to our whales, porpoises and sharks. Be the leader and tell Australia it's not acceptable to disregard marine life.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Roemers-Kleven-1	<p>Last summer the world watched as a Southern Resident Killer Whale carried her dead baby for 17 days in a procession around the Salish Sea that took her over 1000 miles of swimming. it was as if she was saying "Look at what you have done! You are killing us". When she finally let the baby go the females of J pod came by her side and supported her as she grieved. They nudged her into Eagle Cove on the West side of San Juan island where they created a circle of whales. They breathed deep and regularly and frequently touched her sides. They stayed there for hours and humans on shore observing this were convinced this was a private ceremony not unlike those humans hold when they lose a loved one. Then when J50 (the little spunky whale aka Scarlet) died all the whales of J, K, and L pod came together in a Super Pod (a whale gathering) from far, far away and were observed caring for J50's mother.</p> <p>My point is, these are salient beings with emotions like our own. They have their own culture and depend on language to stay connected, to rear their children and to find food. Their brains have more folds than ours and scientists have determined they are very, very smart.</p> <p>The Southern Resident Killer Whales are protected by the Endangered Species Act. Not unlike the Grey Whales, they are dying from malnutrition. The lack of salmon is their primary threat and is caused by environmental degradation and overfishing. Sound in the ocean has been well studied and does affect their ability to echolocate for their prey. (ECHO program Port of Vancouver). Toxins affect the food web and causes them to eat toxic salmon that kills their babies and young ones when they become malnourished.</p> <p>Their range is the entire Salish Sea and the coastal waters or Alaska, WA, OR and California. No longer do they just forage on the West side of San Juan Island. No longer are they predictable as to where they feed. They now frequently spend long times out in the ocean. When J 56 was born</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	recently and seen outside Tofino, Canada they didn't go to inland waters to nourish mom and baby. They went farther out West in the open sea. The Navy has announced it will be testing sonar in their range adding a huge impact on this already endangered species. We want a safe nation but if we hurt this many marine mammals and cause them damage or to strand what will we be left with as humans? An ailing ecosystem that lacks resilience and biodiversity.	
Rogers-1	Please end this torture for these poor whales! We need to change before everything we love is gone!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Rolland J-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only the No Action Alternative is acceptable to the Olympic Peninsula's environment • The comment period should be extended to a total of 90 days, so more people have time to understand and comment. • People in Forks have reported 94 dBA (decibels) with current flights. This EIS will bring many times more of these flights. • The activities stated in this EIS will damage Olympic National Park and Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. • This training operation will change one of the quietest places in America, Olympic National Park/Hoh Rainforest, to never again. • Since 1907, areas of the Olympic Peninsula have been set aside to protect the Peninsula wildlife. Beginning with Theodore Roosevelt and a series of congressional acts, this protection is in wildlife refuges, a national park for the enjoyment of its citizens, elk, other unique wildlife, wilderness areas to protect the resources from human damage, and a national marine 	<p>The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p> <p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>sanctuary. The area the Navy wishes to convert into an electronic warfare training area has been designated as an environmentally sensitive area for 112 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, the EIS is asking for extension of a NOAA permit for "incidental takes of marine mammals... and incidental takes of threatened and endangered marine species." [EIS p. ES-4] • The Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary was set aside by Congress to protect the sea life of the area. The Naval activities will cause unnecessary damage and should be, and can be, done elsewhere. • The noise of jet training emitter search flights will be harmful to the wildlife, people of the Peninsula, and the visitors to it. This makes the plan a detriment to the health and economy of the Peninsula and the state of Washington. • Idaho and Nevada training areas were designed for warfare training—the Olympic Peninsula was not. • This is not the way to treat a national park or a marine sanctuary. They were created to protect our environment. • The Navy says there will be 5,000 "Growler" jet flights a year over the Olympics. [EIS Appendix J, p. 12] (This would be an average of more than 19 search flights per day over the "Study Area"—5000 flights/260 days). This does not include training flights going out to and from vessels off the coast. • Noise levels (admitted to by the Navy) within the Olympic airspace range from over 80 dB to 100 dB at times [EIS J-22], which the Navy compares to hearing a garbage disposal to a handheld drill [EIS p. J-5]. • "Continued exposure to noise above 85 dBA (adjusted decibels) over time will cause hearing loss. The volume (dBA) and the length of exposure to the sound will tell you how harmful the noise is. In general, the louder the noise, the less time required before hearing loss will occur." [Center for Hearing and Communication] • People in Forks have reported hearing 94 dBA flights under current EIS • There are other health problems that are caused or made worse by noise: • Noise causes & aggravates health problems • High blood pressure (hypertension) • Heart disease (ischemic heart disease) • Increases or creates mental health problems • Other locations for this training are dismissed in 7 lines (out of 1,800 pages) as not offering the same proximity of ships and planes elsewhere in the Pacific Northwest (EIS Section 2, p. 2-21). But with millions of miles of 	<p>Nevada are not reasonable. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). The potential impacts to the economy are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources).</p> <p>The Navy and NMFS have jointly consulted with the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries regarding the effects of the Proposed Action on Sanctuary resources.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>coastline in the U.S., what about other parts of the country?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growlers will be routed over Olympic National Park, Lake Crescent, Sequim and Port Townsend as they transit back and forth between their Whidbey Island base and the Olympic training areas over the Hoh Rainforest and Forks (map on p. 2–19) (19– 20 times 2 = 38–40 passes over this area a day). The map also shows arrows of flight over the Olympic Mountains. The Navy has denied flying over Olympic National Park. This is untrue. Not only is this untrue, it is nearly impossible not to fly these missions over the Park. • "This Supplemental (EIS) does consider the cumulative impacts from these three projects as well as other past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future actions in Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts)" [NAVY EIS p. I–9]. This is an unacceptable statement because the EIS does not. The EIS assumes if there is no study, then none is needed. There is a list of activities that could be cumulative; the list is far from complete. • Information on off-shore activities are vague but asking for "incidental takes" of threatened and endangered mammals is very concerning. • Many of the wildlife impact statements end with "are not anticipated." This usually means the result is unknown because of a lack of experience or knowledge. 	
Rolland S-1	<p>I do want to support you, and have in the past, but your recent intrusion into Olympic National Park air space, and your proposed increase in your impact is so disruptive and unnecessary that it proves you clearly don't care about our environment, economy or quality of life. You are losing good will and that will affect public support for you and your mission. Olympic National Park is the life blood of our peninsula economy. It and the quiet life here is why folks move here, build houses and support local businesses, including mine. The 3.1 million annual visitors support almost every business here. In the last few months I have talked to many tourists, and quite a few have mentioned that the constant Navy jet noise in Port Townsend and Olympic National Park have ruined their trips. Several folks said they would not come back to Port Townsend as it was not a relaxing visit with the noise. Most upset were the campers who had traveled over 1000 miles to spend a week in the Park, only to find themselves buzzed by a set of 3 low flying jets in a remote valley. This has become a common story here. You should be decreasing the number of flights in this sensitive area. I will let others speak to the damage to the animals in the park, my comments are focused on the people, their experience and how it will affect our economy and lives.</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>As people choose not to visit here from the noise, our economy will collapse and jobs will be lost.</p> <p>There are a lot of other places you could train, Mountain Home for one, that are not highly visited and environmentally sensitive National Parks and Biosphere Reserves. Your arrogance in destroying the most loved park in the Northwest is destroying your support. Please care about the people you think you are protecting.</p>	<p>The potential impacts to the economy are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources).</p>
Romberg-1	<p>My name is Annie and I am currently pursuing a Bachelor's in Environmental Science and management with an emphasis in Natural Resource Recreation at Humboldt State University. I am commenting on the draft supplement to the 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS/OEIS and oppose the future activities conducted off the northwest coastal zones including environmental impacts of military training activities, including missile firing, aircraft patrols, and the use of sonar. There are two main purposes, wildlife, and tribal rights.</p> <p>Although the navy has a spotter to see sea life that may be near the surface, not even the most trained eye can see what's happening under the water. Meanwhile, the sonar systems generate slow-rolling sound waves topping out at around 235 decibels that can travel for hundreds of miles underwater and can retain an intensity of 140 decibels as far as 300 miles from their source. Thus, if these effects can be seen in the crowded coast near San Diego, how will it affect waters rich in marine wildlife. Moreover, how will monitoring the effects of testing work if given the idea that severely injured animals rarely make it to shore. Secondly, interTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council concerns should be effectively addressed considering coastal activities that may affect the local resources and preventive measure should be taken.</p> <p>After taking into account cultural resources management methods, the EIS/OEIS) should include further details on cumulative effects and indirect effects in the foreseeable future. Particularly on hearing damage and changes in behavior among marine mammals, including Southern Resident orcas, blue whales, humpback whales, dolphins, and porpoises. More alternatives with the idea of going further out to sea while avoiding sensitive areas for all testing. Although it is understandable the Navy should be allowed to continue the use of some mid-frequency sonar testing for the sake of national security, there are more emanate dangers to our ecosystems.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy will continue to consult with the Tribes. Through Government-to-Government consultations, the Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality. See the responses to the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council comments.</p> <p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Rondelle-1	<p>We are not the only species entitled to exist in peace on this planet. We are part of a planetary biological system that will only thrive when all</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	beings can sustain proper balance. Clearly we are out of balance and the whale population is decreasing rapidly leaving the ocean, that we all need out of balance as well. Please wake up and realize this beautiful system that has been so perfectly created that is in great danger from the sonar testing. Thank you	Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Roomes-1	The majority of these training exercises do not have to be conducted along our shoreline and could instead be conducted far from shore minimizing the impact on birds, fish, marine mammals, other wildlife and communities. There is no evaluation for other locations which could significantly reduce the harmful impacts of these exercises. Training around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas should be avoided. These areas have fragile plant, animal, and human inhabitants.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Rose Jen-1	Imagine every time you knock off work to shop for dinner, there is loud, shrill humming in your ears while you select your frozen fish dinner! Imagine when you jump in your car to head home, the same noise makes it hard to concentrate on traffic and hazards! Imagine getting home and when you walk in the front door a shrill, ear piercing noise starts and stops as you put your shopping away, greet the dog that's going mad with the noise and trying to hide under the bed to escape to no avail! Imagine your kids begging 'dad, make the horrible noise stop, our ears are hurting and we're getting sick but you can't as you have no idea where the noise is coming from or what's causing it, day in, day out! Imagine you cook and eat dinner dreading the next minute in case the noise starts, finally you go to bed exhausted from trying to block it out, you put your ear plugs in and ear muffs over those to try and get some sleep but still the noise penetrates just enough to wake you through the night till you wake exhausted and just want to scream, run or jump off a bridge because the noise never stops night after night! Orcas don't have ear plugs and you inflict that life on them and their friends and families as they try to get on with their lives, swim, catch dinner, play, rest, while you are earning a living at work driving them insane with the noise! They can't just hop in a Ford and drive out of the Ocean to escape the sonars you operate with no side effects apart from the odd yawn! Have mercy on the intelligent whales and orcas and dolphins, they would never dream of using ray guns on you!. Let them live without harmful, totally unnecessary human noise pollution	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	while you think about what you're having for dinner in peace and quiet I assume.	
Rose Jes-1	I am concerned about the effect of testing on species of marine mammals, including critically endangered Southern Resident orcas, blue whales, humpback whales, dolphins, and porpoises. I am concerned about the effect on whale mothers and calves.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Rose S-1	I am worried about the effects of the sonar testing on the Mendocino Coast. Our beautiful coast is a treasured ecosystem that animals of all kinds rely on. Studies have shown that whale calf levels have decreased rapidly. The mothers need sufficient nutrition in order to get pregnant, and deliver a calf. If they are lacking this they will either not get pregnant in the first place, or abort the calf midterm. If sonar testing is happening near feeding sites in the arctic they will leave without getting enough nutrition for their migration down the coast. Sonar testing instantly causes deafness in any whales within five feet of the boat. I also reaches out in all directions 300 feet. The beaches and ocean are a sacred place for the citizens along the Mendocino Coast if the whales are washing up dead and the water is filled with heavy metals (No they will not "Just mix right in") how are the people supposed to raise their children on the beaches, and spend substantial time enjoying our oceans. How would you like it if you woke up en=very morning looked out your window and saw dead animals and toxic waste? I am only 13 years old and I want to raise my children on the coast, but if you do sonar testing how is that going to be a possibility? I leave you asking yourself will you make it safe for animals of all kinds to live on the Mendocino coast?	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Rosling-1	I am concerned that the Navy is not listening to the public- specifically our concerns about the increased growler jet flights at olf. This is NOT a good co-existence with the environment, it's people and animals. I request that the PFA's in Coupeville drinking water be fixed. I don't see that happening with increased flights.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Ross A-1	I've been hearing about extraordinary numbers of beached whales along our West Coast. Whales and other sea animals depend on their hearing to communicate and survive. Navy sonar, which can travel 1000s of miles through the ocean and can even be amplified by some ocean conditions, is deafening for these creatures. Entire pods have been seen to struggle to	The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	escape these killing sounds. It seems your sonar operations will only add to ocean fragility, impacting all ocean life and our coastal community. Please respond. My question is “How you will mitigate these impacts???”	examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities. The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ross C-1	<p>I am concerned about the specifics of what meets your requirements of a substantive comment. You have narrowed comment to data. I think there is nothing more substantive than the concerns as expressed by Mr. Alfred Kitching, as stated in his letter to the Editor of the Peninsula Daily News, June 11, 2019 which i have copied here below:</p> <p>LETTER: Navy Growlers bring noise to wild places</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuesday, June 11, 2019 1:30am • Letters to the Editor, Peninsula Daily News <p>Wild place noises</p> <p>I have no doubt that Navy FA-18 Growlers are important to our national security, nor that there are strategic reasons for the Navy’s desire to have them remain where they are.</p> <p>I do doubt that there is no other reasonable way to protect our national security than to destroy the “peace,” the quiet — intrinsic to the beauty — of what is left of our wild places.</p> <p>This “peace” is not the abstract and never attainable “world peace” that is bandied about by politicians, but actual “peace.”</p> <p>Is such “peace” not the “peace” we all seek, we all need — the “peace” our warriors and their families have died and sacrificed for?</p> <p>Is such “peace” and beauty not a vital part of what makes this “America the beautiful?”</p> <p>It is one thing to live in a city and hear the jets flying overheard amid the competing sounds of our civilization — or to see and hear the Navy’s Blue Angels demonstration team scorching the blue sky during SeaFair in Seattle.</p> <p>It’s different to hear Navy Growlers destroy the silence of land set aside for the quality of that silence.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Our beautiful land is a shared gift to be passed on to our children and grandchildren.</p> <p>The Navy should heed John Muir: "Everybody needs beauty as well as bread, places to play and pray in. Where nature may heal and cheer and give strength to body and soul alike."</p> <p>Comments to the Navy may be submitted at www.nwtteis.com/ by Wednesday.</p>	
Ross R-1	<p>I've read about at least 70 whales stranded on the West Coast this year already. Whales depend on hearing to communicate and survive. The devastating and deafening Navy sonar travels thousands of miles through the ocean, and can even amplify, causing irreparable damage to these animals. Entire pods have been seen to struggle unsuccessfully to escape these killing sounds. Many are beached, and it's inevitable that many more sink further out in the ocean and cannot be counted. This impacts an already fragile ocean and our coastal community. Please respond. What plans do you have to mitigate the damage?</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed mitigation measures are described in Chapter 5 of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Rosser-1	<p>Your use of studies conducted as far back as 1984 as source material for your EIS/OEIS draft is wholly unacceptable. So far this year, 70 gray whales washed ashore on the west coast, five times the average rate. NOAA has declared a wildlife emergency. The SEIS at 3.4.282 states that "military expended materials will sink to the ocean floor". At 3.4.302 the SEIS states that "for the most part," this material will be ingested by bottom feeders, Gray whales are bottom feeders. The SEIS needs to take into account the already stressed gray whale population. Scientific studies have shown that explosives and SONAR are very harmful to marine animals, especially whales and dolphins, Hearing is the way they see and communicate. Explosions deafen them, and a deaf while is a dead whale. And whales are a protected https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/gray-whales-</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>stranded-west-coast-1.5119056 https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533 Moreover, the economic considerations are well-stated in the letter of opposition to sonar testing off the coast of Mendocino County by the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors in their letter to you dated April 21, 2019. To paraphrase: sonar and explosive testing off the Mendocino coast is detrimental to the fragile oceanic ecosystem on which we rely. The wide variety of sea life is a key economic source for our county and must not be damaged in any way. Therefore, the naval exercise using explosives and sonar should not be held off the Mendocino coast. I'm sure the Navy will survive without this additional and very ecologically harmful testing of equipment on our coast.</p>	<p>The Navy uses the most current marine mammal population data available from the National Marine Fisheries Service. The 2008 and 2010 references cited in the comment were not used by the Navy to determine current populations.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p>
Rotchford-1	<p>I have been to several of your public meetings and have found them dishonorable in that you have already made your decisions and care little about community input. Your broad plans for the Puget Sound Area are already being implemented even though you imply our input is important to you. The history of your work with the Whidbey community and environmental and health concerns are regrettable and continue to need addressing. Please practice first things first; your responsibility is not shone here. Last night, I woke to the growlers....you have lost my respect in your lack of environmental stewardship, health concerns and protective measures.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Rourke-1	<p>You're putting these animals in danger. Please don't do it.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Rudd-1	<p>I am writing to describe my concern about the impact of testing the Naval Rail Gun system and pilot mine-detecting underwater drones on marine mammals.</p> <p>Scientists have been learning more how sound can harm and even kill marine life and Naval testing already estimates temporary and permanent hearing loss for thousands of marine creatures in the Northwest. The increasingly noisy underwater home for marine life is causing substantial harm, including to resident Orca populations who rely on sound to hunt. I don't consider this kind of impact on marine life either insubstantial or insignificant. Instead of adding to the noise to Puget Sound, as this proposal would, we need to be subtracting from it.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Rudin-1	<p>I am writing to add my voice ~ and those of my Family, to the Overwhelming Consensus of North Coast folks ABSOLUTELY OPPOSED to the Navy's planned War Exercises & Sonic Testing. Many have sent reams of technical analyses & Peer Review data covering the many unacceptable details, environmental impacts, toxic chemical pollution, and other DANGERS which concern us.</p> <p>I will address here ONE of the myriad Issues of Concern, which to my reasoning is the Bottom Line here: the proposed Sonic Testing is IRREPARABLY {MORTALLY} HARMFUL to Marine Mammals.</p> <p>The entire West Coast is Habitat and Migratory Pathway for many Whales and Dolphins.</p> <p>Where I live, we watch the Gray Whales pass by in large groups twice a year. The Human Communities hereabouts have annual "Whale Festivals", which bring visitors from around the World to witness this miraculous migration.</p> <p>This and other celebrations of the pristine ocean grandeur, are the basis of the Local tourist related Economy, a Major Point which I shall leave others to Elucidate in detail. We depend not only on tourism, but fishing, and exploration {both scientific and recreational} to sustain our rural economy. Non~Tribal, as well as Tribal Communities are actively engaged and dependent upon an intact and robust Ocean Ecosystem for Spiritual as well as material and economic sustenance.</p> <p>Here I shall quote Alex Larson of the Ocean Protection Coalition on this subject of Whale Mortality & Sonar:</p> <p>"We have known for a long time that naval sonar has devastating effects on marine life but just exactly how it leads to sickness and death was a mystery 'til now. In new research published in the Proceedings of the Royal Society B, they discovered that the sound emitted by sonar is so intense</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>that marine mammals will swim hundreds of miles, dive deep into the abyss or even beach themselves to flee from the sounds that are literally unbearable to them.</p> <p>And from the 60s onwards, whales washing up on beachings became a very common occurrence. The paper recently published is a summary of what was discussed at a 2017 meeting of beaked whale experts in the Canary Islands and revealed that sonar distresses beaked whales so much that the marine mammals end up with nitrogen bubbles in their blood very similar to what divers would call decompression sickness or the bends. The nitrogen can cause hemorrhaging and damage to whales vital organs. The big question that was brought up was how an animal that lives in the ocean and is adapted to perform deep water dives for hours at a time can obtain decompression sickness? ...Simply, the sonar is so powerful, the animals dive deep too quickly causing the sickness.</p> <p>"In the presence of sonar they are stressed and swim vigorously away from the sound source, changing their diving pattern," lead author Yara Bernaldo de Quiros told AFP.</p> <p>"The stress response, in other words, overrides the diving response, which makes the animals accumulate nitrogen. It's like an adrenalin shot."</p> <p>The authors note that to mitigate the impacts of sonar on beaked whales, we must ban its use in areas where they're found. A moratorium on the use of MFAS around the Canary Islands in 2004 shows just how well this works – no atypical strandings have been seen since. The researchers urge other countries where sonar is deployed, such as the US, Greece, Italy, and Japan, to follow suit."</p> <p>Recent statistics {2019} from Monterey Bay show an alarming recent increase in Whale and Dolphin Mortality. https://www.cnn.com/2019/05/07/us/ninth-gray-whale-death-trnd/index.html</p> <p>This HUGE and serious Problematic Issue is well documented. I have touched on only one underlying aspect.</p> <p>However, I am aware, and SO ARE YOU, that the preponderance of evidence argues unequivocally for a MORATORIUM on this practice of Sonar testing. The area of impact ~ 300 miles ~ is inescapable for Whales and the resulting harm {death} is INEXCUSABLE.</p> <p>I support the Sinkyone Tribal protection zone. It's a start.</p> <p>Please Consider That this War Against the Whales, is contrary to The Peoples' Will, Nature's Will and the primary mandate of the U.S. Navy:</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	protection of our Coastline. Scrap these plans as they have been written.	
Rudin-2	<p>No action option. Whatever -- however it's worded in the EIR; I'll take all the papers home and I will read them. And I have read EIRs before, so they don't make my head explode. I know how to do that, I can read a THP. But did you not get an idea that we have a consensus in this community? Did you get a whole lot of people going, "Wow, the Navy, that's a good idea"? No, you didn't, did you? No. Not even the Navy people think it's a good idea. The people that are ex-Navy here go, "Watch out for those guys." This needs to stop. They stopped it for 12 miles for the Tribe, they can stop the whole thing for everybody. We're all tribes here. I mean, 12 miles is not going to help much, but there's a couple of other options, I understand from Hawk Rosales. He's one of the people on the Sinkyone Wilderness Consortium Committee. Priscilla Hunter was here, too. She's the once and future chief of the Noyo tribe. And there's ten tribes in the Sinkyone group. It actually is the first federal park that's administered by tribes. I imagine there's some more by now, but it was the first one a few years ago. And they had to fight really hard, and they had lots of meetings like this, and it wore everybody down, and everybody learned how to read EIRs and talk to people. And by golly, they managed to get their toe in the door. But this needs to stop. And people need to learn how to think a different way that supports life on this planet, and doesn't, like, "Oh, we can get away with a little bit. So what if a few whales beach and die because their heads are scrambled?" Those guys are bigger than us, they're smarter than us, we don't have a right to do this to them. And we don't have a right to poison the ocean. Do you have kids? Yeah. Yeah. I have a son, and grandnephews, and been trying to hold the line for a long time, since I was young here. I came here when I was young. And I'm not that young anymore, I don't expect that anybody's going to -- you know, I'm not putting on flippers to go out and meet the Navy, but we've got young people who will. And I know people like the Navy come around and they go, "Well, look at, the population isn't very big here, it's a sparsely populated rural area." That doesn't mean you get to trash it. And it doesn't mean the Navy gets to trash it. I'm not saying you personally, but we all figure out where our paycheck comes from, you know? And this has always been amazing to me. (Talks off record about court reporters.) No action option. Erase this plan. You don't want to be setting off bombs or doing sonar or put crap and phosphorous and garbage in that ocean, ever. Any part of it. But we'll start here with this part of it. And the tribes have managed to secure 12 miles,</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	which isn't going to help diddly. It will help a little, but, I mean, I don't know if the whales are, "Let's go over there," you know? "Come over here, it's safe," you know? No. They go down to Baja, they have their babies, and then they come back up here. And we see them twice a year, and we wave at them, and, you know, have little festivals, and drink wine, and watch them go by and spout. And that's nice, but it requires them to be alive and healthy. And that ocean out there is not healthy anymore. It's not necessarily the Navy's fault, but the cumulative impact. We've got global warming, we've got Fukushima, we've got all sorts of things. The temperature has risen and the kelp died off furiously over the last about three years. It's coming back a little. I don't know, I'm not an ocean expert. But I know we don't want this to happen, and we will resist it. They will not have a good time if they come around and try to do this. We will give them a hard time over and over and over again. And there may not be a whole lot of us compared to if you live in a city and you're looking around. We don't have that kind of look around in Fort Bragg, but we have who we have. And we've got kids.	
Rueda-1	I am 100% against sonic testing in the Salish Sea. This harmful practice endangers the marine ecosystem and the wildlife in it. Southern Resident Killer Whales are down to 76 members and it is our duty to do everything we can to protect them and ensure they have all the resources they need to make a comeback.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ruggieri-1	Please protect the orcas from the sonic sounds. They are very sensitive to these noises. Thank you	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ruhnke-1	I am against sonar testing because it negatively impacts delicate wildlife including endangered orcas and other cetaceans.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ruiz-1	Please stop doing sonar tests that it's hurting wildlife!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Rumble-1	<p>In your efforts to train and test readiness of your Sonar system, I ask that you take all proper measures to protect and respect the critical marine resources living in the testing areas.</p> <p>The Northern California coast is a long established migration route of the California Gray Whale. Twice a year the Grays pass through our coastal waters. Coastal events and family outings are determined by the whale migration. They provide a social and economic boon to the Mendocino coast.</p> <p>The Grays' existence, and that of other marine mammals, is protected by our country's Marine Mammal Act as well as the National Environmental Policy Act. The use of high powered SONAR stresses, disorients and leads many whales to leave their calves, in addition to causing others to rapidly alter their diving patterns.</p> <p>Knowing this, why is the US Navy unwilling to modify its SONAR testing program? Why isn't the US NAVY limiting its testing to areas tha will not directly impact the lives of thousands of whales (as well as other marine mammals)? Why can't the Navy respect the routes and timing of the California Gray Whales and not accept collateral kills?</p> <p>I ask that you cease using SONAR in known Gray Whale migration routes and habitation areas. Our current and future national security will not suffer from this testing limit.</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Rush-1	<p>Regarding Noise impact from Jet Fighter Training Flights : The Puget Sound is a densely populated area, interspersed with a few remaining segments of wilderness. To many of us these wild areas are as sacred as any church, or Synagogue. I strongly encourage the Navy to use other lower impact locations for the bulk of Jet Fighter trainings! I am not anti- military, however, the Navy must GIVE AS MUCH CONSIDERATIONS TO THE NEEDS AND WISHES OF THOSE WHO PAY FOR THESE MILITARY OPERATIONS, AS IT GIVES TO YOUR ISSUES OF CONVENIENCE. I know that the Navy has a number of possible locations where training needs can be fulfilled with far less impact on civilian life. It is not acceptable nor appropriate for the Navy to conduct trainings in ANY LOCATION IT WISHES, without taking into account the impact it is having. My request is to USE LOW IMPACT LOCATIONS, not the densely populated Puget sound Area.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Russell-1	<p>I am deeply concerned that the Navy is proposing to do sonar testing in the Salish Sea. The Salish Sea is the home of the critically endangered southern resident orcas. Studies of sonar has shown it to cause the deaths of whales. We can not risk this endangered and beloved species! This must not happen!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Rust-1	<p>Please take into consideration the Southern Resident Killer Whales. They are already on the brink of extinction and the noise created by the Navy's testing makes it even more difficult for them to find food. There must be other areas for testing.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Rutherford-1	<p>Coming into a quiet, pristine, sleepy coastal town and blasting it with your munitions makes you the enemy, the aggressors, the bad guys!</p> <p>You're the ones coming to harm us.</p> <p>What mandate says that's ok?</p> <p>And who do we call to protect us from you?</p> <p>We've got delicate ecosystems that developed because we banded together to make sure they were protected, we've got peaceful and good lives here we've built with decades of sane, well-thought-out planning; each decision was carefully weighed.</p> <p>Forget being all you can be. This is your defining moment. And turning your guns on peaceable kingdoms along your own coastline is not it.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Ryan-1	<p>Port Townsend, WA 98368</p> <p>I should be one of your strongest cheerleaders. My dad fought in the South Pacific in WWII, my brother was stationed on a navy base in Asmara, now part of Eritrea. A cousin fought in WWII and Korea. I lived in the area of the Newport Naval base in RI for 50 years. They worked closely with the community service organizations and were a respected partner in the community.</p> <p>I have followed your publications. I have noted with dismay the proposal to upgrade Indian Island, and proposals for expanded military training locally, have been awakened by the house shaking as growlers roared overhead. I volunteer at a foodbank garden, and with a number of military vets, serve vets and others at a local foodbank. The VFW is a shelter for homeless, a number of them are vets.</p> <p>So, my thinking is changing. I do not see the Navy problem solving with us in the community, as I did in Newport. When I hear the growlers, I am unable to sleep thinking of those in the middle east under fire, losing their families, watching their loved ones die for lack of food, water, shelter; increasingly radicalized. When I hear of expanding weapons storage on Indian Island, I remember that 9/11 was the work of mostly Saudi allies, trained at our flight schools, flying our commercial passenger planes into Wall Street and the Pentagon, and wonder why we need more weapons when we already outpace the world. When I hear of advanced training exercises on our shores in civilian communities, I think of the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq following 9/11, and the devastation of their societies and rise of terrorist groups responding in civilian areas around the world. When I see the size of the military budget, I also deal daily with the impacts</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>on lack of food, housing, medical care that we are being told our taxes cannot afford to cover.</p> <p>None of this brings me comfort or security. Rather, as a civilian whose taxes support the military and pay your salaries, I feel betrayed.</p> <p>So, in response to the reports I say no. No support for proposed special operations training worldwide deployment. No support for small-unit land and cold-water maritime training activities in Puget Sound, Hood Canal, or Admiralty Bay. No support for expanding munitions. No support for training in electromagnetic warfare over the Olympic Peninsula.</p> <p>I support the no action alternative. I wish I had written when this was first covered in the news in 2015.</p>	
Ryder-1	<p>The Navy's sonar scanning is causing physical damage, especially hearing loss, for all marine animals. Wildlife doesn't know country borders, so what you're doing also affects wildlife that travels between Canada and the USA. I ask that you either stop these tests altogether or, at the very least, actually pay attention to your surroundings and stop well before it can affect other creatures. We all share this planet together, after all.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Rylott-1	<p>It is absolutely crucial that the Navy stop their sonar testing. Find another way that does not disrupt our aquatic ecosystems. Sonar testing is leading to the impairment of Orcas, who depend on echo location to find food and to communicate with their pod. The Navy is quite literally helping contribute to the devastation and starvation of the orca population in continuing to practice using sonar. Orcas cannot locate food if they cannot hear it using their echo location due to it being disrupted by the Navy's sonar testing. My brother is entering the armed forces, and practices like your use of sonar are what drive me to not recommend joining the Navy, and also sway his decision away from wanting to join as well. If you want to continue receiving public support and recognition, you must stop this practice immediately.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
S		
S A-1	<p>Stop hurting marine life !!!!</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
S M-1	We need to keep our ice and safe. It's an act that will help keep our species alive. We need to save the ocean	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Saalfeld-1	<p>Please consider suspending these activities at least until such time it can be determined the reason for the most recent die-off of massive multiples of the grey whales.</p> <p>Please don't put our US NAVY in the position to be blamed for even more damage to these great mammals!</p> <p>The ocean environment directly off our West coast is undergoing an enormous amount of change right now and it would be unwise to add to that level of stress and very likely be the center of blame for additional die-offs.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration ~</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Saenz-1	You should really stop this nonsense...	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Sagen-1	Our Puget Sound orcas are struggling to survive. There is already too much surface and underwater noise. It overwhelms the orcas own sonar abilities. Without those abilities, they can't locate fish to eat. They are starving. Please don't increase their problems. Decrease rather than increase your testing.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The alternatives carried forward meet the Navy's purpose and need to ensure that it can fulfill its obligation under U.S.C. Title 10. As explained in Section 2.5 (Alternatives Development) of the EIS/OEIS, the range of alternatives considered by the Navy must be reasonable alternatives. To be reasonable, an alternative must meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. A curtailment or reduction in the number of training and testing activities would not meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, and would therefore be unreasonable.</p>
Salazar-1	To whom is in charge of these tests, I am against sonar! Please stop hurting other lives. Stop the carelessness. It is unfair, unethical, irresponsible and cruel to hurt marine life. It is your duty to defend & protect. Thank you for your service,	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Salgado-1	The Navy should not be allowed to dump anything into Puget Sound, especially heavy metals. How is this even up for debate? Heavy metals affect all life and can destroy our already fragile ecosystems. Whatever we put into the water comes back to us. Has the navy ever heard of Minimata	<p>The Navy's proposed activities do not include dumping of any materials, including heavy metals. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Disease that occurred in Japan? It is a serious neurological illness caused by dumping heavy metals into local waterways. The Navy should never have the right to ever dispose of anything into Puget Sound.	procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.
Salver-1	We understand national security and it's importance. But not at the expense of our Marine life, and neuronal treasures, the whales. We won't stand by idly while the massacre of cetaceans continues, causing hearing loss, brain damage, and death.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Salzman-1	"WE PEOPLE...of the Pacific Northwest Coast of the United States request you deny the U.S. Navy a permit to expand its training, increase the use of high level sonar technology, more explosions and more chemical releases along the Pacific northwest coast in the Gray Whales' migration path between the Arctic Circle and Baja Sur California. The Gray Whales would have to pass through a deadly training area ten times in five years. The Navy has asked in its permit application to be allowed to "take" (harass, injure, modify behavior and for certain kill) millions of marine mammals."	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Sampson-1	This needs to stop immediately! It's not okay to do something dangerous like this in the home of the endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales! Please stop, they deserve better!	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.
Samusick-1	If these sonic tests procede you will be harming and killing hundreds if not thousands of sea creatures. Just kill all life on the planet so you can stop planning and manufacturing wars. Upshot is, you are destroying our only home with your endless "testing" of sonic weapons. You are killing your own children. Fine work.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Samzun-1	I am totally against underwater sonar testing, wich has been proven to cause harm to marine animals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Sanchez-1	Stop the testing! It is hurting the marine mammals!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Sandlin-1	Please stop using sonar in the ocean!! Protect the marine life!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Sands-1	It is unconscionable to frighten and to destroy the lives of the porpoises, orcas and whales that have made Puget Sound and its environs for eons. Stop it! You have no right to make such life altering noise!!!!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.mil/marine-species-monitoring • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Sanghvi-1	DON'T DO SONAR TESTING. Don't go into someone else's home and destroy their quality of living.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Sanguino-1	Is it not considered "Substantive" to just explain to the Navy how the jets flying above my home is causing stress? I purchased my home in 2011. It was not disclosed to me that Jets would fly directly above my home. They did not fly above my home for the first few years. This year, I have seen and heard jets flying directly above my home. When the jets fly above my home, my windows rattle, dogs scramble and cats disappear! Expanding your flight zone above homes that were not in the flight paths previously is causing my home value to decrease and an increase in my	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	PTSD events. Move it, or reduce it.	The alternatives carried forward meet the Navy's purpose and need to ensure that it can fulfill its obligation under U.S.C. Title 10. As explained in Section 2.5 (Alternatives Development) of the EIS/OEIS, the range of alternatives considered by the Navy must be reasonable alternatives. To be reasonable, an alternative must meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. A curtailment or reduction in the number of training and testing activities would not meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, and would therefore be unreasonable.
Santoro-1	STOP TESTING THATS KNOWINGLY HARMING ANIMALS	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Santos-1	I am completely against sonar testing because it is very harmful to marine wildlife, specially the resident orcas. Please do not perform sonar testing. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Santosa-1	This program would threaten the livability of the island by significantly increasing the noise, would threaten the economic stability of the island by discouraging tourism, and further threaten our critically endangered wildlife in the Sound. Please consider more modest increases or a	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	distribution of these activities across the region. The citizens of Whidbey, the tourists of Seattle, and the Orcas of the Sound thank you.	Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.
Santowski-1	The Navy's sonar testing is heavily disrupting and possibly killing ocean life. This is especially detrimental to the Orca whale populations that swim through this area. Already these orcas face so many obstacles, such as starvation. The sonar testing can disrupt their already limited feeding and further worsen their condition. At this critical moment, the orcas need support now more than ever. This can be further backed by the fact that these orcas are on the endangered species list, making it even more important that we not only leave them to be in peace because they are a beautiful part of our world, but also because they desperately need our help. These sonar tests are not helping. Please find another option.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Sarver-1	<p>I am writing with regard to the Navy proposed action, specifically the increase in the proposed number of Navy Growler flights in the area of the Olympic Peninsula.</p> <p>I request that you modify your plans to ensure that your flights are routed away from populated areas and Olympic National Park, that the proposed number of flights be reduced and that efforts be made to further mitigate the sound impacts on human and animal communities.</p> <p>I am a frequent visitor to Port Townsend and plan to move there in the future. The noise generated by the increased practices of military aircraft threaten to undermine the economic and physical health of the community.</p> <p>Thanks for considering this request.</p> <p>Sincerely, Stephanie L. Sarver</p>	<p>The Navy considered but did not develop mitigation for aircraft overflights, such as shifting transit routes, relocating aircrew training activities, or modifying flight altitudes, because such mitigation would not be practical to implement due to implications for safety and mission requirements. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) controls the National Airspace System and routes that overlap the NWTT Study Area. The FAA designed the routes to efficiently manage air traffic in the region and to safely deconflict military traffic from commercial and general aviation aircraft, with consideration given to the presence of Canadian National Airspace and traffic to the north. The FAA is the responsible federal agency for determining transit routes and any changes to such routes must be approved by the FAA. The Navy is currently in discussions with the FAA exploring the possibility of shifting the FAA-established transit routes for military aircraft transiting to and from the Olympic MOA from Naval Air Station Whidbey Island to the north of the Olympic Peninsula. The purpose of these discussions is to consider the efficient and safe use of navigable airspace. While ultimately any shift in transit routes is the FAA's decision, it is possible that, if approved, such a shift will have the added benefit of reducing military aircraft noise over the Olympic National Park.</p> <p>The alternatives carried forward meet the Navy's purpose and need to ensure that it can fulfill its obligation under U.S.C. Title 10. As explained in Section 2.5 (Alternatives Development) of the EIS/OEIS, the range of alternatives considered by the Navy must be reasonable alternatives. To be reasonable, an alternative must meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. A curtailment or reduction in the number of training and testing</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		activities would not meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, and would therefore be unreasonable.
Satiacum-1	Please stop the Naval activity. When the planes fly by, it scares my little nephew's, and they run inside and cover their ears!! I would hate for the activities to increase.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Saul-1	I have just learned about the EIS/OEIS issued by the Navy on March 29, 2019, that alarms me. I visit the Olympic Peninsula for quiet outdoor pursuits such as hiking, backpacking, birding, botanizing, camping, and nature photography. The only acceptable alternative is No Action. The other two alternatives presented in the EIS/OEIS would create unacceptable impacts on the environment and visitors and residents of the Olympic Peninsula, including Olympic National Park, Olympic National Forest, the three Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges, Washington Islands Wilderness, Colonel Bob Wilderness, Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, state parks, Native American reservations, and several communities. The noise from multiple daily low flying Navy Growler jets over the western and northern parts of the Olympic Peninsula would chase residents and tourists away. This will affect the natural and human health and economy of the Peninsula and the State of Washington. The search pattern of Growler jet flights looking for emitters would roar above ocean beaches, frighten sea birds and marine mammals, and disturb hikers on the wilderness beach of Olympic National Park and the residents of towns like Forks and Amanda Park. I have experienced low-flying military jet aircraft in the Cascades Mountains, Steens Mountain, and the desert Southwest so I know how unsettling and disturbing the noise can be. Under this proposal, Navy Growlers will fly search patterns over the wild Olympic coast for up to 16 hours a day and up to 260 days a year -- 5,000 Growler jet flights a year averages 19 or more flights per day. The Navy admits to 85-200 decibels of noise per pass. That is enough to cause hearing loss and contribute to other health problems, such as high blood pressure, heart disease, and mental health problems. Residents of Forks have recorded 94 decibels of noise under current operations. While noise is known to affect humans, no studies have been done of the impacts	The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period. The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>of that noise on nesting sea birds, sea otters, Olympic elk, migrating shore birds, and other birds following the coastline of the Pacific Flyway. This degradation of the Olympic Peninsula's environment is unacceptable. For 112 years, Congresses and Presidents have set aside areas of the Peninsula under protective designations. Irreparable damage would be caused if the Navy is allowed to proceed with its proposed activities. Incidental take of threatened and endangered species and migratory birds, particularly seabirds, already threatened and in population decline due to climate change, is unacceptable. Tufted puffins, common murre, rhinoceros auklets and other sea birds that nest on offshore islands would be frightened off their nests, exposing the eggs to predation, breakage and loss. Given the number of flights anticipated, nesting success could be zero for these sensitive species.</p> <p>Marine mammals use the offshore islands for haul out and resting. They too would be frightened into the water, disturbing their rest and causing them to burn energy reserves, decreasing survival.</p> <p>Please stop this plan. Wild places on the Olympic Peninsula are not empty places waiting for military exploitation. They are environmentally sensitive areas. Other locations for this training should be fully evaluated.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	
Sause-1	<p>Notwithstanding the Navy's stated efforts to minimize the harm caused to marine mammals by the use of sonar and explosives in marine environments to detect the presence of submarines, there is overwhelming evidence that mammal stranding events in the areas in which testing takes place, occurring immediately after testing, are linked to the use of sonar. Necropsies conducted have shown hemorrhaging in their inner ears and around their brains that indicate acoustic or impulse injuries which likely triggered the strandings.</p> <p>Even when use of sonar does not lead to death in mammals, their hearing can be damaged for periods of time, and also permanently. According to the Navy's own calculations, porpoises swimming in inland Washington waters could experience temporary hearing loss from sonar at least 95,943 times over a period of seven years. Sonar could cause them permanent hearing loss 1,033 times over that same period of time, and a behavioral reaction ranging from distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound occur 101,377 times, according to that same estimate. According to research biologist John Calambokidis, limited hearing in the frequencies of sound that marine mammals use extensively, will limit their survival.</p> <p>Environmental groups have fought the Navy's and NMFS in court over the</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	use of sonar along US coastal waters. In 2015, after a judge sided with environmentalists, whale habitat in Hawaii and Southern California was declared off-limits to sonar. In 2016, a federal appeals court ruled that the Navy should not have been allowed to use low-frequency, long-range sonar in some locations, having failed to give adequate protections to areas of the world's oceans its own experts had flagged as biologically important. The reasoning that resulted in the protection of whales in Southern California and Hawaii applies to all our coastal waters. Why are Northwest's marine mammals, their species survival already endangered, left unprotected?	
Savage J-1	I want to be on the record against this. I was a journalist during the time that PG&E (the utility) was using sonic to determine earthquake hazards around nuclear power plants. I studied a lot of data - knowing more about earthquake potential = good. But the sonic method = bad. Scientific and public efforts finally shut down the process. Don't start up again. Sea life has enough problems without you stressing it ever more.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Savage R-1	Our household is against adding more jets and flight paths above Washington State. Please consider the studies being done about effects of Naval Sonar and it's negative impacts on the environment. Our island eco system cannot support more resident pilots and their families.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Sawyer E-1	The Navy cannot be allowed to dump toxic heavy metals into any coastal waters, to include the already over-polluted Puget Sound. The amount of stress our Salish Sea ecosystem is under as it is already has proven too much. To add such toxins as uranium or cobalt or whatever else the US Navy has conjured up is to add fuel to the fire. The Navy already kills hundreds of echolocating marine mammals every year with its sonar blast weapons testing, and now they add insult to injury by asking to dump heavy metals into the very place these creatures call home. Why don't we just pour gasoline all over ourselves and jump in the caldera of Mount St Helens if that is how we are going to aid our dying oceans? It would be a better use of time and money. If the Navy didn't have a good way of	The Navy's proposed activities do not include dumping of any materials, including heavy metals. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	disposing these byproducts in the first place, why were they using such a process that made them at all? This is a national disgrace. Do better.	
Sawyer H-1	Navy sonar testing in the Salish Sea absolutely cannot happen. This testing will impact the marine life (whales, dolphins, seals, and walruses) in a myriad of devastating ways, and subsequently, all the life that depends on the marine mammals to survive. This will impact all marine ecosystems, coastal ecosystems, and eventually terrestrial ecosystems...Which includes humans! The underwater sounds will interfere with marine mammals' echolocation and impacts their ability to communicate, mate, travel, feed/hunt, and be social. The loss of communication can separate members of a pod and calves from their mothers causing stress. The frequency of the sonar testing can also cause physical damage to marine life by disrupting their hearing causing them to wash up on shore and become beached. In 2005, 34 whales died off the coast of North Carolina due to navy sonar training. We CANNOT allow this to continue, not in our Salish Seas; not to our whales. Not in any seas; not to any whales. Navy sonar testing is not worth the lives in our oceans.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWT Final EIS/OEIS, and the "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June 2017)" (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents).</p>
Scammell-1	The Navy needs to refrain from any more sonic testing, especially these crazy futuristic ones they are proposing. It's time to start thinking about our animals instead of crazy weapons.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Scarborough-1	A sense of place is key to our constitutionally-guaranteed right to the pursuit of happiness, and the Olympic Peninsula is the focal point in this regard not only for me, but for many thousands, if not millions, of residents in this region. We take personally any threats to the Olympic ecosystem, our literal or figurative home and also a place of great international significance. The proposed action on the part of the Navy is as acute of a threat to the long-term integrity of the Olympic Peninsula as anything in living memory. What's more, it calls into question whom our nation's military is serving and protecting, because it certainly doesn't appear to be the established, taxpaying residents of Washington state.	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977.</p> <p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>No Action is the only acceptable alternative for the Northwest Training and Testing proposal. Growler warfare training as proposed would fly search patterns over the irreplaceable rain forest valleys and coast of the Olympic wilderness for most days of the year and most hours of the day, with noise impacts causing incalculable damage to natural systems, residents' wellbeing en route, and the regional economy. Perversely, this would occur in an area documented to currently be among the quietest places remaining in an increasingly (and intolerably) noisy world. It is directly contradictory to over a century's worth of conservation work on the Olympic Peninsula, beginning with the Theodore Roosevelt administration. The draft supplemental EIS/OEIS falls woefully short on analysis of cumulative impacts, as they pertain to the juxtaposition of the proposed action, previous actions in this context, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. It is remarkable that the Navy would contemplate such a dramatic escalation of warfare training, with its resulting noise (and visual) impacts, in an area featuring not only a highly intact and sensitive ecosystem, but a high concentration of human communities fully dependent upon the same. What branch of the U.S. government would pursue such inevitable degradation of a tenuously functioning region within our own national boundaries? Apparently, and regrettably, this would be the Navy, but there is still time to correct course by selecting the No Action alternative.</p>	<p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Schanfald-1	<p>These training exercises need to stop proceeding at every hour of the day and night.</p> <p>It is one thing to experience them in the afternoon, but 11 PM, 1 AM, 3 AM, etc., this is a health issue beyond the planes are emissions. You should not be waking babies, ill people, senior citizens, school aged children, anyone at these hours. Stop them!</p> <p>The majority of these training exercises do not have to be conducted along our shoreline and could instead be conducted far from shore minimizing the impact on birds, fish, marine mammals, other wildlife and communities. There is no evaluation for other locations which could significantly reduce the harmful impacts of these exercises. Training around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas could be must be avoided. It has seriously disrupted the public while they are in public parks. You have places in other states already set up for this training where the least disturbance occurs. That is where training she be held.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Schaub-1	I am in complete opposition of naval sonar.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Schaul-1	Don't allow this practice to happen. We need to protect our sea mammals before they die or become extinct!	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Scheier-1	I recognize that the Navy and military families have a long history within the PNW region. I am from a military background. My father was a WWII glider pilot. I respect the men and women who serve this country. The length of time the Navy has been situated in this region Does not give it greater community authority. To state this history as a reason the Navy can do whatever it wants is a bit like saying my next door neighbor can set up a punk-rock theater in their back yard because they have lived here longer than me. The much louder growlers are highly disturbing to me. Being woken up in the night repeatedly is hazardous to my health. Time spent in the forest, Olympic National Park, and on the Sea has been rattled, harassed, and spiritually disturbed by the Navy jets.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Scherba-1	Stop the sonar testing!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Scheuermann -1	As the wife of an audiologist this is reprehensible. And as an animal lover beyond evil.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Schiavo-1	I would like to keep our coastline and waterways pristine, for tourism, fishing, the environment and for the locals.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Schiffman-1	I hereby submit my request that you not dump depleted uranium, explosives, or heavy metals into the Pacific Ocean (or any ocean). Such actions are in contravention to good stewardship of the oceans. Please withdraw this dangerous plan.	The Navy's proposed activities do not include dumping of any materials, including depleted uranium, explosives, and heavy metals. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Thank you.	goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.
Schindler-1	<p>No Action Alternative Is my choice after long and careful thought and analysis.</p> <p>This choice is made because the current training area includes the Olympic National Park, a World Heritage Site. The Park is designated by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization as having special cultural or physical significance. There are 23 sites in the United States but only 10 are west of the Mississippi River. Olympic National Park is the only site in the States of Oregon, Idaho and Washington.</p> <p>In addition, the training area includes the Olympic Marine Sanctuary, where the marine environment is supposed to enjoy special protection. There are only 14 such Sanctuaries in the entire United States including Hawaii and Alaska.</p> <p>Yes, training is essential and without military protection the Park and Sanctuary might not be able to exist. But the choice by the Navy to use one of the rare temperate rainforests in the world as a training area is baffling. The chance of a war in a temperate rainforest is unlikely.</p> <p>The military should choose a trading site that does not include a World Heritage Site National Park and the Olympic Marine Sanctuary. Thank you.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Schirmann-1	<p>Please take your war training out of the paths of the beloved whales. Please have common good sense about how the massive sonar, huge explosions, and harmful chemicals affect the oceans!</p> <p>Have care for the life on Mother Earth and her mysteries and powers! I say definitely No to the abuse of defense powers that harm the whales and waters!</p> <p>Oh, with care, how this jewel planet earth would have peace and wondrous solutions for life here.</p> <p>Where's the respect and responsibility for mother nature?! Especially in these regions (N. California), with many fault lines into the ocean.</p> <p>And about the pervasive, bitzy pieces of plastic in ocean waters...Now there is a challenge worth the time and effort, and the Navy could show some organization there, and move up in history and herstory. Great good will come from her!</p> <p>Let's get out of the war-mentality and live with care-full solutions!</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Let's show some Devotion for Mother Earth Oceans let's clean up the messes and the mega stresses that industry inflicts on us all	
Schmidt L-1	You must stop destroying this homes and habitat of all ocean beings. You must just stop test explosives in the ocean. Senseless slaughter of whales and dolphins and all other life in the ocean. You destroy all our homes by doing this unacceptable testing in the ocean.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Schmidt S-1	<p>I will address two specific areas of concern.</p> <p>1. Marine Mammals, specifically Southern Resident Killer Whales</p> <p>In section 3.4.3.1, in considering combined impacts of all stressors under Alternative 1, the EIS states: "Although potential impacts on certain marine mammal species from military readiness activities under Alternative 1 may include injury to individuals, those injuries are not expected to lead to long-term consequences for populations." At the same time, the EIS acknowledges that "Navy training and testing activities may overlap designated critical habitat, as defined by the ESA, for the Eastern North Pacific Southern Resident killer whale."</p> <p>What I don't see acknowledged is the extreme vulnerability of this declining population of Southern Resident orcas. In the case of this sensitive and long-lived species, the loss of even ONE INDIVIDUAL, particularly a breeding female, could have a significant POPULATION impact on this endangered species.</p> <p>According to the EIS (p. 3.4-406) "the use of sonar and other transducers, explosives, and vessels...as described under the Preferred alternative ... may result in Level A harassment and Level B harassment of certain marine mammals."</p> <p>Based upon this information in the EIS, I suggest that there must be a ban on "sonar and other transducers, explosives, and vessels" at all times that the Southern Residents are in the Salish Sea (the waters is anywhere east of Cape Flattery). The same concerns apply along the shores of British Columbia, Washington, Oregon and northern California where the Southern Resident Killer Whales also spend much of their time foraging.</p> <p>There are many conditions of weather and lighting under which it is impossible for trained observers to detect the presence of marine mammals. Additionally, the effects of sonar and explosives carry much farther through the water than observers can see. So committing to</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	stopping these activities when observers spot marine mammals of concern is completely insufficient.	
Schmidt S-2	<p>2. The proposed extension of the permit to perform warfare training over Olympic National Forest/Park.</p> <p>As a resident of central Whidbey Island who lives close to NAS Whidbey's Outlying Field, I have documented the excessive noise levels of the Growler aircraft. I recognize that this EIS is not the place to specifically address that concern, but it gives me a visceral understanding of how destructive Growler overflights are to peace, health and outdoor enjoyment. Using the airspace over Olympic National Forest, which immediately adjoins and impacts the National Park, is contrary to the intent of the National Park. The increasingly numerous flights of Growler aircraft over the Olympic Peninsula, San Juan Islands and Whidbey Island is destructive to our economy, our tourism, our health and our children's well-being. I know that the estimates of noise pollution and noise effects given in the EIS for the expansion of the Growler fleet at NAS Whidbey were utterly inadequate and did not accurately represent the noise levels experienced by those under the jets. While I have not been able to review all of this EIS, I suspect that the true impact of the body-shattering noise of these aircraft has not been recognized in this EIS either. Having lived in our home for 20 years, about 15 of them under Prowler touch-and-go flights, I can attest to the profound difference we have experienced with the onset of the Growler aircraft. I can feel the vibrations in my internal organs, regardless of wearing ear protection. The noise of the Prowlers was annoying and stopped conversation. The noise of the Growler is shattering and sends us fleeing indoors.</p> <p>The Olympics are a unique treasure. I oppose all military practices in the airspace over the Olympic Peninsula.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977.</p> <p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Schneider-1	I represent a tour operator based in Seattle, WA that spends considerable amounts of time with travelers from around the planet during visits to Olympic National Park. In the Northwest, Olympic National Park (a UNESCO site) represents what is best-saved from a previous era and protects what will likely be extremely important as we head into more-complex times. We have long since given up running trips to another special place - Deception	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Pass State Park - due to the insane levels of noise produced by 'growler' flights.</p> <p>It's no secret that Americans and world travelers alike consider the American National Park system one of the U.S.'s best ideas. Having traveled to a majority of the major Parks in the system, I can tell you that Olympic National Park is one of the finest in the system due to its contiguous, road-less core which offers a true wilderness and real silence (something exceedingly rare in our lifetime - how could any place get more quiet, rather than more noise-filled, today?). Additionally, Olympic National Park represents intact ecosystems representative of wild Northwestern places that have otherwise been heavily assaulted during recent human history (natural resource extraction, fragmented ownership, urban development, etc).</p> <p>Growler flights near or over Olympic National Park aren't good for anyone aside from the armed forces. Olympic National Park and it's wild denizens don't win, millions of travelers don't win, business owners on the Peninsula don't win. We're a small company that tries to protect what we love about the wild Pacific Northwest - Olympic National Park is a rare, fragile remnant of the world's pristine, largely compromised quiet space. When Navy administrators take a weekend with the family, my guess is they don't go sit on a tarmac and enjoy the sounds of the world's loudest planes taking off - they likely head someplace peaceful. Given our modern political climate, I suspect it's likely that no one ever even reads these community comments and the Navy will just do what it wants to - it's too bad that special interests so frequently override the din of the majority.</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Schnurer-1	<p>And I'm a professor at Humboldt State University. And I'm here to call for the continued moratorium and to oppose this project. And, in particular, I want to name three different reasons why I think that is really important. And the first of which is native sovereignty, that most of the native nations on the north coast have vigorously opposed this action. And I think if we want to imagine consultation, consultation would mean listening with native nations. And so if native nations are going to be just communicated with, then that's not actual consultation. And so, essentially, to my understanding of the nation-to-nation conversations between the United States Navy and native nations would be listening to what they actually say. If they are calling for a continuance of the moratorium, if they are asking for this project to not to continue forward, then, as a non-native person on native land in the north coast, it seems vital to show up as an advocate and</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>to encourage the navy to rethink, maybe pause this project. The second reason that I wanted to oppose is local businesses and industries. I think that we rely on tourism, fishing, crabbing, and the enjoyment of the local ecosystem and nature. And I think testing of both sonar, of military weapons will have dramatic negative impacts on the north coast's tourism. And we really need the support and space for those industries. The third reason that I would oppose this is that I think the environmental impacts are too risky. And I want to say that I think dolphins, whales, porpoises, cetaceans are a complex, higher order species that should get consideration. But, of course, more complexly, I think the intricate connections between ecosystems should be considered using something like the precautionary principal, the possibility of harm. And we have some pretty good studies of the complexities of whale life, of dolphin life. Humpback whales can recognize other humpbacks with years' barrier of time between them just from the vocalization. And sonar tests impede complex dialogue between species that should probably be studied rather than harmed. And I guess as a final coda, what I would urge is that I've known a number of people in the Navy through the years and people at the Naval Academy. And I've always viewed it as a forward-looking creative service in terms of the armed forces and the United States. Most of the Navy folks that I've known have always been very thoughtful and able to think outside the box. And I think public pressure to encourage the Navy to go back to the drawing board, while still honoring the need that they have, is part of our duty on the north coast. And so I would urge the Navy to try to think creatively about the ways to do both force preparedness and also training that don't involve the sorts of testing, sonar bomb that are going to be happening from this proposed project. And so I oppose.</p>	
Schoen K-1	<p>I am writing on behalf of myself and my wife Ellen Athens. We are 100% against the proposed training and testing for the following reasons. Global climate change is having a devastating effect on the North West Pacific. In the past year, nine Grey Whales have died mysteriously in the San Francisco Bay. In the past couple of years a wasting disease has decimated the Sea Star population. This has caused an overpopulation of Sea Urchins, destroying the Kelp forest, and the Abalone resource. The proposed testing will pollute the ocean with thousands of pounds of heavy metals, and severely stress the marine mammal population. Further we feel this testing has nothing to do with national security, and everything to do with weapons company profiteering. The cumulative impact of this testing will stress our ecosystem, and is a misuse of our taxes.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Schoen K-2	I am against any testing off our coast. The sea life here is already suffering from climate change. The sea stars died off, the abalone and erchins are dwindling. Why should anyone trust the Navy to protect our sea life? They are part of the multi-billion dollar defense industry whose main purpose is to support the war profiteers.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Schoen M-1	Please adopt the NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE. The national parks are a treasure for our entire country. PLEASE preserve our national parks environment.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Schoeppe-1	I am 100% against underwater sonar blasting/testing of any form in our oceans. This is irresponsible and is causing irreversible damage to our marine animals and marine life. It is your duty to protect us and those that don't have a voice. The animals that are harmed, lose their hearing, affects their natural behaviors or die from not being able to decompress from deep depths. This needs to end now.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Schubert-1	I have spent many years hiking in the Olympic National Park and along the wilderness seashore. I am horrified to even imagine the disruption that flying many fighter jets over this area would cause. Please don't do it.	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977.</p> <p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Schuller-1	The proposed warfare training exercises conducted over the Olympic Peninsula violate the intent of the of United States Congressional legislation which established Olympic National Park and the designated wilderness areas found within the geographic range known as the Olympic Peninsula. These areas are set aside for wildlife and for the enjoyment of the citizens the U.S. They are not areas that congress would have approved	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	for Naval training exercises. I believe the U.S. Navy must seek U.S. Congressional Approval, in the form of new legislation, before they can legally relocate the training exercises.	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year. When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Schumacher-1	Please be cognizant of widespread concerns in the rural Pacific Northwest that unbridled Navy growler flyovers, training incursions, and other activities may have severe negative impacts on resident quality of life, tourism, and wildlife. This is not a desolate desert where negative impacts go unnoticed... there are many people and many animals that are potentially affected. The purpose of our Navy is protect these people and things, so part of that protective role is to be careful not to harm what the Navy is meant to protect. Thanks for considering my comment.	The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Schwab-1	Having the Navy use our national parks as their personal training grounds is the same as letting the homeless of Seattle use the sidewalks as their toilets. It's rude, it's offensive, it's an absolute violation of everything our national parks stand for. I remember when this started and the Navy claimed they needed to train "here" because the Olympic Peninsula is just	Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	like the North Korean peninsula? Really? In what way? and please be specific because anyone with a fourth grade education could tell you the ONLY thing they have in common are that they are both peninsula's that's it! The Navy does not "need" to train here, they "want" to train here. It's lush green and beautiful with snow capped mountains, rivers, lakes, oceans everything they don't have at China Lake California. They don't like training or living there so they come up here with some BS story about how they cannot train anywhere else, they "need" the peninsula. Well guess what US Navy, the peninsula is already spoken for and you need to pack up your gear and go back where you came from. Sorry if California sucks as a place to live and train but using the Olympic National Park as your personal Growler toilet is unacceptable.	1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Schwabe-1	I just learned of the EIS NW training proposal and i am very concerned by it. The only EIS alternative that is acceptable is the No Action Alternative. The other options given are unacceptable to the environment and life on the Olympic Peninsula. Alternatives 1 and 2 would cause deplorable damage to Olympic National Park and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. Alternative 2 is the most extreme and even more unacceptable. I enjoy the Olympic Peninsula as a vacation area, as do many people in the Pacific Northwest. This would be hugely disruptive to the environment, tourism industry, and inhabitants of this area. It's a beautiful area and needs to be protected, and allowing this type of action to occur here is unacceptable.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.mil/marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTTEIS.com
Schwalt-1	I have lived on the beautiful west coast my whole life. I have viewed the Marine life here as precious beings we desperately need to take care. The science to back this information is astonishing. The ecosystem needs to stay in balance or devastation will occur. I am 100% against the Navy doing testing that blatantly harms the sea life balance. The Navy should never test close to the shoreline that should be illegal action. The Navy should come up with safe alternatives and be more into environmental studies than weapons use. Taking care of this "human damaged" planet is our immediate concern not the threat of war.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Schwartz-1	I oppose the naval exercises. Trump says not needed in South Korea then why are the needed here? Also Trump said these exercises are too expensive. I do not want the Navy spending my money to destroy marine life.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Scott M-1	The Navy must protect the great sea mammals and ocean wildlife as a matter of moral duty to do what is right and honorable. Americans DO NOT want our military services to be responsible for being part of the atrocity that helps to destroy our ocean and the life therein. Find some other way!	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Scott P-1	We are losing so many species on this earth at an increasing rate. We need to stop immediately all practices and procedures that may be harmful to whales and other ocean wildlife. The evidence of harm is there, and it is our responsibility to care for this earth. Do no harm.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Scott T-1	The format of the meeting itself does not allow a discussion to happen in a meaningful way in the way that humans have for thousands of years come together to discuss. This way of meeting is fractured. It creates a fractured and disempowered style of commentary where nothing can actually be achieved. There's no dialogue here. Jene McCovey, the Yurok elder, spoke and wished a gathering because a gathering is the only way that there can actually be a fruitful discussion. When we began to circle around with Jene to discuss, the Navy representatives stayed back and gave some protocol of: This is how it is. And unfortunately, the meeting has no power, yeah, to address the real issue. And the real issue is that this is a waste of	The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	petroleum, mass waste of petroleum. The U.S. defense budget is \$700 billion. I was told that the U.S. is having to defend itself. Well, -- against two other super powers which are China and Russia. China has a defense budget of 200 billion. And Russia has a defense budget of 60 billion. So the money spent on the U.S. Navy is, frankly, an illness of this country, part of the illness of the United States as a country. It's really crazy. Anyway, thank you so much for taking that.	members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.
Scranton-1	Olympic National Park is one of the quietest places on Earth or at least was before growlers started practicing over the park on a daily basis. Olympic National Park should not be the site for navy training flights. This is unacceptable.	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Scriver-1	I have lived on Lopez island in the San Juan islands for over 40 years, sense I was a small child. i have raised two young men and I call Lopez my home! I am GREATLY saddened by the extreme increase in Navy Jet noise, particularly the awful Growlers! we are so blessed to live in such a beautiful and once wild area, but sadly i have seen in my short life here a HUGE decline in all sea life, it is horrifying!, I am also shocked almost daily at the rattling thunder of jets that seem to never stop! I feel like i am in a war zone! and i am deeply saddened to think about all the species that are already struggling with climate change, loss of habitat, and now the continual sound of war! this is not right! we need to all wake up and get our priorities straight before we are totally out of time! this is a urgent situation, and the Navy needs to be held accountable!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Seale-1	I question any need to test weaponry in the last barely safe waters for marine mammals. With all the stresses documented on orcas, whales, & others, this permission to proceed should be denied. To temporarily or permanently deafen those who depend on natural sonar communications	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	to live is inexcusable. Like the growler planes that destroy the few moments of quiet we can still find in the Olympic Peninsula, please please rethink this. I don't want to become a kayak protester should you fail to understand the errors of the choice to test sonar in our Salish Sea.	to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Searles-1	<p>We have known for a long time that naval sonar has devastating effects on marine life but just exactly how it leads to sickness and death was a mystery till now. In new research published in the Proceedings of the Royal Society B, they discovered that the sound emitted by sonar is so intense that marine mammals will swim hundreds of miles, dive deep into the abyss or even beach themselves to flee from the sounds that are literally unbearable to them.</p> <p>In particular, beaked whales are one of the marine mammals that are often found beached due to sonar testing. Prior to the 1960s, beaked whale strandings were extremely rare. But once the 60s rolled around, the Navy started to use mid-frequency active sonar (MFAS) to detect submarines. And from the 60s onwards, whales washing up on beachings became a very common occurrence. The paper recently published is a summary of what was discussed at a 2017 meeting of beaked whale experts in the Canary Islands and revealed that sonar distresses beaked whales so much that the marine mammals ends up with nitrogen bubbles in their blood very similar to what divers would call decompression sickness or the bends. The nitrogen can cause hemorrhaging and damage to whales vital organs. The big question that was brought up was how an animal that lives in the ocean and is adapted to perform deep water dives for hours at a time can obtain decompression sickness? Well simply, the sonar is so powerful, the animals dive deep too quickly causing the sickness.</p> <p>"In the presence of sonar they are stressed and swim vigorously away from the sound source, changing their diving pattern," lead author Yara Bernaldo de Quiros told AFP.</p> <p>"The stress response, in other words, overrides the diving response, which makes the animals accumulate nitrogen. It's like an adrenalin shot."</p> <p>The conclusions are drawn from autopsies of dead whales, although a handful of animals were killed by other threats inflicted by humans, such as collisions with ships or entanglement in fishing nets, as well as disease.</p> <p>The authors note that to mitigate the impacts of sonar on beaked whales, we must ban its use in areas where they're found. A moratorium on the use of MFAS around the Canary Islands in 2004 shows just how well this works – no atypical strandings have been seen since. The researchers urge other</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWT Final EIS/OEIS, and the "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June 2017)" (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	countries where sonar is deployed, such as the US, Greece, Italy, and Japan, to follow suit.	
Secord-1	<p>Please cease the sonar testing that is so very hurtful on the whales and dolphins. They communicate with one another through sounds and your sonar testing is damaging their hearing. You threaten their survival if they cannot hear each other!</p> <p>Please find another way, something, to alleviate the damage your sonar testing is doing to these innocent and vital marine mammals.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Secord-2	<p>I ask that the navy stop sonar testing in waters known to be waters where whales are active. It messes up their ability to communicate with each other. In all of that ocean, I'm sure you can find somewhere else to do your testing other than whale feeding grounds and/or mating grounds, Thank you</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Segura-1	<p>All I have to say is this.... If your job is to protect our waters, please protect what lives within them as well. Thank you!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Seidel-1	Please please stop sonar testing and respect that past ways are no longer acceptable and we need to cherish and protect our waters, the mammals have it hard enough with humans being they're worst enemy please stop the testing!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Seinen-1	<p>/Users/margrietseinen/Desktop/Military Sonar kills marine animals.pdfDoes Military Sonar Kill Marine Wildlife?</p> <p>The frequency used in military testing could be harmful to some animals</p> <p>Share on FacebookShare on TwitterShare on RedditShare on LinkedInShare viaPrint</p> <p>Taken from scientific american</p> <p>Dear EarthTalk: Is it true that military sonar exercises actually kill marine wildlife?</p> <p>-- John Slocum, Newport, RI</p> <p>Unfortunately for many whales, dolphins and other marine life, the use of underwater sonar (short for sound navigation and ranging) can lead to injury and even death. Sonar systems—first developed by the U.S. Navy to detect enemy submarines—generate slow-rolling sound waves topping out at around 235 decibels; the world's loudest rock bands top out at only 130. These sound waves can travel for hundreds of miles under water, and can retain an intensity of 140 decibels as far as 300 miles from their source. These rolling walls of noise are no doubt too much for some marine wildlife. While little is known about any direct physiological effects of sonar waves on marine species, evidence shows that whales will swim hundreds of miles, rapidly change their depth (sometime leading to bleeding from the eyes and ears), and even beach themselves to get away from the sounds of sonar.</p> <p>In January 2005, 34 whales of three different species became stranded and died along North Carolina's Outer Banks during nearby offshore Navy sonar training. Other sad examples around the coast of the U.S. and elsewhere abound, notably in recent years with more sonar testing going on than ever before. According to the nonprofit Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), which has campaigned vigorously to ban use of the technology in waters rich in marine wildlife, recent cases of whale strandings likely</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWT Final EIS/OEIS, and the "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June 2017)" (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>represent a small fraction of sonar's toll, given that severely injured animals rarely make it to shore.</p> <p>In 2003, NRDC spearheaded a successful lawsuit against the Navy to restrict the use of low-frequency sonar off the coast of California. Two years later a coalition of green groups led by NRDC and including the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), the League for Coastal Protection, Cetacean Society International, and Ocean Futures Society upped the ante, asking the federal courts to also restrict testing of more intense, harmful and far ranging mid-frequency types of sonar off Southern California's coastline. In filing their brief, the groups cited Navy documents which estimated that such testing would kill some 170,000 marine mammals and cause permanent injury to more than 500 whales, not to mention temporary deafness for at least 8,000 others. Coalition lawyers argued that the Navy's testing was in violation of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act. Two lower courts upheld NRDC's claims, but the Supreme Court ruled that the Navy should be allowed to continue the use of some mid-frequency sonar testing for the sake of national security. "The decision places marine mammals at greater risk of serious and needless harm," says NRDC's Joel Reynolds.</p> <p>Environmental groups are still fighting the battle against the sonar, lobbying the government to curtail testing, at least during peacetime, or to at least ramp up testing gradually to give marine wildlife a better chance to flee affected areas. "The U.S. Navy could use a number of proven methods to avoid harming whales when testing mid-frequency sonar," reports IFAW's Fred O'Regan. "Protecting whales and preserving national security are not mutually exclusive."</p> <p>CONTACTS: NRDC, www.nrdc.org; IFAW, www.ifaw.org.</p> <p>EarthTalk is produced by E/The Environmental Magazine. SEND YOUR ENVIRONMENTAL QUESTIONS TO: EarthTalk, P.O. Box 5098, Westport, CT 06881; earthtalk@emagazine.com. Read past columns at: www.emagazine.com/earthtalk/archives.php. EarthTalk is now a book! Details and order information at: www.emagazine.com/earthtalkbook.</p>	
Seiter-1	<p>Comments have been solicited by the United States Navy on the expansion of Northwest Training and Testing associated with Navy operations on or near the Olympic Peninsula of Washington State. I recognize that military readiness is an essential component of the American defense strategy, and that the Puget Sound region has long held critical geographic importance for defense. However, the use of the Olympic Peninsula as an intensive</p>	<p>The duration of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS is for the foreseeable future. The analysis would remain valid unless the Navy makes substantial changes in the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns, or there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts. The Marine Mammal Protection Act permits would be in place for seven years.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>training ground for weapons and military training on an indefinite basis is unnecessary and creates ongoing harm to the unique wildlife species and human communities that reside here. The proposed training and testing activities are in direct conflict with the stewardship mission of the Olympic National Park and Olympic National Forest to protect and manage natural resources for the benefit of future generations. Both the Department of Defense and the Departments of Interior/Agriculture have important missions; but it is not necessary nor advisable for intensive military training activities to take precedence on the Olympic Peninsula. The Olympic National Park and associated wilderness areas are unable to relocate to fulfill their mission. In short – this is the wrong place for the military activities described in the draft EIS.</p> <p>As a resident of the Olympic Peninsula I would like to offer the following comments.</p> <p>1. The timeframe offered for the ongoing environmental impacts associated with these operations is defined as, “Beyond 2020.” Impacts of this magnitude need to be limited temporally as well as geographically, with interim reviews to assess impacts and adjust actions.</p>	
Seiter-2	<p>2. The Navy repeatedly states in the Draft EIS that cumulative impacts to critical species of marine mammals, birds, and other wildlife will be negligible in comparison to impacts that have already occurred from human activities. This conclusion is illogical – rather it would make more sense to conclude that threatened and endangered species and critical habitats cannot endure additional damage and encroachment.</p>	<p>The purpose of the Navy's analysis of cumulative impacts is to determine what cumulative effects the Navy's proposed activities would have on the environment; therefore, the conclusions stated in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS are correct.</p>
Seiter-3	<p>3. I have been a resident of the Olympic Peninsula for over 30 years, and the increased noise from military jets has become more frequent and more apparent. Sound levels frequently result in the need to raise our voices to converse, or wait until jet noise dissipates. I have observed native bird species seek cover during these episodes. The long term, cumulative impact of the additional noise level and the frequency of noise episodes is insufficiently addressed in the Navy's analysis.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to these comments. I hope the Navy will engage in long term planning to identify suitable locations for military training with less impact to critical species, and away from a location that was specifically designated for stewardship and the appreciation of the quietude of the natural world.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977.</p> <p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude.</p> <p>2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year).</p> <p>3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day.</p> <p>4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.</p>
Self-1	<p>Please stop what you are doing. It's stressing out the whales and sealife. We here in Wa state. Are trying to protect the whales. Get them food. They are dying because of no food. Then they eat the plastic and are found washed up on the floor. We are trying to get the dams open here to get food to them. My lummi tribe in Bellingham are helping in their way to. To get them food. I got adoption papers for a j pod whale from Friday harbor. I watched where that whale traveled through the years. I love the whales. There was a sperm whale that washed up today. All the animals are dying. Hunters kill them. So I'm asking you to stop the tests. It's already stressing them out. And they can die. Why not pick up trash in the lakes and oceans instead of this. That would help the whales. Instead of stressing them out and maybe killing them from the noise. Thank you for your time.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Sen K-1	<p>Respected authorities we all know how important it's now a days to save marine life specially when climate change is in its peak please don't do that to those innocent creatures by disturbing their communicating network we all know how it's works so please for the of sake of our future don't do that to us.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Sen Z-1	<p>Hello, I am writing a comment because I am concerned for marine mammals that get affected by navy sonar work. I don't want there to be navy sonar done in the ocean when it negatively affects marine creatures, but I feel like a more feasible solution would be to research equipment that would work for this operation but not emit noise that would disturb</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	wildlife. Please research a better alternative! Many people value the lives of marine mammals than military work.	Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Septian-1	Saya menentang pengujian sonar!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Serinus-1	I am astounded at all your requirements to even consider a statement from a citizen about your proposals. The very premise—that you will refine your proposals rather than abandon them—tells the citizens that your supposedly pledged to support that their comments are, for the most part, worthless. As is par for the course, your Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS will negatively impact wildlife and humans' quality of life on the Olympic Peninsula. It's as simple as that.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Serrano-1	Protect wildlife and find alternative ways to conduct human business without continuing to hurt wildlife and the balance of nature.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Servoss-1	The Navy's sonar is truly hurting sea life. Orcas can't handle your "testing" and it's unconscionable that you guys KNOW it's a problem yet continue to use it in this way. Protect what you love. Protect our oceans. Protect who lives in them. Stop using sonar training/testing NOW.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Severn-1	Please stop! Don't risk the hearing and in turn, the lives of orcas and other marine mammals to run a few tests...	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Severson-1	I am 100 % opposed to underwater sonar testing by the US navy that has been proven to damage hearing of marine animals	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Seward-1	Re: Navy's Proposed Five Year Extension Permit To Perform Warfare Training Over Olympic National Forest and Park. I'm writing to express my opposition to a five-year extension of the permit to allow warfare training over the Olympic National Forest and Park. The Navy's Environmental Impact Statement does not state any legitimate reason that the training cannot occur in an area designated for warfare training. The Olympic National Park is not a warfare training ground and is not an appropriate place for the Navy with its FA-18 Growler aircraft to be conducting training missions. The Olympic National Forest and Park is an environment of beauty and wonder, a place for people and wild life to enjoy; it is a refuge for people who seek the peace and renewal this Park offers, not the incessant noise of Growler aircraft flying overhead.	Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Shaffer-1	I am not ok with Navy sonar testing in the Salish sea. If we don't protect the sea life, then who?	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Shafransky-1	<p>I am writing to express my concern over the proposed increase of Growler navy jet flights over the northwest region and specifically over The Hoh Rain Forest - one of the most pristine and quiet places in the lower 48 states. From information provided by the navy it's my understanding that the navy is proposing to add 38 more Growlers to NAS and increase training flights from 6,100 to 24,000 flights per year. This is unacceptable to me as a long time resident of this part of the country.</p> <p>I lived on Whidbey Island for 5 years and have lived in Sedro Woolley for 26 years. I expected to hear jet noise on Whidbey. When I moved to Sedro Woolley there was no discernible plane noise at my house 7 miles outside of the city limits. In the past 3 years, however, the navy jet plane noise has increased tremendously. I have had planes fly so low over my house that I could read the numbers on the body of the plane. When I contacted the navy about this they said the planes aren't supposed to fly below 300 hundred feet and that I should take a picture if I could. Of course there is no way of knowing when the planes are coming over, and I can't be out in my yard waiting with a camera in hand.</p> <p>As an avid hiker I have noticed that the planes are now flying regularly over the wilderness areas in the North Cascade National Park. While I'm not sure if this is illegal, it destroys the reason people go into the wilderness - to seek quiet from daily life. Our northwest country is some of the most beautiful and pristine land in the US. I feel the jet plane noise is turning our communities into stressful environments that we are not able to control or escape.</p> <p>There needs to be some kind of common sense and compromise when it comes to noise pollution. The Navy used to be a good neighbor. That is not the case now.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration in this most important matter.</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Sedro Woolley or on the eastern side of Puget Sound. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com</p>
Shanks-1	<p>I am writing in response to the United States Navy's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for train and research, development, testing and evaluation activities conducted within the Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT) study area.</p> <p>This study includes areas off the coasts of Washington, Oregon, northern</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>California, Western Behm Canal, Alaska and inland waters of Washington State. This is the very habitat traveled by resident orca pods. This Southern Resident orca is classified as endangered in Canada and is listed as endangered by the United States as required by the Endangered Species Act of 2005. This population of orcas has dropped to less than 75, the lowest number in 30 years.</p> <p>Navy plans include testing and research of high frequency explosive weapons and munitions, high explosive underwater detonations, high-energy lasers, vessels, underwater vehicles and aircraft, and increased use of Growlers.</p> <p>This year the Southern Resident Orca Task Force identified disturbances from noise and vessel traffic as one of three major threats to our orca population. The report notes, "Vessels transiting near Southern Resident orcas can produce underwater noise that masks or impairs orca communication and echolocation (the method orcas use to find their prey). This makes it harder for orcas to find food and reduces the time orcas devote to foraging by almost 20 percent, reducing their potential prey intake and increasing their energy expenditure."</p> <p>The Navy's proposal comes at time when the people of Washington are imploring their elected officials and the Governor to protect our endangered orcas and our marine environment. The Navy training and research plan is the antithesis of everything our state supports. We are trying to keep boats away from our marine mammals. In fact legislation passed this year finds a person guilty of a crime if the person causes a vessel or other object gets too close to an orca or exceeds speeds greater than 7 knots over ground. We prohibit commercial whale watching operations from approaching or intercepting within the direction of whales. This year Washington State is investing \$1.1 billion to help ensure a thriving and resilient orca population, our ecosystem and improve water quality. In the meantime, the United States Navy plans to use my tax dollars to create a Fallujah in my community, causing irreparable damage to our marine mammals and environment.</p> <p>The United States Navy should not conduct training and testing activities in these waters.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	<p>the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Shannon-1	<p>In August of 2016, we found our perfect family and retirement home on Whidbey Island, Washington. I had a list of 6 homes and by the time we saw number 4, I knew this was meant to be our home in Admirals Cove. You see my husband and I both teach college biology. Our home at 1235</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island or OLF Coupeville. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Farragut, Coupeville, Wa has a view of the Puget sound, the Olympic mountains and a small stream that is part of the Camano/Whidbey trust wildlife preserve. We have a 7 year old daughter who loves observing the numerous birds (from bald eagles to kingfishers), beavers, otters, deer and raccoon from our living room window. It all seemed perfect until the first jet flights to the OLF (outlying field). Of course, the realtor was required to tell us of these jet flights before we bought the house. However, as my husband said, "they can't be louder than is safe for humans, right?" When my husband asked this to our 85 year old neighbor, our neighbor just laughed and said let's just say if you have company over that night you won't be talking much. Our neighbor was right! These same neighbors put in air conditioning and watch TV with earphones on when the jets are flying. The Navy posts a schedule but the Thursday before the week of flights. (Hard to plan social events.)</p> <p>It is not just that the navy does not follow neighborhood noise ordinances that the rest of us must follow. They also fly too low and with each pass they get lower over our homes. It is an accident waiting to happen. My 7 year old is afraid to go to sleep when the jets are flying. They fly the lowest late at night. Normally night flights begin around 9 or 10pm and they do not end until midnight! Since they fly lowest at night it is hard to get photos and video of how low it is, but we can see the pilot in the plane from our living room window. It is that low! We time when our dogs go potty according to the flight schedule because we don't want to damage their ears either. But as I said there are numerous species of wildlife in our area and domesticated animals that cannot be brought inside. We do not have air conditioning. We get a wonderful sea breeze that naturally cools our home but when we hear the jets coming we run around and close all windows and doors until they leave. They are so low that I am afraid our pictures on the walls will shake off and break.</p> <p>I don't mind jets going over if they keep a safe distance above the homes. But who monitors this? Who sets what is safe for the distance above homes and noise levels? Who makes sure the pilots follow what is safe?</p> <p>I was diagnosed with breast cancer on May 23, 2018. I just had my 5th surgery last week. In fall 2018 I endured 4 cycles of chemotherapy and 6 months of immunotherapy. My first thought when I was diagnosed with a cancer that grew very fast in a 6 month period was the water quality at our home in Coupeville and the navy pollution of the ground water at the OLF. Please do not increase the number of jet flights! If anything, the number of flights should be reduced and the distance above homes in admiral's cove</p>	<p>to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	increased! They should be flying higher not lower! The EPA should be testing all water in the area of the OLF!	
Shapona-1	Please allow the majestic Beauty of these Whales and other sea life to continue their existence on this Planet without harming them. Humans are not the only ones that share this Earth. Please do not disturb the sea world as an experiment. We Humans are the experiment and warring with each other is the test. I would like to know the many benefits we Humans will receive if this testing occurs? I am so sorry that War is part of the Human Condition. Maybe I am not understanding the real human condition and that the Navy does at the expense of the Majestic Whales and other sea creatures. Thank for letting us share our opinions.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Sharkey B-1	I am adamantly against sonar testing and airgun blasting in the PNW. It is damaging to the living beings in these waters, specifically cetaceans that depend on hearing for orientation, feeding, migration, breeding. This practice is inhumane and detrimental to every species, and should be illegal, especially in the presence of endangered species.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include the use of airguns.
Sharkey D-1	There are direct correlations between blasting and sonar testing and cetacean breachings throughout the world. These activities in the Pacific Northwest would be harmful to the critically endangered Southern Resident Orcas, whose population is already dangerously low. Cetaceans depend on hearing to navigate in every facet of their lives. To knowingly cause damage to their hearing or obstruct their ability to successfully navigate is unconscionable. I am 100% against testing in the PNW.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, and the "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June 2017)” (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents).
Sharnoff-1	There absolutely needs to be a 100-mile wide test-free corridor along the entire Pacific coast.	The Navy’s mitigation involves numerous distance-from-shore restrictions for active sonar, explosive, and non-explosive training and testing activities. For example, the Navy will not conduct explosive training or explosive testing (except explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing) 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures, including development a new mitigation area known as the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. It would not be practical for the Navy to prohibit all training or testing activities within 100 miles from shore for the reasons described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), Chapter 5 (Mitigation), and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Sharp A-1	Stop killing our whales! please and thank you	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy’s ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy’s Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research’s Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy’s project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Sharp L-1	Your aware of what you are doing and being of conscious choice, you are knowingly causing physical, mental and emotional harm to this species. I recommend finding an alternative solution to these tests. In today’s day and age of technological advance there are other alternate methods that you can (create) and or utilise. In every given moment we get the choice to do the ‘right thing- or the	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	wrong thing' Choose wisely!	<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Sharp P-1	<p>I am extremely alarmed that the Navy is proceeding to locate and test 36 additional growler airplanes and other expansion to include the doubling of Anti-Submarine Warfare testing and doubling Surface Ship Sonar testing. The growlers presently tested are an environmental nightmare for both humans and wildlife in the area. This kind of expansion should be unthinkable.</p> <p>In a 2017 Seattle Times article, retired Navy Captain Brian Cullin wrote If the Navy proceeds with its projected plans to increase aircraft operations (adding up to 36 new aircraft to the current 82), our "protected" forests, parks and communities will be seriously violated. Property values will plummet, tourism will wane, and we all will be faced with the very long and acrimonious road of trying to reach a solution in the courts or through legislation." I agree wholeheartedly.</p> <p>The Navy's own draft EIS addresses other proposed expansions include the doubling of Anti-Submarine Warfare testing and doubling Surface Ship Sonar testing "the use of sonar and other transducers during testing activities as described under Alternative 1 will result in the unintentional taking of killer whales incidental to those activities...the use of explosives during training activities as described under Alternative 1 may affect ESA-listed killer whales, and may overlap Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat." (In this context, taking could mean temporary or permanent hearing impacts for the whales, as well as physiological stress or behavior problems).</p> <p>We are facing a crisis here with our threatened orca whale resident pods. Their numbers are very low and sound pollution is a big threat to them. While the civilian population struggles to reduce human impact, the Navy has no right to multiply the problem exponentially.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	This area is both a national and a global treasure. This expansion at Whidbey could ruin it for future human generations and destroy valued species.	
Sharpe-1	Previous mitigation measures have not prevented harm to marine life. At this time when our oceans are stressed by ongoing environmental damage, it's doubly imperative that the Navy suspend these exercises and experiments. What information and feedback you hope to gain will have to be obtained by refining computer-modeling. The health of our oceans and marine life is urgently important, more so than is war-making capabilities.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Shaw C-1	It's. Gotta. Stop.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Shaw M-1	You are harming, harassing, and murdering millions of marine life without repercussions! As an American citizen, I adamantly protest this testing. Why are we harming habitats and destroying entire ecosystems? For the sake of "national defense?" Please reconsider this testing; it is barbaric and unnecessary!	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Shay-1	Please stop the harmful underwater sonar testing this testing is not necessary and is causing great damage to our underwater sea life especially our whales. PLEASE STOP I BEG OF YOU	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Shearer-1	Sirs: I am adamantly opposed to any kind of seismic testing in waters that are the habitat of marine species dependent on echolocation for finding their food and pod communication. These sentient and intelligent beings are under threat as it is with their deaths being more and more due to starvation from stomachs full of plastic. We don't need to add more life burdening actions in their "homeland." If the tables were turned, and your	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>homes were being invaded with these kinds of noises that damaged your hearing, what would you do if you couldn't speak the language of the ones doing the testing? Whales, porpoises and dolphins are intelligent and aware. Just stop a minute and remember all the stories about one of them saving a human and making eye contact.</p> <p>Seismic testing isn't truly worth all the damage it will do! PLEASE DON'T! All these marine beings are needed for the eco-balance in their environment.</p> <p>While I am an individual and not a scientist who can quote facts as such, they are already known to those who are involved in the issue. It is just a matter of what is considered more important - a life or a noise test.</p> <p>Thank you for being willing to listen to even a single voice.</p>	<p>populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Shefter J-1	<p>The majority of these training exercises do not have to be conducted along our shoreline and could instead be conducted far from shore minimizing the impact on birds, fish, marine mammals, other wildlife and communities. There is no evaluation for other locations which could significantly reduce the harmful impacts of these exercises. Training around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas should be avoided as a priority for the Department of Defense. While we understand training is necessary there is enough scientific evidence (which is amply available all over the internet) of the negative impact of the jet noise to marine mammals. It negatively affects their sonar which is critical for their feeding and for their survival. It also has severe negative consequences for birds, small mammals and other non-human residents of the Olympic Peninsula and other areas in the Saratoga Passage area. Please investigate alternative areas for these jet training exercises. There are many more remote areas that would be less negatively impacted.</p> <p>It is sad to witness the unnecessary destruction of this beautiful area.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Shefter M-1	<p>While we don't like the noise or the aircraft flying directly overhead, we understand the need for training,</p> <p>However, as has been previously reported, the noise is affecting the Orca population.</p> <p>Is it possible to re-route the training exercise over the Pacific Ocean so as not to affect the whale migration in limited areas such as the Saratoga Passage.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Shepard-1	Please do not release any heavy metals or other toxins into the PNW.	The Navy's proposed activities do not include dumping of any materials, including heavy metals. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.
Shepherd-1	I am against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. ☐ Marine mammals utilize sound extensively; but sonar testing can limit their ability to recognise frequencies in sound. ☐☐ A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas. ☐ ☐ The Navy's use of sonar would cause these porpoises permanent hearing loss and limit their chance of survival.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Sherk-1	There are not many majestic untouched (almost) areas in our country. This training disrupts the plant and animal life in the area and has negative effects on our lands. I do not think our forest and sea in the PNW should be used to advance such a destructive agenda.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Sherman J-1	<p>This is my reply [to] your recent notice about the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS for your NW Training and Testing Program. Having never seen this Draft document nor any summary of it I cannot comment on any specific details of it.</p> <p>My comments are limited to:</p> <p>(1) Effect of the training & testing program on marine mammals and fish and sea quality</p> <p>(2) Involving use of sonar and explosives</p> <p>(3) Sea strikes from Navy ships</p> <p>(4) Sea pollution from ship oil plus waste.</p> <p>Marine mammals have [illegible] sensitive echolocation abilities for communicating and possibly for locating and attacking prey. Use of sonar may [illegible] this echolocation ability, threatening the lives of the mammals. Sonar use should be minimized and [illegible] not harmful</p> <p>Explosives should be minimized for same echolocation reason and should not be used near any marine sanctuary or [illegible]. This applies to [illegible] training/testing operations.</p> <p>Ships and plans should avoid operating near marine mammal feeding, mating, migrating [illegible] areas</p> <p>Marine Mammal Protection Act prohibits killing [illegible]</p> <p>These animals should be fully [illegible] with [illegible] including day & night watch for marine mammals.</p> <p>To avoid sea strikes ship speeds and mass maneuver should be minimized. Sea quality should be protected from ship oil and food and other ship waste that should be disposed of only onboard. The fueling of ships can result in sea oil pollution. Such operations must be very carefully done. I assume that this operation will occur from Northern California to the Canadian border including Puget Sound.</p> <p>The Sound is under [illegible] stress from man's activities but I am [illegible] comments to Washington residents.</p> <p>If adjacent state Coastal Zone Management Act please [illegible] marine mammal [illegible] sea quality provisions the Navy should fully recognize them.</p> <p>P.S. I was unable to attend the April 30 public meeting in Newport.</p>	<p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Sherman S-1	<p>I oppose the Navy's Training & Testing and demand stronger protection for the Ocean & the Northern California Tribes Cultural Lifeways.</p> <p>The adequacy of the assessment of Tribal cultural impacts as well as environmental impacts from the Navy's training and testing activities is</p>	<p>Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>especially important because these activities take place in the Pacific Ocean, which holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes and is critically important for the wellbeing of all people and lifeforms on this planet.</p> <p>The Navy should work meaningfully with the Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities.</p> <p>The Navy should prohibit use of sonar within the 50-mile mitigation area. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals.</p> <p>The "best available science" referenced in the draft SEIS should be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy's NWTRC.</p> <p>The Navy's monitoring program should be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy should expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing</p>	
Shiah-1	As a new resident of the Olympic peninsula, I am very disheartened at the constant, very loud noise from the Growler training flights. I certainly strongly support a well trained military and understand the need for the	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>training flights.</p> <p>However, this is a populated area that many people live in and visit and the noise is very annoying and stressful. The Olympic National Park is also a much revered and special place that this ongoing noise is unwelcome.</p> <p>I strongly encourage you to consider ceasing all Growler training flights in this area and re-locate the jets to an un-populated region of the US (perhaps Nevada).</p> <p>Thank you for considering these comments.</p>	<p>MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Nevada are not reasonable. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Shockley-1	<p>As a longtime resident of California I am 100percent oppose to this testing. Out marine life is being destroyed by the ongoing negligence of our institutions. The Navy included. Study after study has been done and the detrimental affects of SONAR testing are undisputed.</p> <p>I am opposed and horrified at the cavalier way our oceans and the life they contain are being used as something to rip apart at will.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Short-1	<p>These are not "substantive" but they should mean something. The big point is being missed in this meeting. We cannot, as a species, continue to see ourselves as separate nations at war with one another, as separate individuals pursuing our own wealth or career goals. If we ruin this planet we will all die—we don't need to wait for our enemies to kill us. We need to protect the oceans and the air and the web of life that allows us to exist. Other goals must give way to this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Shroyer-1	<p>The use of sonar has been linked to a widespread stranding of dolphins and whales around the world. Sonar has been reported to trigger certain behavioral and psychological changes in underwater species and can lead to their death as well.</p> <p>Ever since the technology has been introduced, the cases of mass stranding of marine animals on coasts and shores around the world has been on a rise.</p> <p>What happens is that most mammals rely on sound for a large number of functions in life such as movement, foraging and even communication. Thus when a foreign sound which is too loud is introduced in the marine environment, it can interfere with the basic life and functions of the animals and may affect them in multiple ways.</p> <p>As an example, whales that are exposed to sonar pings would stop swimming or feeding and they will swim away from the noise. Their swimming style would change from relaxed strokes to long and deep dives. Through many research findings and other evidence, it was found that many marine animals would surface rapidly due to the noise and this made them vulnerable to decompression illness. When beaked whales dive deeper than usual due to the sonar pings, their lungs tend to collapse. This stops the infiltration of nitrogen in their blood and this in turn makes them vulnerable to the decompression sickness.</p> <p>The beaked whales are reportedly the most affected species as far as mass stranding due to sonar noise is concerned. This could be due to the fact that these whales are the world's deepest diving whales and are spotted at those depths where submarines are placed mostly.</p> <p>A lot of whales confuse the sonar pings to the sounds made by killer whales and this too could be a reason that their behavior changed.</p> <p>Sonar pings can also cause permanent injury and deafness among marine mammals and this is the violation of the National Environment Policy Act and several other acts.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, and the "Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June 2017)" (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents).</p>
Shupe-1	<p>These sonar tests are harmful to these gracious and gentle giants. Please stop continuing this</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Shuri-1	1. ES.5.1 No Action Alternative. The Draft Supplemental EIS defines the No Action Alternative as complete cessation of all activities and “the Proposed Action does not take place”. Because this approach is not acceptable with respect to meeting the Navy’s statutory requirements, it becomes a trivial and meaningless standard that obscures the magnitude of increases in activities under the proposed alternatives, relative to the current level of activities. The DSEIS should be revised to consider the current level of activities as No Action, as was done in the 2015 DEIS, and the differences between the No Action and other Alternatives clearly defined in the Executive Summary and elsewhere in the document.	<p>In regards to providing a “continuing action” No Action Alternative, the Navy applied a scenario where no authorizations or permits are issued, the Navy’s training and testing activities do not take place, and the resulting environmental effects from taking no action were compared with the effects of the Proposed Action (refer to Section 2.4.2.1 [No Action Alternative] of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS). This approach supports NMFS’ regulatory process by presenting the scenario where no authorization will be issued. Additionally, this approach responds to comments submitted at various stages regarding the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and during the scoping process of this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. However, Section 2.4.1 (Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration) has been expanded to include a Continuing Action Alternative. This alternative considers no change to the training and testing activities as approved in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and the Navy consulting with NMFS under the MMPA. The Navy determined that this alternative did not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action after thorough consideration.</p> <p>As stated in Section 2.4.2.1 (No Action Alternative) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, "the analysis associated with the No Action Alternative is carried forward in order to compare the magnitude of the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Actions with the conditions that would occur if the Proposed Action did not occur." The No Action Alternative was sufficiently analyzed, and a Supplemental Draft EIS/OEIS is not warranted.</p>
Shuri-2	2. Table ES-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2. Consistently throughout this table, the No Action Alternative states that it “would lessen the potential for impacts” on the associated resource category. Based on the definition of the No Action Alternative as discussed in comment 1 above, this wording should be changed to “would eliminate the potential for impacts”. The current wording unrealistically minimizes the differences between the No Action and the other Alternatives.	Because there would still be the potential for impacts from other sources, the wording is correct.
Shuri-3	3. Table ES-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2. The language in the table is strictly non-quantitative, using terms such as “minor”, “significant”, “low”, and similar expressions. These terms are vague and subjective and do not convey actual risks in a way that can be utilized for determination of acceptable impact levels. Quantitative information, for example, the	No marine mammal deaths are expected as a result of the Navy's proposed activities. The text quoted is from the Executive Summary of the document and is necessarily brief. Please see the full analysis in each of the appropriate sections within Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	expected number of marine mammal deaths relative to the total population, should be added to this table to provide a clearer indication of the effects of each of the proposed Alternatives.	
Shuri-4	4. ES.7.5.1 Consistency with Other Federal, State, and Local Plans, Policies and Regulations. The Draft Supplemental EIS has not evaluated consistency with or implementation of recently enacted (April 2019) State legislation related to protecting orca environment and food supply, namely Senate Bill 5577, House Bill 1578, House Bill 1579, and Senate Bill 5135, because this legislation was not in effect at the time of preparing the DSEIS. The DSEIS should be revised to include appropriate implementation of these laws based on consultation with the appropriate State agencies.	The federal government is not generally subject to the laws and regulations of any individual state. However, the Navy has been invited to take part and, as a result, a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Task Force's working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.
Sickenberger-1	I am against the Navy's sonar testing because it harms the animals of the sea. We are their voice, without us, they have no one to help them :-(The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Siebrands-1	I live less than 4 miles from the entrance to Olympic Natl Park. At my home, I can always know when a Growler is flying as they make more noise than any other aircraft that passes anywhere near. It is bad enough to hear them at home, but the noise is so much more insulting when I am hiking in the Olympics to "get away from it all" and routinely hear a Growler overhead. I know it is convenient for Whidbey aircraft to have all this lovely airspace so close, but, as a retired USCG helicopter pilot, I know we regularly, when possible, adjusted flight paths to not impact the citizens on the ground. I have not seen such concern or consideration in this process of the Navy. The Peninsula does not have a large population and maybe that is why the Navy has not been too concerned about accommodating locals' concerns. That is not what I expect from a military entity that has a huge impact on civilian's daily lives. There are options.	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>The Navy considered but did not develop mitigation for aircraft overflights, such as shifting transit routes, relocating aircrew training activities, or modifying flight altitudes, because such mitigation would not be practical to implement due to implications for safety and mission requirements. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) controls the National Airspace System</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		and routes that overlap the NWTT Study Area. The FAA designed the routes to efficiently manage air traffic in the region and to safely deconflict military traffic from commercial and general aviation aircraft, with consideration given to the presence of Canadian National Airspace and traffic to the north. The FAA is the responsible federal agency for determining transit routes and any changes to such routes must be approved by the FAA. The Navy is currently in discussions with the FAA exploring the possibility of shifting the FAA-established transit routes for military aircraft transiting to and from the Olympic MOA from Naval Air Station Whidbey Island to the north of the Olympic Peninsula. The purpose of these discussions is to consider the efficient and safe use of navigable airspace. While ultimately any shift in transit routes is the FAA's decision, it is possible that, if approved, such a shift will have the added benefit of reducing military aircraft noise over the Olympic National Park.
Sieglinde-1	Stop sonar testing by the US Navy in the Salish Sea!!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Sievert-1	Why do we need this? The Navy has Widbey Island, which has been ruining the environment for years. To ruin another ancient environment would harm the animals and people who live there. This is an ancient place and should be protected and well as the native people.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Silver-1	This is animal cruelty. Stop!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Silveria-1	Training with Growlers does not belong on the peaceful Olympic Peninsula. There are other places they could train without disturbing the protected natural spaces here.	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Silvia K-1	Please do not allow sonar testing in the waters. This often kills cetaceans! Very detrimental to our ecosystems.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Silvia P-1	No dañen más animales por favor	Gracias por su participación en el proceso de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental. Su comentario es parte del registro oficial del proyecto. Las actividades de entrenamiento y pruebas propuestas son generalmente consistentes con el entrenamiento y las pruebas que la Marina ha estado llevando a cabo en el área de estudio de NWTT durante décadas.
Simon-1	We need to prioritize wildlife more. There are plenty of sea to go around but little orca habitat. Move the ships somewhere else or stop using sonar in these areas.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy has considered conducting training and testing in other locations; however, as stated in Section 2.4.1.1 (Alternate Training and Testing Locations), other locations fail to provide all the attributes necessary for effective training and testing.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Simpson D-1	<p>My concern's not so much -- my concern's working concept in terms of what's going on tonight is that the Navy has a great opportunity in front of it. Based on the facts that IT'S inarguable that the oceans are dying because it forces -- some of which are directed within climate change, species are dying; coral reefs are dying. Plastic is prolific, the section causing disruption in the food chain. The Navy has an opportunity to lead the way and to provide protection and restoration to the seas. In other words, repurpose. I'm suggesting that we consider seriously repurposing of the Navy to take on issues that are presented to us causing our future to be so much in question. Without the oceans, we're doomed. And the oceans seemed to be doomed. So I'm proposing that we launch a series of programs. The Navy's launching programs. One, for instance, could be assisting the clean up of and dealing with the plastic waste, gyres of plastic, G-Y-R-E-S. Plastic wastes are circling the ocean in massive amounts. And in breaking down, the process entering the food chain, poisoning the fish, starving them. The fish consume microparticles of the plastic because they resemble food. And either they're poisoned outright or they starve to death because they do not have room to eat nourishing substances. So right now, the Navy suggestion was that the Navy doesn't have the tools. But, of course, the tools can be developed for emergencies perceived. If it's important enough, the tools will be developed. For instance, going into World War II in 1939, the United States military was paltry. In 1941, it was strong, the strongest military force ever. So in a short period of time, the demand was there. The military rise to the occasion. That's what we need to do here soon because we -- all those -- these forces are proliferated. The ocean's heating up. The coral reefs are dying, proliferating oceanic problems. The Navy could establish itself as a leader and provide an example to China and Russia to challenge this. This is what the Navy's dedicated to, survival. You can do -- so that the competition between nations is to build on the need to protect our treasures, our oceanic treasures.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Simpson J-1	<p>Dear Navy I am a person with health issues and the jet noise does not make my health issues better I feel it makes it worse can you fly your jets please somewhere else I have health issues from being traumatized by a nurse and I have cortisol stress related health issues as a result of being choked by a nurse and in my bed at night I have to hear the noise right outside my window and it is very much disturbing for me and hurtful. I feel it is time for the jets to fly somewhere else. Ms. Jessica Simpson thank you for your time</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Simpson K-1	<p>Simply stated, the Growlers are too noisy in the residential area where we live. I have monitored them of at least 102 db and one cannot hear a conversation or TV when they are flying over. And, they do NOT observe the sound abatement regulations of Island County when they are flying from 9:30 to 11:30 at night.</p> <p>Relocate the Growler jets from using OLF to another landing field.</p> <p>Having the Growlers fly here is like oil and water they do not mix.</p> <p>There are health factors that you need to be aware of and address, like hearing loss, insomnia, anticipatory stress disorders and high blood pressure, etc.</p> <p>The Growlers have no place being here!</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island or OLF Coupeville. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com</p>
Sinatra-1	<p>Please no sonar in the oceans. If the oceans die, we die.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Singh-1	<p>Read the whole story Mentally. We Humans should understand its their home also and this Planet is Not only for us but for other life forms also.</p> <p>Us Navy should stop these sonar Practices 🙏</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Sinker-1	<p>I have attached a Word document that contains my full and complete public comment, the entirety of which is incorporated into this comment form.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Please see responses below.</p>
Sinker-2	<p>Olympic National Park and the outer Washington Coast, from Kalaloch to Neah Bay are very special to me, and our family has spent many weeks visiting these incredibly beautiful and peaceful places over the last 40 years or so. However, since the Navy began Growler operations the experience is</p>	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>now significantly degraded. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed extension of the special 3-year permit, due to expire at the end of 2020.</p> <p>The Supplemental EIS/OEIS is lacking scientific support in several areas:</p> <p>1. On-site monitoring of aircraft overflights, instead of modeling, is required to accurately measure and evaluate the impacts of Growler overflights of Olympic National Park and adjacent Olympic National Forest lands. The “Military Operations Area” (MOA) encompasses large portion of the Park, adjacent US Forest Service land, and Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. To base the evaluation of impacts from sound on both people and wildlife on modeling rather than on peer-reviewed scientific study is speculation and not science. The Supplemental EIS/OEIS must be based only on scientific facts.</p> <p>2. I have direct experience with these Growlers flying over my home in North Snohomish County/Stanwood area. The flights at lower elevations are anything but a “human whisper” (see Pg. 9, Fig. 2, Supp. EIS/OEIS). Rather, the resulting effects range from so loud that you can’t hear anything until they pass by to terrifying my horses to the point they ran through a fence when one of these planes flew over in the dark of night at 10:30 pm earlier this year. In fact, the noise was so loud I went outside and thought at first the plane might be in trouble, until I saw it turn smoothly toward the west and head towards NAS Whidbey. Natural noise and aircraft noise are completely different and so are the resulting effects, not only on people but on animals, wildlife and birds. Modeling for noise impacts is speculation, not sound scientific procedure as required by the Environmental Impact Statement process. The Supplemental EIS/OEIS must use peer-reviewed science to determine the effects of these planes on people, animals, wildlife and birds.</p>	<p>these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD’s position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Sinker-3	<p>3. The establishment of a MOA in whole or in part over a National Park is entirely inappropriate. The Supplemental EIS/OEIS gives no scientific basis for conducting the activities detailed therein within or over a National Park or designated marine sanctuary. The Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not show that the Navy is exempt from conducting only those activities that will preserve Olympic National Park and Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary for the enjoyment of current and future generations. The activities proposed in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS are the exact opposite and will significantly degrade the natural conditions at Olympic National Park. It’s already happening at year-round highly visited areas on the coastal beaches from Kalaloch to Neah Bay, Hurricane Ridge, and the Hoh</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA’s designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA’s designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic Military Operations</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	rain forest as the loud Growlers interfere with the historically peaceful natural environment.	Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Sinker-4	4. The proposed and current training and testing activities in Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary are absolutely incompatible with the purpose set forth by Congress in establishing this sanctuary in the first place. Ships, aircraft, live ammunition and explosives are not minimal impacts by any use of the definition of “minimal.” The suggestion in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS that any effects from these operations are very likely to be minimal is speculation and not based on any peer-reviewed sound science.	To ensure compliance with the National Marine Sanctuary Program regulations and the interagency consultation requirements of National Marine Sanctuaries Act section 304(d), the Navy considered all proposed modifications to training and testing activities to determine whether they have the potential to destroy, cause the loss of, or injure sanctuary resources, or result in adverse impacts on sanctuary resources or qualities. Accordingly, the Navy and NMFS submitted a joint Sanctuary Resource Statement to the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Sinker-5	5. Throughout the Supplemental EIS/OEIS the reason given for choosing the Olympic Peninsula is one of convenience with associated cost savings in money spent for aircraft fuel. Sorry, but convenience and cost savings alone don’t justify the degradation of a premier national park and designated marine sanctuary, both established by Congress to be protected in perpetuity. The Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not present an alternative that details this proposed training and Growler overflights for an area that is already designated for military or warfare training. Such an alternative must be presented to the public for review and consideration.	Please see response to Sinker-3.
Sinker-6	6. The Supplemental EIS/OEIS lacks a sound and scientifically-based plan for eliminating or severely limiting Growler overflights to the park, its visitors and all wildlife, marine and on land. Olympic National Park and Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary have not been designated as warfare training areas by Congress, but rather to be preserved and protected in perpetuity.	Please see responses to Sinker-3 and Sinker-4.
Sinker-7	7. The Marbled Murrelet is listed as endangered under Washington State law and this is not mentioned in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. On Pages. 3.6-5.6, it is stated that, “Marbled Murrelets would be exposed to explosives during mine countermeasures and neutralization testing proposed in the offshore areas...” There is no scientific evidence presented that this	The Navy consulted with USFWS under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act to address potential impacts to marbled murrelets with implementation of the preferred alternative. Discussions about the level of benefit of the Navy's mitigation measures are presented throughout Section 5.3 (Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	exposure will be beneficial to the recovery of this endangered species. It is scientifically known that such exposure can result in scarred or ruptured eardrums or gastrointestinal problems that can lead to death. The proposed mitigation of having a single observer with binoculars watching for Marbled Murrelets is almost laughable, given how difficult it is to spot these birds in ideal conditions (calm water, clear visibility, etc.) let alone from a ship that is underway during military training exercises.	Assessment). The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from applicable acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors on marine and bird species wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals, sea turtles, birds, and fish in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict all but one type of explosive activity from occurring within 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area year-round, which will help the Navy avoid potential impacts from explosives on marbled murrelets in important foraging areas.
Sinker-8	8. Sound science is again severely lacking on the effects of Growler overflights and associated activities on the Northern Spotted Owl. Critical habitat designations for the Spotted Owl and Marbled Murrelet are found throughout the entire proposed area and yet no scientific evidence is presented showing that the overflights and associated activities will be beneficial to the recovery of these endangered birds. Regarding the Northern Spotted Owl, the Supplemental EIS/OEIS uses data extrapolated from a study done on Mexican Spotted Owls – different bird, different environment – and thus this study is completely useless for the purpose of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Supplemental EIS/OEIS must contain sound relevant scientific studies relating to the Northern Spotted Owl, Marbled Murrelet, and all marine and land birds, mammals and wildlife residing in or transiting through the proposed training and Growler overflight areas.	The analysis of potential impacts to northern spotted owls was conducted in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, and was also included in the consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, resulting in the 2016 Biological Opinion in which the Service stated, "the proposed aircraft overflights are likely to affect spotted owls through intermittent exposures to aircraft noise throughout the year, including during the nesting season. However, because Navy aircraft will maintain minimum flight altitudes well above the distances at which any significant behavioral responses by affected spotted owls are likely to occur, the effects to spotted owls by these aircraft overflights are considered insignificant." The Navy is not proposing to decrease flight altitudes, so the conclusion of insignificant effect to spotted owls remains correct.
Sinker-9	The cumulative effects of sonar and underwater explosions on marine mammals are not entirely known and are of great concern to me. This Supplemental EIS/OEIS does not relieve any of my concerns in this area and must include relevant, in-depth peer-reviewed studies on all of the marine mammals residing in or transiting through the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. I understand the importance of military training; however, military training must be undertaken in an area already designated for such purpose. Olympic National Park, the adjacent Olympic National Forest lands, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary are not designated for this purpose and certainly designated as areas for warfare training as proposed by this document. Thank you for considering my comment and please keep me informed.	The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, all backed up by hundreds of relevant, in-depth, peer-reviewed studies.
Sirois-1	Seismic testing and ships cause permanent damage to the ecological balance of the ocean's marine animals. Many marine animals rely on sound	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>to communicate, locate food, avoid predators and navigate. Exposure to certain frequencies of sonar could also affect animals' ability to hear sounds in those ranges. You must take measure to prevent such damage and protect these creatures.</p> <p>The Navy estimates that over 320,000 porpoises and 1,100 whales will experience hearing loss from their screeching sonar. These marine mammals depend on their ability to hear to survive! PLEASE REDUCE SEISMIC/SONAR TESTING AND TRAINING to consider the effect on the ocean's inhabitants.</p>	<p>and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The alternatives carried forward meet the Navy's purpose and need to ensure that it can fulfill its obligation under U.S.C. Title 10. As explained in Section 2.5 (Alternatives Development) of the EIS/OEIS, the range of alternatives considered by the Navy must be reasonable alternatives. To be reasonable, an alternative must meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. A curtailment or reduction in the number of training and testing activities would not meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, and would therefore be unreasonable.</p>
Siroshton-01	This field appears to have an issue, I have attached my comments in aa file below.	Thank you for participating in the NEPA process.
Siroshton-02	<p>1. Navy impacts on Southern Resident orcas were in fact recognized as an issue by the Orca Task Force in Washington state.</p> <p>The EIS inaccurately claims that "Navy actions were not the sources for any of the identified threats" in the report by the Southern Resident Orca Task Force (Office of the Washington Governor, 2018) (page 3.4-46).</p> <p>Given the small size of the endangered Southern Resident orca population today, and the fact that they travel in groups, harm to a single individual orca can easily mean a population-level effect.</p> <p>Each individual orca in the current population matters if the population is to avoid extinction. There has been a net loss of 12 individual Southern Resident orcas since 2011. The population has continued to decline since the 2015 NWTTS EIS. In 2016, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) declared that Southern Resident orcas are one of the marine species most at risk of extinction nationwide. The final EIS will need to be updated with the latest number of Southern Resident orcas alive today, which is currently fewer than the 77 stated in the draft.</p> <p>The Draft EIS states that "the use of sonar and other transducers during training activities as described under Alternative 1 will result in the unintentional taking of killer whales incidental to those activities" (page 3.4-190). The EIS Fact Sheet Booklet states that 99.84% of all estimated</p>	<p>The Task Force Final Report did not identify Navy sonar among the major threats. The major threats identified in the report are a lack of prey, disturbance from noise and vessel traffic, and toxic contaminants in the waters they inhabit. The Navy, as acknowledged by the Governor's Task Force in 2018, was not previously requested to participate in the Task Force, and the Navy was not made aware of conversations held during meetings in 2018. The Navy has since been invited to take part and, as a result, a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Task Force's working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor's Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales. The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.</p> <p>There are several sources of abundance numbers for marine mammal species. For consistency, the Navy uses abundance numbers of Southern Resident killer whales (as well as other marine mammal species) provided by NMFS in</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>takes of marine mammals would be Level B harassment, disrupting natural behavior patterns such as feeding, surfacing, nursing, breeding, sheltering or migration to those point where those patterns are abandoned or significantly alter. These—and especially feeding, breeding, and nursing—are all critical activities for the Southern Resident orcas now, given that they have produced only two surviving calves in the last three years, two orcas are visibly emaciated, and nutritional stress is recognized as a primary threat to the population. Up to 69% of all detectable pregnancies between 2008 and 2014 were unsuccessful, and low availability of Chinook salmon appeared to be a significant cause of late pregnancy failure (Wasser et al. 2017); Level B harassment by Navy activities that interferes with both feeding and breeding or displaces orcas from preferred foraging areas is of significant concern and will further contribute to the Southern Resident orcas' low reproductive success.</p> <p>Table 3.4-40 in the EIS estimates two behavioral impacts to Southern Resident orcas per year from sonar and other transducers. It is unclear whether that means just two individual orcas will likely be affected; if so, we question whether that is realistic given that pods of orcas travel together. We are particularly concerned about new and increased impacts to Southern Resident orcas from mine explosives, which can cause injury or death, and the use of mid-frequency sonar, which can impact other marine mammals out to 16 km offshore. wildlife within 2,000 square miles – well outside the reasonable area that marine mammal observers are able to survey to record marine mammal sightings and initiate mitigation measures. In fact, military exercises have been documented to impact orcas right here in the Salish Sea.</p> <p>In a population with strong family ties, the loss of one orca also directly affects the others' chance of survival. When a female resident orca dies, it increases the mortality risk of her male offspring under age 30 by 3.1 times, and the mortality risk of her male offspring over age 30 by 8.3 times (Foster et al. 2012). In late 2018 and early 2019, for example, it was reported that male Southern Resident orca K25 was observed to be doing poorly after the death of his mother, K13.</p> <p>3. There are documented cases in this region of U.S. and Canadian naval activities, including active sonar training and explosive testing, causing direct harm to the Southern Resident orcas.</p> <p>In 2003, an active sonar training exercise conducted by the U.S. Navy in the eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca and Haro Strait caused one of the Southern Resident killer whale families (J pod) to stop foraging and exhibit abnormal</p>	<p>the most recent Stock Assessment Report. The Navy tracks this species closely and will continue to use the most recent available data.</p> <p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	behaviors and movement, change direction multiple times, and group together in shallow water where they are at increased risk of stranding. In a video recording of the incident, sonar can clearly be heard above the water. More recent incidents involving testing of sonar and explosives by the Canadian Navy in Southern Resident orca habitat are examples of the potential impact of the activities proposed in this EIS. A juvenile Southern Resident female was stranded in 2012 with evidence of trauma consistent with an explosion or high-pressure impact, a week after the Canadian Navy had been conducting sonar exercises in the region. An exact cause of death was not determined, but experts in underwater noise who continue to review her case believe that the most likely cause of death was an underwater military explosion. In 2017, explosives detonated by the Canadian Navy near a group of Southern Residents (L pod) caused the whales to group together suddenly and flee the area. These examples show that just one incident of training and testing activities impacting Southern Residents can cause significant harm, death, or displacement from preferred habitat.	
Siroshton-03	<p>4. Other agencies and operators are taking new, meaningful steps to reduce noise and disturbance affecting Southern Resident orcas. The Navy must also increase its protections, or it will become responsible for a larger share of the cumulative impact and potentially negate some of the benefits of the other actions being taken.</p> <p>In 2019, Washington state has taken big steps to reduce impacts on Southern Resident orcas from other vessel types, recognizing that noise and disturbance have significant adverse consequences for this endangered population. In May 2019, Governor Inslee signed into law a bill that increases the distance that vessels must stay away from the Southern Residents and enacts a 7-knot speed limit within a half nautical mile of these orcas. The legislature also allocated funding for a new hybrid ferry and funding to convert some ferries to hybrid-electric power. Washington State Ferries is also doing a baseline noise inventory and developing solutions to address noise and frequencies of concern. Meanwhile, in 2019, voluntary ship slowdowns will continue and expand for the third year through the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority-led Enhancing Cetacean Habitat and Observation (ECHO) Program – a Canadian program that directly benefits Southern Resident orcas in the inland waters.</p> <p>The Navy should increase its own mitigation efforts so that there is still a significant net benefit to the Southern Residents in terms of reduced noise</p>	<p>The Navy is fully aware of the plight of the Southern Resident killer whales. In 2019 a team of Navy subject matter experts and Navy officers began to participate with the Governor’s Southern Resident Killer Whale Task Force working groups on prey and vessel traffic. The Navy participated in the Governor’s Task Force, as the group identified ways to support recovery efforts for the Southern Resident killer whales.</p> <p>The Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals in areas that are particularly important for biological life processes, such as feeding and migration.</p> <p>Procedural mitigation measures already in place and proposed to continue include ceasing activities that could be harmful to marine mammals when marine mammals are detected within defined mitigation zones.</p> <p>The Navy has also been a key contributor to marine species monitoring projects for a number of years to advance scientific knowledge of Southern Resident killer whales and the salmon they rely on. For decades, the Navy has implemented habitat improvement projects on its installations in Puget Sound that benefit the Southern Residents.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	and disturbance when all these other entities are increasing their protective measures.	
Siroshton-04	5. The designation for Southern Resident orca critical habitat is likely to change later this year. The Navy should not make final decisions about training and testing in the potential new critical habitat areas off the coasts of Washington, Oregon and California until this designation has been made. NMFS has committed to proposing a rule with an expanded designation of critical habitat off Washington, Oregon and California by early October 2019 – an area encompassed by the NWTT range. Advancing this EIS now for activities in an area that is on the cusp of being designated as critical habitat is irresponsible. The Navy should wait until NMFS makes its final designation for expanded critical habitat before pursuing activities that would adversely affect the area. Changes in the Navy's mitigation measures are likely to be necessary so that the proposed action does not "result in destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat."	The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Siroshton-05	6. Recent variations in Southern Resident orca presence in the Salish Sea are complex and should not be an excuse for exercising less caution in the inland waters. The EIS states that "foraging during the spring in Salish Sea by Southern Resident killer whales has declined in recent years as they shift their range and forage for Chinook salmon or other prey species elsewhere in response to reduced prey availability in that historically used inland waters foraging area" (p. 3.4-26). Even spending time elsewhere, Southern Resident orcas are not getting enough food and are showing signs of malnutrition. The inland waters foraging area is still critically important if they are going to survive and thrive. In recognition of this fact, state and federal governments are actively working to restore salmon populations in the inland waters. It is difficult to predict orca presence on a long-term or even annual basis, and the Navy should not assume that the shift outside of the Salish Sea in the spring and summer is a permanent change. The Southern Resident orcas are still sighted in the Salish Sea frequently. In fact, Olson et al. 2018 noted that K and L pods have been increasing the duration of their stay in the inland waters by staying in the Salish Sea through the fall and into the early winter. The Navy should consult with orca biologists to gather other recent information, in addition to reviewing recent published literature on Southern Resident orca presence in the Salish Sea. The EIS implies that changes in the Southern Residents' presence in the Salish Sea mean that protections there are less important than they used to	The statements quoted from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS are part of an establishment of the environmental baseline the Navy then uses to estimate potential impacts resulting from the Navy's activities. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The commenter incorrectly asserts that the Navy suggests that protective measures in the Salish Sea are less important; however, the Navy has not suggested that and does not consider that to be true. The mitigation measures developed for both NWTT Inland Waters and the NWTT Offshore Area for the Proposed Action represent an increase over the mitigation developed for the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>be. In fact, it should be reason for an extra layer of caution. Reducing noise and disturbance in the heavily-trafficked inland waters could enable the Southern Residents to forage there more effectively and therefore spend more time there as they have historically. Recent information on foraging locations should not be interpreted as a reason to decrease or discontinue mitigation efforts to avoid impacts to Southern Residents in the Salish Sea. Additionally, the Navy should consider that when the Southern Resident orcas are not in inland waters, they are likely to be in their offshore area, which is subject to additional training and testing activities that do not occur in the Salish Sea. The Navy should consider additional mitigation and monitoring in the orcas' offshore habitat given the potential increased use of this area and the unique activities—such as active sonar—that take place in this portion of the NWTT range.</p>	
Siroshton-06	<p>7. The EIS should include two additional studies related to impacts on Southern Resident orcas: Wieland et al. 2010 and Emmons et al. 2019. Wieland, M., A. Jones, and S. C. P. Renn. 2010. Changing durations of Southern Resident killer whale 23 (<i>Orcinus orca</i>) discrete calls between two periods spanning 28 years. <i>Mar. Mam. Sci.</i> 26(1):195–201. This study found that the Southern Residents make a behavioral adjustment as a result of vessel noise, as measured through an increase in mean durations of discrete calls. “Because they are adjusting their vocal behavior, we must consider the very real possibility that engine noise is hindering their ability to communicate, and may well impact their efficiency at using acoustics to forage and navigate, as well” (Wieland et al. 2010). These findings should be incorporated into 3.4.2.1.1.4 on masking (page 3.4.103, which talks about other species but not killer whales) and into the odontocete discussion on page 3.4-120.</p> <p>Emmons, C.K., M.B. Hanson, and M.O. Lammers. 2019. Monitoring the occurrence of Southern Resident killer whales, other marine mammals, and anthropogenic sound in the Pacific Northwest. Prepared for: U.S. Navy, U.S. Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, HI. Prepared by: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Northwest Fisheries Science Center under MIPR N00070-17-MP-4C419. 25 February 2019. 23p. This report states that there were 148 mid-frequency active sonar events detected between 2011 and 2017, with the peak overlapping with occurrence of the three killer whale communities (including Southern Residents). This is concerning because, as the EIS states, exposure to mid-frequency sonar has been directly linked to separation of a killer whale calf from its group (page 3.4-102); the separation and loss of a single calf would be a serious blow to the</p>	<p>Wieland et al., 2010 was incorporated in Section 3.4.1.7.4 of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS as recommended by the commenter.</p> <p>The Navy-funded research presented in Emmons et al. 2019 was considered in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, but the report was not cited because it was still in the process of being edited by the authors and had not been finalized. The report has since been finalized and is cited in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy does not frequently conduct training or testing activities in the location of the Cape Flattery Offshore hydrophone since that area is highly utilized by commercial vessel traffic, making it an undesirable location for the Navy to conduct activities, especially sonar training or testing.</p> <p>The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on Southern Resident killer whales and other marine species in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitat areas, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures specific to Southern Resident killer whales. For example, in the NWTT Offshore Area, the Navy developed a new mitigation area, the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area, which encompasses waters off Cape Flattery. The Navy's mitigation now includes annual limits on hull-mounted mid-frequency active sonar and prohibits explosive Mine Countermeasures and Neutralization Testing in the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. All other explosive activities are required to be conducted 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. In addition, the Navy developed a new mitigation to issue annual awareness notification messages</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	small population, given that there are so few calves and the southern residents have had limited reproductive success in recent years. Exposure to mid-frequency sonar has also been directly linked to mass strandings of cetaceans (page 3.4-127). In addition, the EIS states that newer high-duty or continuous active sonars have more potential to mask vocalizations, particularly for mid-frequency cetaceans like killer whales, and “longer-term consequences could include potential decrease in recruitment” (p. 3.4-102). The Southern Resident orcas cannot afford any further decrease in their already very low recruitment rates. The findings from Emmons et al. 2019 regarding seasonal use of different offshore areas by Southern Resident orcas and other whales should also be used to minimize adverse impacts by shifting sonar and explosives testing and training by season and by location.	to alert ships and aircraft to the possible presence of increased concentrations of Southern Resident killer whales seasonally, which will further help avoid potential impacts from vessel movements and training and testing activities on this species.
Siroshton-07	8. New whale report alert systems should be used for real-time monitoring and early warnings to build on the limited capacity of lookouts. The Navy should explore the use of newly available apps and technology that provide real-time information on whale presence in the Salish Sea and along the coast. Using this technology could expand the ability of the Navy’s marine mammal observers to be aware of and respond to the presence of Southern Resident orcas. For example, the Whale Report Alert System (WRAS), developed by the British Columbia Cetacean Sightings Network, alerts mariners to the presence of whales so that mitigation measures may be enacted to reduce the risk of disturbance and collision. Orca Network, Whale Scout, and other organizations in Washington also contribute to a Whale Sighting Network with close to real-time reporting in the Salish Sea.	The Navy developed new mitigation for Navy biologists to initiate communication with the appropriate marine mammal detection networks in NWTT Inland Waters prior to conducting explosive mine neutralization activities involving the use of Navy divers, Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Training, Civilian Port Defense – Homeland Security Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Exercises, and Small Boat Attack Exercises. This mitigation will help the Navy plan activities in a way that minimizes the potential for exposure of Southern Resident killer whales, as described in Section K.3.3 (Mitigation Areas for Marine Species in NWTT Inland Waters). The Navy will also continue to assess the practicality of other available monitoring techniques as technologies advance.
Siroshton-08	9. Additional information is needed on the anticipated timing of the proposed activities. The EIS should detail the times of year during which the proposed activities will take place. The Southern Resident orcas have exhibited seasonality in their movements, and information from tagging studies, coastal surveys, and passive acoustic monitoring allows some degree of prediction for when and where they may be traveling and foraging. Any overlap in their seasonal movements and the Navy’s testing and training activities will increase impacts on these species. Information about timing should be made public in the EIS and the Navy should seek to adjust the timing of their activities to minimize such overlap.	As stated in Section 2.3 (Proposed Activities), because of the nature of training and testing requirements for forces that must be ready to deploy at all times, activities could occur throughout the year. The Navy added additional details on seasonality and day/night requirements of its activities to Appendix A (Navy Activities Descriptions) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy did consider seasonal movements and behaviors of marine species in its effect analysis. The Navy developed mitigation areas to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species either seasonally or year-round in key foraging, breeding, and migration habitats, as described in Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment).
Siroshton-09	10. The intended duration of the EIS is not clear. This EIS is unclear as to the duration of the planned activities. A change in	The duration of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS is for the foreseeable future. The analysis would remain valid unless the Navy makes substantial changes in the

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	the 2019 Naval Defense Authorization Act extended the Navy's authorization for marine mammal take and harassment under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) from five to seven years. It is not stated in this EIS whether the proposed activities were analyzed for impacts over a five-year time period or for the extended seven-year time period.	proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns, or there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts. The Marine Mammal Protection Act permits would be in place for seven years.
Siroshton-10	<p>11. Increasing the Navy's testing and training activities at this time is counter to what the endangered Southern Resident orcas need right now to have a chance at recovery.</p> <p>Without bold and immediate actions, the Southern Residents are likely to go extinct within our lifetimes. Everything we can do now to protect the Southern Resident orcas is critical. In a time when we should be taking action to address and decrease threats facing the population, including reducing noise and disturbance, the Navy's proposed activities increase the risks from ocean noise, vessel strike and disturbance, potential direct harm and injury to Southern Resident orcas, and displacement from preferred habitat.</p> <p>The Navy must consider the current crisis facing the endangered Southern Resident orcas and make new adjustments in its testing and training activities. Despite being listed under the Endangered Species Act for nearly 14 years, this unique population is not recovering and is continuing to decline. It is obvious that status quo actions, including the Navy's training and testing activities, are not serving the Southern Resident orcas. Given their highly endangered status and continuing decline, the Navy should be considering how to reduce impacts and increase protections for Southern Resident orcas.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of our input and concerns as you finalize the EIS.</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Sivertsen-1	When I moved here 15 years ago I was aware of the training that was occurring at OLF and I was good with it. Now we are being told that a four fold increase will happen with not so much as a compromise. I don't understand why Ault field or some other locations can't take the overflow. The Navy in my view has been a good neighbor up until now. In Addition to increasing the noise they have also contaminated our water sources. It's despicable. They are no longer considered a good neighbor.	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island or OLF Coupeville. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com
Sjogren-1	I wholeheartedly object. This project must not go forward! The environmental impact is unjustifiable. I will bring my young family to these waters to visit their grandparents regularly over the upcoming decades and we need safe and healthy oceans and ecosystems to survive. We do not need more war weapons. This will not make us safer.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Sjunneson-1	We need to do everything in our power to protect our marine animals. It is time for the US Navy to do its part and halt the Sonar Testing.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Skullerud-1	<p>Nobody speaks up for the working people near the OLF who have to go to work sleep-deprived after the fighters fly in the evenings, often past 11:00 pm. I am partially retired and can manage a sleep-deprived day because my schedule is flexible, but 9 to 5 working people have no such freedom, and must either take a day off or stumble through their responsibilities as low functioning employees who offer who-knows-what excuses to their employers.</p> <p>Sports youth stop their games to cover their ears. People working on the farms and visitors to such important tourist destinations as Deception Pass must do the same. No one wants to camp under the stars and the Growlers. Income from such an important state park is surely affected. And Whidbey Health hospital in Coupeville has just built a new wing. One wonders how many potential patients from the island will opt for other hospitals at quieter locations like Anacortes.</p> <p>I've lived near the OLF for 10 years and worked daily for 14 years on commercial jets at the Everett Boeing flight line. The Prowlers and</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	commercial jets can't hold a candle to the ear-splitting racket made by the Growlers. These leaf blowers on wings destroy any chance of living outside while they are flying. And it's not much better inside. Despite our soundproofing windows, all phone and face-to-face conversations have to stop while the jets blast overhead. Imagine having to watch captioned TV 24/7 and you get the picture. These jets need to move their practices to less populated areas.	
Slater C-1	I am against the solar testing	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Slater L-1	<p>Thank you for serving and protecting our country and the values it has historically stood for. Among these values, as you may remember, are “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” The following information related to the upcoming Navy project calls these fundamental values into question: “Last November, the U.S. Navy announced its plan to release 20,000 tons of environmental “stressors,” including heavy metals and explosives, into the coastal waters of the U.S. Pacific Northwest over the course of this year.”</p> <p>Considering that the Navy already has the most current scientific knowledge with regards to the detrimental effects of heavy metals on all living organisms—humans, marine mammals, fish—and the water we all depend upon for life, how can you possibly justify this flagrant attack on our already fragile ecosystem?? Our orcas, our salmon—our children are already suffering the effects of environmental pollution, with extreme dwindling of populations and severe health issues like never before.</p> <p>How can the Navy, which is sworn to protect our waters and our people, contribute enormous amounts of these well-known highly toxic materials to our vulnerable oceans—here in the Pacific Northwest or anywhere (you know better than anyone that all oceans are connected!)??</p> <p>Please consider the true long-term and short/mid-term consequences of further contamination of our oceans on ALL life, including your own people’s children and grandchildren. There must be other creative and healthy alternatives. The Navy has the human and material resources to</p>	Please see Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for the analysis of impacts to water quality from the Navy’s proposed activities.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	implement them, in the name of Life and a safer world for now and generations to come. Thank you.	
Slotterback-1	I live within Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve....an area of outstanding natural beauty, cultural, historical, and architectural significance. This region's unique and extraordinary qualities has drawn the designation of National Historic Reserve and citizens who value them. With the increase of frequency, type, and decibel intensity of jets training at the Coupeville Outlying Field, the well being of our citizens and wildlife are significantly negatively impacted. We would invited those with any doubt as to the negative impact to come sleep under the war zone that skims our tree tops late into the night, night after night. Surely there is an alternate location where this training can be conducted without destroying our lives in this uniquely beautiful Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve.	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island or OLF Coupeville. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com
Slovinac-1	This sonar testing is hurting our SRKW. They are on the brink of extinction and you are ensuring they have no chance to rebound. We are home to many beautiful, intelligent marine animals. Stop hurting them and their home. This is unacceptable.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Smith A-1	I live in England and I am currently 14 years old I have wanted to be a marine biologist since I was 5. It has only been this year more people have been more interested in saving the world. But that's still not enough as so many people are uneducated about these issues we need to act, together now. Please share. Please save lives for animals and humans. Saving the planet starts with what you choose to do about it. Watch the cove.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Smith B-1	"Marine mammals, such the Orca, rely on sound to communicate, locate food, avoid predators, and navigate." Sonar testing in their natural habitat could (and probably will) detrimentally change their behavior. There are countless studies that prove marine mammals, such as porpoises, suffer from hearing loss as a direct result from Navy testing (sonar testing). For many marine mammals this is the equivalent of a death sentence. Please stop any naval testing in these waters. You are harming many	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	populations of marine mammals, not to mention the already threatened Southern Resident Killer Whale population. If you refuse to stop, I request that you spend some more time determining how this will affect the Southern Resident Killer whale population.	3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Smith C-1	it is not acceptable that the Navy conduct training exercises over Olympic National Park.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Smith D-1	This is not right to do this to the sea mammals. It's very disturbing hearing. Please stop	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marin-species-monitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Smith E-1	<p>I am very much against having the Navy fly lots of loud jet planes over the Olympic Coast of Washington and surrounding areas.</p> <p>They are already doing this and it is frightening annoying and generally terrible! It causes stress even when they are not overhead, just anticipating their arrival. And it creates heart racing panic when a low flying jet turns away and suddenly creates a deafening roar from its engines.</p> <p>When it gets around that this formerly peaceful area is now a playground for noisy war machines I am worried that tourism will drastically decline, hurting an already crippled economy. The animals are also stressed out by</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>all this.</p> <p>I hope that we can keep this area in the ecologically respectful state it has been in since 1907 when Theodore Roosevelt first began preserving park lands.</p> <p>Please see what you can do to help American citizens avoid being saddled with this infringement of our Third Amendment right to be free of the temporary quartering of troops in peace time!</p>	
Smith H-1	<p>The Southern Resident Orca, wild salmon and the Salish Sea as a natural resting sanctuary are under threat of collapse. Damage to one species, or concern of damage to one species seems limited, as we should all be concerned about a military that continues to push destructive war technology given that we are supposedly evolving as a species. But, my focus will be the Southern Resident Orca as a protected and endangered species with a limited range, primarily the Salish Sea and the Coasts of Washington and Canada. These Orca have a limited feeding range, a habitual roaming range, and their food source,/range is under threat by tourism, boat noise, and average sea traffic, fishing, etc. The sonic, wartime frequencies or any sounding tech used to map, or search for resources, are beyond what these limited ranges can tolerate. From what I understand the range for damage during these exercises is extreme, damage to even a few individuals can't be endured. I'd like to see the entire Salish Sea legally protected for 5 to 10 years as an environmentally guarded sanctuary to learn from that protection measure.</p> <p>The Navy's EIS clearly indicates that the Southern Residents will be harmed by their testing and training activities, and this is not acceptable. Our Southern Residents need quiet in order to "hear" their prey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please be reminded that in 2003 during a training session, the J pod quit foraging and instead spent time and calories trying to leave the area instead of hunting and eating. • In pursuing these activities, the Navy violates the Endangered Species Act, which should be protecting the orcas. • The designation for the orcas' critical habitat is under review and the Navy should not be allowed to move forward until the designation is final. Please respect the Southern Resident Orcas' Endangered Species status and take steps to mitigate further harm. Please protect the critical habitat of the orcas and prohibit testing and training in these waters. Please ban sonar and explosives in these waters. I am concerned that the Navy should not engage in any activities that can harm marine life, especially the endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales. 	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p> <p>The Navy consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service regarding the Navy's Proposed Action and potential impacts to endangered species, as required under the Endangered Species Act. Most marine species continue to thrive in the Study Area as well as in other areas where Navy training and testing activities are more extensive, such as Hawaii and Southern California. Therefore, the Navy's analysis of potential impacts is supported by empirical data pertaining to marine mammal species population size and health. The Navy will continue to coordinate with NMFS on criteria and thresholds for assessing impacts to marine mammals, including cumulative impacts.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>The Navy has consulted with NMFS on designated critical habitat as required under the Endangered Species Act. The Navy has been aware of the proposed revision to Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat. As NMFS noted in the Proposed Rule, during preparations for the revision to the critical habitat, NMFS provided the Navy (and other DoD entities) with information regarding the areas under consideration for Southern Resident killer whale critical habitat, and requested the Navy identify areas they own or control which may overlap with the areas under consideration. NMFS also asked the Navy to identify any impacts to national security that might arise from the proposed designation of critical habitat. The Navy included discussions of the proposed critical habitat in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy evaluated the effectiveness and practicability of a number of potential mitigation measures. Through consultation and permitting with NMFS and USFWS, the Navy refined the mitigation measures, which are now presented in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of this Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy is committed to protecting the marine environment during the conduct of its training and testing activities by using extensive measures to protect the marine environment while training and testing for nearly a decade.</p> <p>Based on the analysis in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS and monitoring conducted during actual training and testing events, the proposed training will not pose a risk to whales, fish, and other wildlife given that these same types of activities have been conducted for many years here and in other Range Complexes with no indications of broad-scale impacts that are either injurious or of significant biological impact to marine mammals, fish, or wildlife at those locations. Please see the recent results supporting this as presented in training ranges monitoring reports available at the Navy website (www.navy.mil/speciesmonitoring.us/) and from the NMFS Office of Protected Resources website (www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental.htm#applications).</p>
Smith J-1	<p>I SUPPORT NORTHERN CALIFORNIA TRIBES OPPOSE NAVY TRAINING AND TESTING AND DEMAND STRONGER PROTECTIONS FOR THE OCEAN AND THEIR CULTURAL LIFEWAYS!</p> <p>The adequacy of the assessment of Tribal cultural impacts as well as environmental impacts from the Navy's training and testing activities is especially important because these activities take place in the Pacific Ocean, which holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes and is critically important for the wellbeing of all people and lifeforms on</p>	<p>Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>this planet.</p> <p>The Navy should work meaningfully with the Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities.</p> <p>The Navy should prohibit use of sonar within the 50-mile mitigation area. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals.</p> <p>The "best available science" referenced in the draft SEIS should be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy's NWTRC.</p> <p>The Navy's monitoring program should be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy should expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.</p>	
Smith M-1	<p>As one of the people you represent, I want you to know that I wholeheartedly object to the Navy's proposal to use the Olympic Peninsula as training grounds and urge you to do the same. The effect that the different types of pollution, especially noise, will have on the ecosystem there is detrimental to both the animals living there and the humans that call the Peninsula their home. The tourism sector that drives so much of</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the coastal economy would take a big hit as well, severely effecting residents' income and therefore quality of life.</p> <p>I grew up going to the Olympic Peninsula every summer, and I was and still am in awe of the raw, natural, beauty of the area. As those places become harder and harder to come by, we should be striving to safeguard them even more instead of selling them out.</p> <p>I am 21 years old, and when I am old enough to take my kids out of the city for a little bit, I would love for them to be able to experience the same wonder and amazement that I was able to on the Olympic Peninsula. For them to be able to experience that, I am counting on you now to represent me and the many other people that love and utilize the Peninsula to protect it from just being another casualty to our country's military industrial complex.</p> <p>I urge you to think of the future and the irreversible damage that passing this proposal would bring.</p> <p>Extend the comment period and reject this proposal.</p>	<p>minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Smith N-1	<p>I am 100% against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals! PLEASE STOP NOW!! Thank you.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Smith P-1	<p>Do not release heavy metals, depleted uranium, or other toxins into Puget Sound. I cannot believe you are even contemplating this. It is unsafe and unconscionable.</p>	<p>The Navy does not propose the use of ordnance containing depleted uranium. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.</p>
Smith S-1	<p>The proposed sonar testing in the Salish Sea could endanger the already at risk Southern Resident Killer Whales (76 members left). Sonar testing could</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	interfere with the sonar of the orcas and compromise their hunting, and they are already starving. Please stay out of the Salish Sea.	The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Smith W-1	Please consider our community and parks when making this decision. Thank you.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Smoke-1	Please reconsider testing in the waters off the sensitive west coast. Our waters are inhabited by our endangered Orcas, and the numbers are down. We'll lose them all.. Your testing will cause problems throughout the area.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Snape-1	How can these creatures endure this noise? Are your intentions to wipe out these animals because that is precisely what will happen. They along with many other sea creatures are being systematically killed off due to humans and their ignorance of sharing this planet.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Snell-1	If the role of the Navy is to protect citizens of the US, then they are neglecting their duty by knowingly harming cetaceans through use of Sonar. Every organism is vital to our ecosystem and by threatening their existence, you threaten the existence of human beings as well.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Snopek-1	The Navy using and testing sonar in this manner will have a tremendously negative impact on the endangered southern resident killer whales and all other marine life dependent on sonar for their movement, hunting/gathering and social life. In essence, the navy will be directly responsible for threatening the existence of these whales and marine life. It is completely unacceptable to move forward with this plan when biodiversity in the pacific northwest depends on us to make the opposite kind of decisions: we need to be changing our behavior to accommodate these delicate ecosystems which are already stressed by human activity, not producing more human activity that will push the ecosystem into a systemic failure and cause extinction.	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Soberanis-1	Orcas are the apex predators of the see; however, we can all acknowledge that humans are the one threat they're facing. Everyday we take their food, we've taken their family members, and now the Navy wants to take their hearing away. There are only 76 Southern Residents Orcas and interfering in this way is just gonna aid in these Orcas extinction. There are hundreds of other Marine mammals that will also face this issue, if we even care a little about our planet, our animals, and just mother nature in general we will take action to ensure that the marine population is safe and thriving.	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Soest-1	Greetings: "Olympic is one of the premier wilderness parks in the United States, and it harbors one of the richest old-growth forest preserves in the world. The park also protects the core of a larger ecosystem that surrounds it." (Olympic National Park, A Natural History, by Tim McNulty) Short of a direct hit by an atomic missile, nothing could compare with the Navy's plans to systematically ruin this World Heritage Site and make the	<p>The Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS was released to the public before the Kuehne report was made available. The Navy has considered this report in the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS (see Section 3.12 and Appendix J). The Navy will continue to use the best available science in its analyses of impacts.</p> <p>The Navy has expanded the noise analysis to include the transit of aircraft to and from the Olympic MOA.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>nearby towns and reservations virtually uninhabitable. Navy jet noise has no business in Olympic National Park. Noise Intrusion. The Navy has offered no data on noise levels proposed, but instead uses models. This is entirely insufficient and unacceptable. Fortunately, recent independent research provides actual data on current Growler activities. Between June 2017 and May 2018 the researchers recorded up to 85 growler overflights per day, with the sound impacting 17% of daylight hours. Some locations were impacted for 50% of daylight hours. 85% of aircraft noise on the Olympic Peninsula is military. This will get much, much worse if the Navy is permitted to implement their current plans.</p> <p>(Source: Impact of Military Flights on Olympic Peninsula Soundscapes: Initial Summary of Findings. Lauren Kuehne, Research Scientist, University of Washington's College of the Environment. June 4, 2019.)</p> <p>Areas Outside MOAs Ignored. The draft SEIS fails to consider the impacts of Growler noise outside the MOAs. This failure is unacceptable given the wide swath of terrain impacted by the sound of even a single Growler.</p> <p>Wildlife Impacts. The draft SEIS fails to consider that Olympic National Park wildlife do not recognize the park boundary. Both the park and the ignored terrain outside the park include critical habitat for endangered and threatened species, such as the Northern spotted owl, Western snowy plover, and Marbled murrelet. Growlers will greatly impact the feeding and nesting activities of these and other species. (My cat hides in the closet when the Blue Angels perform in Seattle.) Here is how the Park Service treats loud noise in the Park:</p> <p>"[Park] biologists determine when threatened species are most vulnerable to impacts such as helicopter noise and siltation in rivers. Birds are most at risk during their spring and summer nesting seasons, while salmon most need protection during their upstream spawning runs. Park staff plan projects around these times, to minimize impacts to threatened species and their critical habitats. We strive to work around, not through, natural lifecycles." (Emphasis added.)</p> <p>https://www.nps.gov/olymp/learn/threatened-and-endangered-species-of-olympic.htm</p> <p>Pacific Flyway. The Olympic Peninsula is also critical habitat for bird species of the Pacific Flyway. Each spring and fall, a billion birds rely on our Pacific Coast for feeding and resting during the spring and fall migrations between Alaska and the US west coast. This is a fraction of the numbers of birds of a century ago. These birds are already threatened by loss of habitat and</p>	<p>In the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy thoroughly analyzed the potential impacts to all forms of marine life and habitats. See Section 3.3, Marine Habitats; Section 3.4, Marine Mammals; Section 3.5 Sea Turtles; Section 3.6 Birds; Section 3.7, Marine Vegetation; Section 3.8, Marine Invertebrates; and Section 3.9, Fishes.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>dwindling food sources. Threatened or endangered species that use the Pacific Flyway include the Black-footed albatross, Marbled murrelet, Sooty shearwater, and Brant goose.</p> <p>Failure to Consider Alternatives. Before the Navy decided to co-opt so much of Western Washington, they trained elsewhere. The Navy needs to consider alternatives to ruining the natural wonders of the Olympic Peninsula, the inhabitability of the peninsula for its residents, and the visitor-based economy of communities on the peninsula.</p> <p>Convenience for the Navy is not a sufficient reason to wreak such havoc upon so many civilians. Extreme noise causes stress, a legitimately life-threatening condition, as well as economic catastrophe if real estate becomes uninhabitable.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments on the Navy's EIS. Please reject it as unacceptable.</p>	
Somerville-1	<p>Olympic National Park is an oasis of tranquility, world famous as an oasis of silence, an environmental gem that extends from the snowy peaks and glaciers of the Olympic mountains to the protected shores of the Pacific Ocean... except when the Navy's FA-18 Growlers conduct ear-splitting training flights up and down the coast.</p> <p>Overflights of up to 16 hours a day, 260 days a year, destroy any visitor's experience of nature's grandeur and disturb every form of wildlife in the forests and the ocean and threaten the well being of local residents and visitors alike. And the Navy's two-volume Environmental Impact Statement gives no legitimate reason why their training cannot be undertaken in a designated warfare training area.</p> <p>Olympic National Park is not designated a warfare training ground -- for the Navy or anyone else. Olympic National Park exists to protect the flora and fauna of its four distinct environmental zones as well as the natural, geological and human history of those regions.</p> <p>Please fly elsewhere and allow visitors and residents to appreciate nature's quiet and majestic beauty.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Sophie-1	<p>Please stop making noise, stop harassing the living beings of our sacred oceans, stop investing in war. Start putting your efforts into more sustainable solutions to create a better world for everyone. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Sorensen-1	I am against sonar practices, as they have been proven to harm our marine animals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Sorkin-1	Whales are dying along our coast due to naval interferences and they are an intrinsic element of this planet's ecology. Test out of the whales migration' range, PLEASE!	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Sormani-1	Humans would NOT tolerate this unacceptable practice, nor should these whales and marine animals have to!!!! Stop now, this is animal abuse!! 🚫	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Soza P-1	I didn't gain much from this gathering. I expected a detailed speech that all could hear & then questions to follow. An open conversation.	The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.
Soza S-1	We came to this meeting to gain information and hear public input on proposals. This was not remotely what we expected. Quite a few Navy Reps, not too much information shared. Maybe it was the forum. I had to pry technical answers and of most reps I asked, they seemed more defensive than informative. I felt they were so busy formulating a response that they failed to hear the questions.	The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.
Spees-1	Currently I am reviewing a series of DVD on WWII in the Pacific. There are many lessons to be learned from these documentaries. Tarawa was a 'clusterxxxx' and reflecting poor planning, poor execution, and inexperience. We paid for those errors by the US Navy & Marines with the lives of our countrymen. The best deterrent to War is the understanding that the aggressor will get his 'nose bloodied'. The best protection to the environment, a small part of the negative consequences of war, is to prevent a war. Any measures the US Navy can take to strengthen our position will be of benefit to our Country.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	I say: Anchors up and full speed ahead on your training, testing, and research.	
Spees-2	<p>"I am in favor of this project,"</p> <p>ppThere is a steep learning curve in going in to combat. Our Enemies and aggressors, to be defined later, are already far along in their endeavors, we need to catch up or even be ahead of them.</p> <p>ppIn the April/May 2019 edition of Air& Space magazine is a story about PBY's or "Catalina s" (Legends of an ocean crossing seaplane). It only talks about the PBY's use in the Pacific campaign. It had many lessons in how to most effectively wage war.</p> <p>ppThe PBY,nicknamed CATalina's or Cats, were slow and poorly defended. They were sitting ducks for all the Japanese aircraft. Despite these obvious weaknesses it was an awesome and most effective tool of war. Here is why: They had a long range. They were equipped with RADAR which was top secret and rapidly being improved in WWII. (The Japanese were way behind in the use of RADAR detection in WWII.)</p> <p>ppThey were painted black, called 'black cats", flew from dusk to dawn in search of the enemy with RADAR. They could cut their engines and silently glide-in undetected to effectively drop their munitions. We had the technological advantage and used it. Dr. Karl Spees of PAWA 98362</p> <p>Anchors up and full speed ahead on your training, testing, and research</p>	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Spickard-1	I urge the US Navy to STOP blasting sonar waves in the habitat of the extremely endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales. They are starving to death & this practice interferes with their ability to hunt salmon and communicate with other whales. This practice is total ignorance of a species fighting for survival. Actions like this by the US military make me furious. STOP	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Spielman-1	I don't think the Navy ever listens to the civilians for any reason. But here goes. Why don't the higher ups care about the oceans? When the oceans are so full of trash and all the mammals and fish are gone where will the Navy launch their boats then! The animals of the ocean help clean it. When you do tests that you are proposing you will hurt any mammal traveling in	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	that area. It has been proven that those tests do hurt the mammals hearing and echo location capabilities. Do the testing on computer generated applications!! Leave the inhabitants of the ocean alone!!!	<p>Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Spina-1	<p>This DEIS, like the Growler expansion DEIS, is in violation of NEPA requirements in that there should be one comprehensive DEIS for all of the expansion and navy military training in the Pacific Northwest. You are illegally segmenting impacts to reduce their appearance. The Growler DEIS/EIS/ROD should be voided, this DEIS should be abandoned, and one comprehensive DEIS for all activities should be conducted.</p> <p>Secondly, this expansion of training for convenience sake cannot justify the permanent damage being done to pristine and fragile environments with devastating impacts upon marine mammals, land creatures, and humans alike. You have places to do this training without the environmental destruction being done here in the Pacific Northwest.</p>	<p>The Navy prepares Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) and Environmental Assessments (EA) in order to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). These NEPA documents are intended to ensure decision makers consider the potential environmental effects of a proposed action and its alternatives, provide an opportunity for public involvement, and promote transparency by informing the public of these potential environmental effects. Each NEPA document addresses a specific proposed action, separated from other actions by its purpose and need, independent utility, timing, and geographic location. Some NEPA documents are stand-alone documents; others tier off or expand the analyses of other NEPA documents. NEPA documents for training and testing, including this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, focus on training and testing activities occurring within a range complex or military operation area and involve different types of aircraft, ships, and range complex enhancements. NEPA documents for aircraft homebasing actions focus on aircraft operations in and around the airfield and their facility needs. NEPA documents for installations focus on infrastructure enhancements for host and tenant command missions. Importantly, every environmental document considers the cumulative impacts to the environment from other relevant past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (federal, state, local, and private) in addition to the proposed action.</p>
Sponheim-1	Forward of the Save The Olympic Peninsula (STOP) letter.	See responses to Save The Olympic Peninsula (STOP) letter.
St. Clair-1	<p>Thank you for this opportunity to share my input on the proposed training and testing. I provided verbal comments at the public meeting in Everett but wanted to augment my concerns about the impact on Puget Sound wildlife. I have particular concern about two items:</p> <p>1. The testing of ordinance in Crescent Harbor. This area is an area of extreme important for planned restoration efforts of chinook salmon habitat and the subsequent impact on our Southern Resident Whale population. It is hard to reconcile the efforts to restore salmon habitat and</p>	<p>The analysis of potential impacts to salmon and other marine species was included in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As stated for fishes in Section 3.9.3.2.2.3 (Impacts from Explosives Under Alternative 1), "due to the short-term, infrequent and localized nature of these activities, ESA-listed fishes are unlikely to be exposed multiple times within a short period. In addition, physiological and behavioral reactions would be expected to be brief (seconds to minutes) and infrequent based on the low probability of co-occurrence</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the state, local and federal investments in that work with ordinance training. I understand that Mr. John Moser has been consulted and states that while there is an allowable maximum of 2.5 lbs (except in wartime when the use is 20 lbs) and that here will be monitoring of salmon migrations, marine mammals and other efforts, whether the monitoring was visual or sonar and whether operations would be suspended with the presence of these vital species was not specified. Even at the proposed ordinance use at only 1.5 lbs, it is still likely to have a biological impact.</p> <p>2. It is a strong concern with the importance and threats to these species that operations could be moved outside of the Puget Sound where mitigation and areas of operation can be more sufficient. I offer the attached research to support my concern that this is not the appropriate location for training.</p> <p>file:///C:/Users/J.StClair/AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/INetCache/Content.Outlook/EJGYH8RE/AANPMF08167@co.island.wa.us_20190529_140205.pdf</p>	<p>between training activities and these species. Although individuals may be impacted, long term consequences for populations would not be expected."</p>
St. Clair-2	<p>So this was really a wonderful opportunity to look at the offshore work and the broader impact. I'm just going to give feedback on the issues of concern.</p> <p>One is the difference between noise modeling and noise monitoring. I appreciate the research that's gone into noise modeling, but I think we need to really be doing noise monitoring across Puget Sound, whether it's underwater noise monitoring with the sonar -- although I feel a little more comfortable with the work that's been done there -- or the flight monitoring and the impact of the Growlers as they do their work. With the noise modeling that they're doing where they take an average I think that's giving you a false mean because -- or a false average because you're taking data and you're averaging it across 24 hours. You're averaging it across signif -- instead of saying in the hours in which the activity is occurring here is the impact of noise. So we really need to get better, stronger data on what the actual noise impact is during the operation and not separate from the operation. And so that's one of our concerns.</p> <p>The other -- I have to say that I was pleased to see a lot of the mitigation efforts, especially around the wildlife and our efforts on our mitigation, especially with our whales, given the severity of the crisis we have, particularly around our southern resident Orcas. So I was pleased to see some of the mitigation. I was pleased to see that the work out at Marrowstone has stopped and they have changed that work and are not doing the same level of explosive, sonar, disruptive activities as in the past.</p>	<p>Acoustic modeling of in-water sound sources provides the best estimate of expected marine mammal or sea turtle exposures to sound. For more information on that acoustic model, please see the "Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing" technical report, which can be found on the project website at: https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents. Much research, based on actual monitoring of various impulsive and non-impulsive sound sources were used in determining criteria and thresholds, two critical parameters used in the acoustic model. For more information on the development and use of those criteria and thresholds, please see the "Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III) (June 2017)" technical report, found in the same location.</p> <p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>I'm hopeful that will be a positive impact, but it did lead to an interesting conversation about explosive ordnance. So underwater explosives, the disposal work they do, the testing. And there's an area off Crescent Harbor where they've been doing this historically for decades, for years.</p> <p>That is an area in which Island County is going to be investing in habitat restoration, so would love to have a conversation with the Navy about what that means as we partner with the Navy, which we are on that Crescent Harbor, it's their land, and the -- the habitat and the salmon restoration there, how do we then assess and know what the impact will be as we hopefully see a return of our forage fish, our salmonids, and then our adult migrating salmon into that area, if they're doing AODs. What does that mean? So I'd be interested to continue to have that conversation. Now, that's inland waterways and not the offshore stuff that they were doing, but that's of interest to me.</p> <p>I think that's it for now. Yeah, I think that's fine.</p>	<p>conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
St. John-1	<p>Gray whales are dying off the West Coast at an unprecedented rate. NOAA calls this a "wildlife emergency". The causes are as yet not fully understood, but may have to do with insufficient food supply, which itself may have to do with climate change. Other whales, including blue, humpback, dolphins, killer whales, and porpoises are also at risk.</p> <p>Other sea creatures are also in decline and at risk: cetaceans, pinnipeds, sharks, starfish, invertebrates, pelagic and migrating birds, bull kelp, among others. The interactions are not all well understood, but it is clear that the ocean and its creatures are threatened.</p> <p>Meanwhile, the navy is proposing to conduct war games and weapons testing off our coast that will surely exacerbate these risks and conditions. The use of sonar and seismic blasting is particularly dangerous. Both can damage marine mammals' ear-drums. Both make navigation and communication difficult or impossible for marine mammals. Beaching events have been associated with the use of underwater sonar and blasting.</p> <p>How will the Navy guarantee that marine mammals will not be harmed by these activities?</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
St. John-2	<p>The navy proposes to explode munitions in and on the ocean, leaving behind thousands of tons of toxic residue, introducing heavy metals and toxic compounds into the ocean. There has been talk of "cleanup efforts", but how, realistically, can any of that be cleaned up or mitigated? The truth, surely, is that these substances will be left behind, permanently polluting the oceans and endangering the creatures that live there.</p> <p>How will the Navy prevent the pollution of the marine environment from its testing activities?</p> <p>The navy says that its sonar and explosive testing will be 12 miles off-shore, but that is no help considering that sound travels in water far more efficiently than in air. Sonar can be 140 decibels 300 miles from its source. Marine mammals depend on their hearing for navigation, feeding, and reproduction.</p> <p>How will the Navy prevent the severe damage to marine mammals' hearing that sonar blasting can cause?</p>	<p>Please see Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for the analysis of impacts to water quality from the Navy's proposed activities.</p>
St. John-3	<p>The climate is undeniably in crisis. Environmental catastrophe is unfolding before our eyes. The world may not support human or animal life in the foreseeable future. Meanwhile, the Navy is proposing to conduct war games and weapons testing that can only exacerbate the climate crisis. What is the Navy doing to better understand the impact of its testing and training on the environment and in particular on global warming?</p>	<p>The Navy considered the current environment, which includes impacts of climate change, in which its activities will be conducted.</p>
Staley-1	<p>It is imperative that the Navy ceases any and all sonar practices, which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. □ A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas. □</p> <p>I have written about the importance of a quiet ocean to the wellbeing of the orca population in the southern area of Vancouver Island and sonar is profoundly disturbing to their echolocation abilities, which is used to find food, mates and communicate with other whales. You are jeopardizing their current wellbeing and possibly pushing this charismatic group closer to extinction.</p> <p>Studies also show that □ harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations. □</p> <p>Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times. □</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	It is morally and ethically imperative that all sonar practice is stopped immediately and permanently.	
Stanley-1	The USN is a very Dirty Bird. Clean up your act!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Stansbury-1	<p>I've lived in the county for 49 years. Okay. My name is Melissa Stansbury. And I heard about the sonar thing hurting marine mammals for -- I don't know -- 20 years or longer. And the few times I hear about it, I put my voice in. There's very little I can do. I just want to put my two cents in for the wildlife and not just mammals but all life in the oceans. We must protect the oceans. The oceans are in peril from plastic garbage already. And I think the sonar thing is, like, one of the worst, nightmarish experiences for any life form to have to experience. I heard that the Navy has alternatives to sonar. I have yet to learn what they are. But I'm happy to hear that and to hear that they have scientists and biologists. And they're willing to find a middle ground and make it safer for the marine wildlife. That's the only reason I'm here is for the wildlife. Thank you.</p> <p>And my boyfriend is a fisherman. And he says that he's concerned about the explosions out in the ocean for the fish. So from a fisherman's perspective. Thank you. Or woman, of course.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Stanton-1	Please do not do any testing close to the gray whale migration or near other marine animals. I live where our economy is dependent on tourists coming to see the whales and appreciate our sea creatures. Plus it is horrible to needlessly disturb these natural wonders. I am adamantly opposed to this testing.	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Stark-1	Cruel and disgraceful.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Stats-1	Please stop killing orcas	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Stearns-1	<p>I strongly urge that this permit for the navy to conduct sonar testing in the North Pacific be denied due to damage and mortality to cetaceans and other marine wildlife.</p> <p>I contest the Navy's assertion that sonar testing does not affect whales. Damage and death to Beaked Whales around the Canary Islands has been conclusively shown to be caused by sonar testing.</p> <p>I urge you to find ways to make sonar tests without damaging wildlife. Our oceans and the life in them are very precious resources essential to our well being.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Steele-1	<p>I consider any further impact on already-stressed marine animals in the Salish Sea to be completely unacceptable. It must stop!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Steidl-1	We are at a critical point in climate change and ecosystem/biodiversity collapse and we cannot afford to release ANY more toxic compounds or additional harmful acoustics into our environment! Making smart long-term decisions for the sake of a livable planet is the most important thing we can do right now. Please do not to release ANY heavy metals, depleted uranium, toxic chemicals, or harmful acoustics into the Puget Sound (or any oceans) or its surrounding environment.	<p>Please see Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for the analysis of impacts to water quality from the Navy's proposed activities.</p> <p>Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.</p>
Steinberger-1	<p>I am very much opposed to adding 36 more Growler aircraft to NAS Whidbey. I wholeheartedly agree our naval aviators need the best possible training in order to do their jobs. However, NAS Whidbey and OLAF are the wrong venue.</p> <p>The Growler's F-18 airframe is one of the most accident-prone military airframes in existence. Between 1980 and 2014, the F- 18 sustained 39 accidents; 22 crashes of the EA-18G and F/A-18 E,F have occurred since 2000. The F-18 Super Hornet platform has a mishap rate well above the average of all military aircraft, including two serious mishaps involving EA-18G Growlers, since December of 2016. Do we want to run the risk of this very expensive aircraft making touch and go landings next to SR-20 on a 5400 foot runway which is 3500 shorter than recommended by the navy itself for touch and go landings?</p> <p>At the very least, initial takeoffs and landings could occur at Ault field, aviators could then fly to McChord for their touch and go practice - where there are multiple runways and air traffic controllers.</p> <p>The additional noise and air pollution negatively impacts our quality of life and ability to do our jobs. Many jobs are based on tourism: people won't spend their money here with increased jet noise. I personally have first hand experience with having to pause a customer call due to jet noise. Please rethink this policy for all concerned - navy personnel, residents, and tourists</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island or OLF Coupeville. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Steinstrasser-1	I am 100% AGAINST underwater sonar testing which has been proven to cause harm to marine animals!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Stenberg-01	Please see attached letter	See responses below.
Stenberg-02	<p>I have lived on the Coast of Mendocino County for almost 40 years. My deck is right above the Ocean on the South Coast of Mendocino. I have seen with my own eyes the dire state our Ocean is in from Climate Change and Pollution.</p> <p>Usually during this time of year, I see, daily, a least two pairs of Mother and calf gray whales swimming close to the coast. This year I haven't seen any. I have attending the Navy's public meetings and a read a lot of the draft SEIS. I don't believe the SEIS accurately states our Ocean's current state and the state of its inhabitants.</p> <p>The Ocean ecosystems are in collapse. Sea creatures are starving. Just in the last months there have been over 70 dead Grey Whales washed ashore on West Coast. How many dead whales are still out there or have been eaten by other creatures?</p> <p>(BTW Since I started this letter last week, news reports have stated that 7 more dead Gray Whales have been found on the West Coast.)</p> <p>Climate Change is fluid and getting worse all the time. It is affecting all ocean species.</p> <p>GRAY WHALES</p> <p>The SEIS cites a study done in 2008 and 2010 to claim that there are between 17,000 and 20,000 gray whales on the West Coast.</p> <p>Will the SEIS update information and impacts etc. on the current population of Gray whales? See attached SEIS gray whale references in the SEIS dated from 1984-2014</p> <p>Will the SEIS address the 70+(now 77) whale deaths on the West Coast so far this year, that represent only 10% of the actual loss and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbated this situation? How will the SEIS address the Wildlife Emergency just announced by NOAA?</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. As described in Section 5.2.1 (Procedural Mitigation Development), the Navy's analysis assumes that due to limitations such as those mentioned in the comment, Lookouts will not be 100% effective at detecting all individual marine mammals.</p> <p>The Navy used the most current, best available science from the National Marine Fisheries Service for marine mammal populations cited in the document. For the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, released in early 2018, the references cited for determining gray whale populations (as one example) were from 2017 and 2018.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>https://www.paradisepost.com/2019/05/31/feds-declare-emergency-as-gray-whale-deaths-reach-highest-level-in-nearly-20-years/ https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grey-whales-stranded-west-coast-1.5119056 A recent Study published in January 2019 documents the severe effect sonar has on whales. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533 Scientific studies have shown, without a doubt, that explosives and SONAR are detrimental to marine animals. For whales and dolphins, ‘listening’ is as important as ‘seeing’ is for humans, as they live in a world of water and sound. Noise pollution threatens whale and dolphin populations, interrupting their normal behavior, driving them away from areas important to their survival and at worst injuring or sometimes even causing the deaths of some whales and dolphins. 3.4-107 of the SEIS states that Gray whales in Baja abandoned an historical breeding ground due to an increase in noise and shipping activity. Until NOAA’s study of the die off on the Gray Whales is complete will disruption of the Ocean by Sonar and Explosive activity as outlined in the SEIS be halted? The SEIS at 3.4-135 acknowledges that Gray whale are slow moving and sometimes exhibit “snorkeling activity,” they surface quietly and exhale without of any visible blow. The Navy claims they have lookouts watching for whales before the use of sonar and explosives and are “very unlikely” to have their feeding and migration impacted by the Navy’s activities. How will the SEIS take into account this “snorkeling” and fog and rough seas that make it near impossible to spot whales? Noted scientist John Calambokidis, whose’ studies are quote through-out the SEIS state recently that, as we experience the effects of climate change on the ocean’s food supply, “that as the whales search farther afield for food, they’ve entered areas where they’re not normally seen so often, including San Francisco Bay and Puget Sound.” https://989theanswer.com/news/national/feds-to-investigate-spike-in-gray-whale-deaths-on-west-coast Will the SEIS take into account that the high gray whale mortality has something to do with their search for food and that they are often found in unlikely areas? As an example, just this week Bairied-Beaked whales have been spotted right off the Coast, something that rarely occurs.</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	https://www.sfgate.com/whales-sharks/article/bairds-beaked-whales-monterey-whale-watching-rare-13922815.php?fbclid=IwAR1YUsCsmXzCrOXsIX_5mG7n8l4FgURW10z9HfW67t_2xSi-iBAGDmIoSNo	
Stenberg-03	<p>Should the SEIS integrate the most current climate -related impacts?</p> <p>https://www.sfgate.com/whales-sharks/article/bairds-beaked-whales-monterey-whale-watching-rare-13922815.php?fbclid=IwAR1-4Y3Z0RLp75gZIJ8vDCFUaJQPIx4HjKJZ-caPjSUQG64mrXkfJaEjw</p> <p>The SEIS details the presence of gray whales in six of the NWT areas for short periods and claims that the gray whales have “low risk” of being impacted. How much risk is acceptable given NOAA’s Wildlife Emergency? The SEIS at 3.4.282 states that “military expended materials will sink to the ocean floor”. At 3.4.302 the SEIS states that “for the most part,” this material will be incidentally ingested by bottom feeders. Gray Whales are bottom feeders. Given the already stressed gray whale population should the SEIS take this into account?</p> <p>https://news.nationalgeographic.com/2016/03/160331-car-parts-plastics-dead-whales-germany-animals/</p> <p>https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/03/whale-dies-88-pounds-plastic-philippines/</p> <p>https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/04/dead-pregnant-whale-plastic-italy/</p>	The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Stenberg-04	<p>COMMON MURRES</p> <p>We here on the Coast are in the middle of a major die off of the Common Murres.</p> <p>https://www.advocate-news.com/2019/05/24/major-die-off-of-common-murres-underway-along-the-mendocino-coast/?fbclid=IwAR1jCzAbxz1OsGgCxiUWjmWiUqMVP5f7_uo6vlpJF7Dhvc4A7TSgnI9HVXk</p> <p>According to news reports, “Common murres, little seabirds have been washing up dead by the hundreds of thousands along the shores of Alaska all the way down to San Francisco for the last four years, the reason is thought to be a lack of fish along the west coast. Earlier in 2018, a sea surface sample was the warmest it has been since records began in 1916.”</p> <p>http://www.thebigwobble.org/2019/06/so-far-this-year-at-least-70-gray.html?fbclid=IwAR1S-SDbcPvH8v6U27dhbE41AFNtlwhHbtt0Pc64_HsLTIVGFmEVzZGB44w</p> <p>The SEIS at 3.6.15 states that the Common Murres were deterred from gillnets by acoustic transmitters. What effect will the solar and explosive</p>	The analysis of the potential impacts related to birds, including murres, can be found in Section 3.6 (Birds) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Impacts to kelp can be found in Section 3.8 (Marine Vegetation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Navy considers the current affected environment, which includes the affects of climate change. Climate change is addressed in the NWT Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Section 3.2.3.2 (Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change). Climate change, as a cumulative impact was analyzed in the 2015 NWT Final EIS/OEIS and referred to in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>activities Stressors outlined in the SEIS have on the Common Murres? Will the SEIS address the major die off of the Common Murres and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbated this situation?</p> <p>KELP</p> <p>Should the SEIS address the loss of the kelp forests and abalone and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS that will exacerbate this situation?</p> <p>I see with my own eyes that the Kelp forests are gone so are the abalone. https://www.cencoos.org/about/news/2016/warm-waters-impact-california-kelp-forests https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Fishing/Ocean/Regulations/Sport-Fishing</p> <p>NATIONAL SECURITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE</p> <p>The Pentagon issued its own finding in 2015 outlining the security effects of Climate Change and issued orders that, all combatant commands integrate climate-related impacts into their planning cycles, https://dod.defense.gov/News/Article/Article/612710/</p> <p>Even with this Administration's denial of Climate Change and its effects, the DOD issued a report in January 2019. It states "The effects of a changing climate are a national security issue with potential impacts to Department of Defense, missions, operational plans, and installations. " https://media.defense.gov/2019/Jan/29/2002084200/-1/-1/1/CLIMATE-CHANGE-REPORT-2019.PDF</p> <p>Will the SEIS address the how the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will contribute to the threat to our national security due to the activities listed in the SEIS that contribute to climate change and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbate this situation?</p> <p>As stated, Climate Change is fluid and getting worse all the time. The draft SEIS does not integrate current climate -related impacts.</p> <p>Will the SEIS update its underlying references that it uses to justify its proposed activities?</p> <p>Ocean heat waves are another problem exacerbated by explosives and SONAR. Will the SEIS address the Ocean heat waves and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbate this situation? https://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-019-0412-1</p>	
Stenberg-05	<p>TRIBAL CONCERNS</p> <p>The Navy is mandated to work meaningfully with Pacific Coast Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of</p>	<p>The Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.</p> <p>As stated in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the term "traditional resources" is used to encompass protected tribal resources.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities.	
Stenberg-06	Will the SEIS expand prohibited activities in the 50-mile mitigation area to include use of sonar, due to the overwhelming evidence that sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals?	Training and testing with active sonar is essential to national security. The Navy uses active sonar during military readiness activities only when it is essential to training missions or testing program requirements since active sonar has the potential to alert opposing forces to the operating platform's presence. Passive sonar and other available sensors are used in concert with active sonar to the maximum extent practicable. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict certain activities or types of sonar year-round within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, seasonally within the Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area and Stonewall and Heceta Bank Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, and year-round in the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to help the Navy avoid potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. Additional mitigation for active sonar (e.g., prohibiting sonar within 50 NM from shore) would be impractical to implement for the reasons described in the Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) and Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar).
Stenberg-07	Should the "best available science" referenced in the Draft SEIS be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge? Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy's NWTT.	The Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality. As stated in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the term "traditional resources" is used to encompass protected tribal resources.
Stenberg-08	Will the monitoring program outlined in the SEIS be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels? Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.	The Navy understands there may be limitations of the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act protecting cultural and spiritual resources. The Navy's monitoring program does address impacts beyond the potential for harm at the population level. The Navy uses cutting edge research to improve the science in a number of areas, including marine mammal densities, species occurrence, exposure and response, and habitat use. The Navy has consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service pursuant to the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the resulting mitigation measures achieve the least practicable adverse impact. The Navy is committed to continual good faith consultations in the

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		context of the government-to-government relationships, which endures beyond consultations limited to a specific law or project.
Stenberg-09	Will the SEIS expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing?	The Navy acknowledges the spiritual connections, as stated in Section 3.10.1 (Affected Environment) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, "Sociocultural elements, such as traditions, lifeways, religious practices, community values, and social institutions may be considered by some groups to be types of cultural resources, especially within tribal communities whose traditional interaction with the natural world is integral to their culture. However, the Navy has completed this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS within the framework of NEPA, providing impacts as determined using the best available science. As stated in Section 3.10.1, this supplement is organized "to consider cultural and historic elements of the human environment within and between the three following sections: Section 3.10 (Cultural Resources), Section 3.11 (American Indian and Alaska Native Traditional Resources), and Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). Combined, these sections seek to provide a full analysis of the potential impacts from the Proposed Action on sociocultural elements of American Indian/Alaska Native communities and American history." The Navy acknowledges that some of its activities may impact cultural or spiritual resources.
Stenberg-10	Why isn't the cumulative effect of ocean acidification considered in the SEIS? The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives by products in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.	The Navy discusses ocean acidification in the context of climate change in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) and 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and includes information from scientific studies conducted since 2015. The Navy acknowledged in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) that "metals tend to dissociate" in more acidic ocean conditions. The Navy added a reference back to these two sections in the sections analyzing the impacts of explosives (Section 3.1.4.1) and metals (Section 3.1.4.2). Note that corrosion can also act to insulate ordnance and other metal items from contact with seawater and sediments, slowing or even halting further corrosion and movement of metals into the adjacent sediments and water column. The effects of climate change on the ocean environment, particularly effects specific to a particular region like ocean waters in the Pacific Northwest, continue to be researched and to evolve and are not necessarily predictable. For example, as described in Section 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality), increases in ocean acidity are believed to reduce the availability of carbonate in the water column, which is needed by organisms to generate calcium carbonate structures. However, increases in sea surface temperature associated with climate change appear to stimulate calcification at an even greater rate, essentially overriding the inhibiting effects of lower

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		pH levels and leading to unexpected high abundance of coccolithophores (which build protective scales from calcium carbonate) in some ocean regions.
Stenberg-11	<p>TRIBAL CONCERNS</p> <p>The Navy is mandated to work meaningfully with Pacific Coast Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities.</p> <p>Will the SEIS expand prohibited activities in the 50-mile mitigation area to include use of sonar, due to the overwhelming evidence that sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals?</p> <p>Should the "best available science" referenced in the Draft SEIS be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge? Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy's NWTT.</p> <p>Will the monitoring program outlined in the SEIS be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels? Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.</p> <p>Will the SEIS expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing?</p> <p>Why isn't the cumulative effect of ocean acidification considered in the SEIS? The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives by products in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.</p>	<p>Please see responses to Stenberg-5 through Stenberg-10.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Stenberg-12	<p>COMMON MURRES</p> <p>We here on the Coast are in the middle of a major die off of the Common Murres.</p> <p>https://www.associate-news.com/2019/05/24/major-die-off-of-common-murres-underway-along-the-mendocino-coast/?fbclid=IwAR1jCzAbxz1OsGgCxiUWjmWiUqMVP5f7_uo6vlpJF7Dhvc4A7TSgnI9HVXk</p> <p>According to news reports, "Common murres, little seabirds have been washing up dead by the hundreds of thousands along the shores of Alaska all the way down to San Francisco for the last four years, the reason is thought to be a lack of fish along the west coast. Earlier in 2018, a sea surface sample was the warmest it has been since records began in 1916."</p> <p>http://www.thebigwobble.org/2019/06/so-far-this-year-at-least-70-gray.html?fbclid=IwAR1S-SDbcPvH8v6U27dHbE41AFNtlwhHbtt0Pc64_HsLTIVGFmEVzZGB44w</p> <p>The SEIS at 3.6.15 states that the Common Murres were deterred from gillnets by acoustic transmitters. What effect will the solar and explosive activities Stressors outlined in the SEIS have on the Common Murres? Will the SEIS address the major die off of the Common Murres and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbated this situation?</p> <p>KELP</p> <p>Should the SEIS address the loss of the kelp forests and abalone and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS that will exacerbate this situation?</p> <p>I see with my own eyes that the Kelp forests are gone so are the abalone.</p> <p>https://www.cencoos.org/about/news/2016/warm-waters-impact-california-kelp-forests</p> <p>https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Fishing/Ocean/Regulations/Sport-Fishing</p> <p>NATIONAL SECURITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE</p> <p>The Pentagon issued its own finding in 2015 outlining the security effects of Climate Change and issued orders that, all combatant commands integrate climate-related impacts into their planning cycles,</p> <p>https://dod.defense.gov/News/Article/Article/612710/</p> <p>Even with this Administration's denial of Climate Change and its effects, the DOD issued a report in January 2019. It states "The effects of a changing climate are a national security issue with potential impacts to Department of Defense, missions, operational plans, and installations. "</p> <p>https://media.defense.gov/2019/Jan/29/2002084200/-1/-1/1/CLIMATE-</p>	Please see response to Stenberg-4.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>CHANGE-REPORT-2019.PDF</p> <p>Will the SEIS address the how the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will contribute to the threat to our national security due to the activities listed in the SEIS that contribute to climate change and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbate this situation?</p> <p>As stated, Climate Change is fluid and getting worse all the time. The draft SEIS does not integrate current climate -related impacts.</p> <p>Will the SEIS update its underlying references that it uses to justify its proposed activities?</p> <p>Ocean heat waves are another problem exacerbated by explosives and SONAR. Will the SEIS address the Ocean heat waves and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbate this situation?</p> <p>https://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-019-0412-1</p>	
Stenberg-13	<p>Should the SEIS integrate the most current climate -related impacts?</p> <p>https://www.sfgate.com/whales-sharks/article/bairds-beaked-whales-monterey-whale-watching-rare-13922815.php?fbclid=IwAR1-4Y3Z0RLp75gZIJ8vDCFUaNjQPIXx4HjKjZ-caPjSUQG64mrXkfJaEjw</p> <p>The SEIS details the presence of gray whales in six of the NWTT areas for short periods and claims that the gray whales have “low risk” of being impacted. How much risk is acceptable given NOAA’s Wildlife Emergency?</p> <p>The SEIS at 3.4.282 states that “military expended materials will sink to the ocean floor”. At 3.4.302 the SEIS states that “for the most part,” this material will be incidentally ingested by bottom feeders. Gray Whales are bottom feeders. Given the already stressed gray whale population should the SEIS take this into account?</p> <p>https://news.nationalgeographic.com/2016/03/160331-car-parts-plastics-dead-whales-germany-animals/</p> <p>https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/03/whale-dies-88-pounds-plastic-philippines/</p> <p>https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/04/dead-pregnant-whale-plastic-italy/</p>	Please see response to Stenberg-3.
Stenberg-14	<p>GRAY WHALES</p> <p>The SEIS cites a study done in 2008 and 2010 to claim that there are between 17,000 and 20,000 gray whales on the West Coast.</p> <p>Will the SEIS update information and impacts etc. on the current population of Gray whales? See attached SEIS gray whale references in the SEIS dated from 1984-2014</p> <p>Will the SEIS address the 70+(now 77) whale deaths on the West Coast so far this year, that represent only 10% of the actual loss and take in to</p>	Please see response to Stenberg-2.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbated this situation? How will the SEIS address the Wildlife Emergency just announced by NOAA?</p> <p>https://www.paradisepost.com/2019/05/31/feds-declare-emergency-as-gray-whale-deaths-reach-highest-level-in-nearly-20-years/</p> <p>https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grey-whales-stranded-west-coast-1.5119056</p> <p>A recent Study published in January 2019 documents the severe effect sonar has on whales.</p> <p>https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533</p> <p>Scientific studies have shown, without a doubt, that explosives and SONAR are detrimental to marine animals. For whales and dolphins, 'listening' is as important as 'seeing' is for humans, as they live in a world of water and sound. Noise pollution threatens whale and dolphin populations, interrupting their normal behavior, driving them away from areas important to their survival and at worst injuring or sometimes even causing the deaths of some whales and dolphins.</p> <p>3.4-107 of the SEIS states that Gray whales in Baja abandoned an historical breeding ground due to an increase in noise and shipping activity.</p> <p>Until NOAA's study of the die off on the Gray Whales is complete will disruption of the Ocean by Sonar and Explosive activity as outlined in the SEIS be halted?</p> <p>The SEIS at 3,4-135 acknowledges that Gray whale are slow moving and sometimes exhibit "snorkeling activity," they surface quietly and exhale without of any visible blow.</p> <p>The Navy claims they have lookouts watching for whales before the use of sonar and explosives and are "very unlikely" to have their feeding and migration impacted by the Navy's activities.</p> <p>How will the SEIS take into account this "snorkeling" and fog and rough seas that make it near impossible to spot whales?</p> <p>Noted scientist John Calambokidis, whose' studies are quote through-out the SEIS state recently that, as we experience the effects of climate change on the ocean's food supply, "that as the whales search farther afield for food, they've entered areas where they're not normally seen so often, including San Francisco Bay and Puget Sound."</p> <p>https://989theanswer.com/news/national/feds-to-investigate-spike-in-gray-whale-deaths-on-west-coast</p> <p>Will the SEIS take into account that the high gray whale mortality has something to do with their search for food and that they are often found in</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>unlikely areas?</p> <p>As an example, just this week Bairied-Beaked whales have been spotted right off the Coast, something that rarely occurs.</p> <p>https://www.sfgate.com/whales-sharks/article/bairds-beaked-whales-monterey-whale-watching-rare-13922815.php?fbclid=IwAR1YUsCsmXzCrOXsIX_5mG7n8l4FgURW10z9HfW67t_2xSi-iBAGDmIoSNo</p>	
Stenberg-15	<p>I have lived on the Coast of Mendocino County for almost 40 years. My deck is right above the Ocean on the South Coast of Mendocino. I have seen with my own eyes the dire state our Ocean is in from Climate Change and Pollution.</p> <p>Usually during this time of year, I see, daily, a least two pairs of Mother and calf gray whales swimming close to the coast. This year I haven't seen any.</p> <p>I have attending the Navy's public meetings and a read a lot of the draft SEIS. I don't believe the SEIS accurately states our Ocean's current state and the state of its inhabitants.</p> <p>The Ocean ecosystems are in collapse. Sea creatures are starving. Just in the last months there have been over 70 dead Grey Whales washed ashore on West Coast. How many dead whales are still out there or have been eaten by other creatures?</p> <p>(BTW Since I started this letter last week, news reports have stated that 7 more dead Gray Whales have been found on the West Coast.)</p> <p>Climate Change is fluid and getting worse all the time. It is affecting all ocean species.</p> <p>GRAY WHALES</p> <p>The SEIS cites a study done in 2008 and 2010 to claim that there are between 17,000 and 20,000 gray whales on the West Coast.</p> <p>Will the SEIS update information and impacts etc. on the current population of Gray whales? See attached SEIS gray whale references in the SEIS dated from 1984-2014</p> <p>Will the SEIS address the 70+(now 77) whale deaths on the West Coast so far this year, that represent only 10% of the actual loss and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbated this situation? How will the SEIS address the Wildlife Emergency just announced by NOAA?</p> <p>https://www.paradisepost.com/2019/05/31/feds-declare-emergency-as-gray-whale-deaths-reach-highest-level-in-nearly-20-years/</p> <p>https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grey-whales-stranded-west-coast-1.5119056</p>	Please see response to Stenberg-2.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>A recent Study published in January 2019 documents the severe effect sonar has on whales. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533 Scientific studies have shown, without a doubt, that explosives and SONAR are detrimental to marine animals. For whales and dolphins, 'listening' is as important as 'seeing' is for humans, as they live in a world of water and sound. Noise pollution threatens whale and dolphin populations, interrupting their normal behavior, driving them away from areas important to their survival and at worst injuring or sometimes even causing the deaths of some whales and dolphins. 3.4-107 of the SEIS states that Gray whales in Baja abandoned an historical breeding ground due to an increase in noise and shipping activity. Until NOAA's study of the die off on the Gray Whales is complete will disruption of the Ocean by Sonar and Explosive activity as outlined in the SEIS be halted? The SEIS at 3.4-135 acknowledges that Gray whale are slow moving and sometimes exhibit "snorkeling activity," they surface quietly and exhale without of any visible blow. The Navy claims they have lookouts watching for whales before the use of sonar and explosives and are "very unlikely" to have their feeding and migration impacted by the Navy's activities. How will the SEIS take into account this "snorkeling" and fog and rough seas that make it near impossible to spot whales? Noted scientist John Calambokidis, whose' studies are quote through-out the SEIS state recently that, as we experience the effects of climate change on the ocean's food supply, "that as the whales search farther afield for food, they've entered areas where they're not normally seen so often, including San Francisco Bay and Puget Sound." https://989theanswer.com/news/national/feds-to-investigate-spike-in-gray-whale-deaths-on-west-coast Will the SEIS take into account that the high gray whale mortality has something to do with their search for food and that they are often found in unlikely areas? As an example, just this week Baird-Beaked whales have been spotted right off the Coast, something that rarely occurs. https://www.sfgate.com/whales-sharks/article/bairds-beaked-whales-monterey-whale-watching-rare-13922815.php?fbclid=IwAR1YUsCsmXzCrOXsIX_5mG7n8l4FgURW10z9HfW67t_2xSi-iBAGDmIoSNo</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Should the SEIS integrate the most current climate -related impacts? https://www.sfgate.com/whales-sharks/article/bairds-beaked-whales-montereywhale-watching-rare-13922815.php?fbclid=IwAR1-4Y3ZORLp7SgZIJ8vDCFUaUjQPIx4HjKjZ-caPjSUQG64mrXkfJaEjw The SEIS details the presence of gray whales in six of the NWT areas for short periods and claims that the gray whales have "low risk" of being impacted. How much risk is acceptable given NOAA's Wildlife Emergency? The SEIS at 3.4.282 states that "military expended materials will sink to the ocean floor". At 3.4.302 the SEIS states that "for the most part," this material will be incidentally ingested by bottom feeders. Gray Whales are bottom feeders. Given the already stressed gray whale population should the SEIS take this into account? https://news.nationalgeographic.com/2016/03/160331-car-parts-plastics-deadwhales-germany-animals/ https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/03/whale-dies-88-pounds-plastic-philippines/ https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/04/dead-pregnantwhale-plastic-italy/ COMMON MURRES We here on the Coast are in the middle of a major die off of the Common Murres. https://www.advocate-news.com/2019/05/24/major-die-off-of-common-murresunderway-a-long-the-mendocinocoast/?fbclid=IwARljCzAbxz10sGgCxiUWjmWiUqMVPSf7uo6vlpjF7Dhvc4A7TSgnl9HVXk According to news reports, "Common murres, little seabirds have been washing up dead by the hundreds of thousands along the shores of Alaska all the way down to San Francisco for the last four years, the reason is thought to be a lack of fish along the west coast. Earlier in 2018, a sea surface sample was the warmest it has been since records began in 1916." http://www.thebigwobble.org/2019/06/so-far-this-year-at-least-70-gray.html?fbclid=IwARlSSDbcPvH8v6U27dhbE41AFNtlwhHbttOPc64HsLTIVGFmEVzZGB44w The SEIS at 3.6.15 states that the Common Murres were deterred from gillnets by acoustic transmitters. What effect will the solar and explosive activities Stressors outlined in the SEIS have on the Common Murres? Will the SEIS address the major die off of the Common Murres and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbated this situation? KELP</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Should the SEIS address the loss of the kelp forests and abalone and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS that will exacerbate this situation?</p> <p>I see with my own eyes that the Kelp forests are gone so are the abalone. https://www.cencoos.org/about/news/2016/warm-waters-impact-californiakelp-forests https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Fishing/Ocean/Regulations/Sport-Fishing NATIONAL SECURITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE The Pentagon issued its own finding in 2015 outlining the security effects of Climate Change and issued orders that, all combatant commands integrate climate-related impacts into their planning cycles, https://dod.defense.gov/News/Article/Article/612710/ Even with this Administration's denial of Climate Change and its effects, the DOD issued a report in January 2019. It states "The effects of a changing climate are a national security issue with potential impacts to Department of Defense, missions, operational plans, and installations." https://media.defense.gov/2019/Jan/29/2002084200/-1/-1/1/CLIMATE-CHANGEREPORT-2019.PDF Will the SEIS address the how the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will contribute to the threat to our national security due to the activities listed in the SEIS that contribute to climate change and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbate this situation? As stated, Climate Change is fluid and getting worse all the time. The draft SEIS does not integrate current climate -related impacts. Will the SEIS update its underlying references that it uses to justify its proposed activities? Ocean heat waves are another problem exacerbated by explosives and SONAR. Will the SEIS address the Ocean heat waves and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbate this situation? https://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-019-0412-1 TRIBAL CONCERNS The Navy is mandated to work meaningfully with Pacific Coast Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities. Will the SEIS expand prohibited activities in the 50-mile mitigation area to include use of sonar, due to the overwhelming evidence that sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals?</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Should the "best available science" referenced in the Draft SEIS be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge? Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy's NWTT.</p> <p>Will the monitoring program outlined in the SEIS be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels? Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species.</p> <p>Will the SEIS expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing?</p> <p>Why isn't the cumulative effect of ocean acidification considered in the SEIS? The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives by products in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.</p>	
Stephens-1	Please do not do the under water sonar testing. We are in a climate crisis and have endangered our oceans enough. Do not endanger it more.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Stermer-1	Please don't do it	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Stevick-1	Orcas deserve our protection. We aren't fighting in a war and there is no need for sonar that hurts the marine life in the Salish Sea, or any body of water. There won't be a public to protect if climate change destroys the earth and most of its inhabitants. The US navy should help protect these endangered animals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Stewart-1	The testing that the Navy is engaging in is completely unacceptable. As a United States citizen I would like to enter my objection and complete outrage at the tests that are taking place and am demanding that this stops. Our sea life depends on their hearing for navigation, hunting and their livelihood. This testing is an act of violence and should be considered a weapon of mass destruction. This type of misuse of power is unacceptable. I beg you as a US citizen to cease and desist these tests. Please think of our future on this planet, and stop this outrageous practice immediately.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Stiles-1	Please immediately cease and desist from traumatizing marine life. It is not acceptable to disturb the peace of precious aquatic animals. You're testing is intrusive and cruel. You must urgently find another way to enagage yourself in this capacity. Please understand and reevaluate your mindset, purpose and values when you cause harm to our precious ecosystem.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Stillman-1	Dear Madam or Sir: I have reviewed the U.S. Navy's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for training and research, development, testing, and evaluation activities conducted within the Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT) study area. Simply put, it's a disaster. The Navy cannot go forward with its proposed activities in Washington state and elsewhere on the basis of this deeply flawed DSEIS. Those activities include use of aircraft (including Growlers), explosive practice munitions and ordnance, high-explosive underwater detonations,	The noise model used, MR_Nmap uses state of the art science and is the appropriate method to evaluate aircraft noise in special use airspace such as the Olympic MOA. This model is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses. The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). The potential impacts to the economy are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>electromagnetic devices, high-energy lasers, high- and very high-frequency active sonar, weapons systems, underwater vehicles, and others.</p> <p>The failure of the DSEIS must result in a rejection of the Navy's plans to turn the beautiful and pristine areas of the Salish Sea into a war zone that will do irreparable harm to numerous marine mammals, including the Orca whales that are already at great risk due to other environmental challenges. The Navy, if unfettered by adherence to environmental requirements, would expand dramatically the air combat maneuvers, submarine tracking and detection exercises, electronic warfare practice, mine training, torpedo testing, and other activities.</p> <p>As you should know, many marine animals locate food, navigate, and avoid predators by relying on sound to communicate. The range of activities proposed by the Navy would result in intense, repeated exposure to sonar that will harm the ability of whales and other marine life to hear sounds needed for their survival.</p> <p>The Navy plan is a death sentence for Orca whales. And for many other marine mammals, such as porpoises.</p> <p>Noise from the proposed huge expansion of Navy warfare activities in the Northwest also will harm humans. Let me describe that and some of the other most obvious problems:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The frequency, duration, and intensity of Growler flights are threats to public health because of the deafening and toxic noise they produce. 2. Aircraft noise levels included in the Navy's DEIS are wrong. They are generated by an outdated and flawed computer model. 3. Children exposed to loud noise show impaired cognition, delayed development, decreased reading comprehension, and memory loss. Growler noise from Coupeville to the San Juan Islands show damaging levels of up to 115 decibels. 4. Growler engines emit low-frequency pressure waves that penetrate body organs and can cause medical problems. 5. The Growler's F-18 airframe is one of the most accident-prone in existence. There have been 22 crashes of the EA-18G and F/A-18 E,F that have occurred since 2000. Increased Growler flights further endanger schools, hospitals, homes, parks/playgrounds, and businesses/residences located in the potential Growler crash zones. 6. Many of the areas affected by the Navy's proposed warfare activities are those that depend on tourism—particularly the San Juan Islands and the Olympic Peninsula. If the Navy is allowed to turn these areas into a giant military staging ground, the tourism industry will be crippled. 	<p>Resources). Regarding aircraft mishaps, non-anticipated accidents or emergencies are not included in the NEPA analysis.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>7. Outdoor recreation in my area of Washington state helps to create 199,000 jobs and is valued at \$21.6 billion—far, far more than the contribution of the military to our economy. Jobs in Washington depend on its pristine skies, land, and waters.</p> <p>8. Farmers will be harmed by the Navy's proposals. Growlers fly at low altitudes during landing practices and their toxic particulates fill our air, fall into waters, and drift down to our soils. Healthy food cannot grow on acreage exposed to constant pollution from above, which is why California—with strict clean air regulations—prohibits such maneuvers.</p> <p>9. The average annual commercial value for Puget Sound crab, shrimp, mussel, oyster, geoduck, and clams is \$44 million. Recreational shell fishing is valued at \$42 million per year. Recreational fishing in Puget Sound at \$57 million. Additional noise and pollution from more military jets pose a threat to these sectors so crucial to Washington state.</p> <p>10. The Salish Sea is bordered by 8 national parks and 68 state parks and monuments, wildlife refuges, forests, and public lands. These assets help drive about \$9.5 billion in travel spending, including support for 88,000 tourist-related jobs that bring \$3 billion to the region.</p> <p>11. The proposed increase in Growler flights will add about 60,000 metric tons of additional carbon dioxide—further worsening climate change. The increased Growler flights will speed ocean acidification and harm coral reefs, shellfish, and marine ecosystems.</p> <p>Finally, because I am not a scientist, I wish to endorse the comments made by the experts at the Marine Mammal Commission and its Committee of Scientific Advisors on Marine Mammals which were submitted to you on April 15, 2019 by Dr. Peter O. Thomas.</p>	
Stockel-1	I truly believe the Navy should be allowed to go forward with their training. They are a vital part of our country's defense system. To stop them because it might damage the hearing of a few ocean animals, if they are even around, really does not make any sense to me. Are there reports of this taking place in other regions where they have conducted tests? I have not heard of any.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Stokor-1	This has got to stop now	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Stoll-1	<p>Sound is one of the most, if not the most, invasive and intense of underwater physical perturbations. Sound travels far faster, further and in higher intensities in water than in air. Sound is especially intense in the lower frequencies. In underwater environments there is very little sound.....other than anthropogenic.</p> <p>A number of marine species depend on sound in a number of ways. In some marine species certain sounds creates a predator avoidance response. In others sound is generated to locate prey. This later is the case in various orca populations are native to the waters where sonar testing is proposed. This also where salmonid populations Orca prey on, specifically chinook salmon, are becoming increasingly limited. This is of very high concern amongst regulatory and natural resource agencies, and user groups especially including commercial fishers, tribes, and anglers. Per the Navy's own studies (eg: during the Everett pier construction) salmonids were shown to have strong sound avoidance behaviors.</p> <p>While the Navy purports to be the experts in the field of effects of sound on some marine species, the fact is that overall very little is known about the scope and breadth of underwater sound effects on underwater ecosystems and the species that inhabit them.</p> <p>Especially considering the delicate state of some Orca populations, including southern residents, the Navy should avoid all underwater sonar testing in areas where these animals occur. The Navy should also consider eliminating in-situ sonar testing and rely on models to replicate the same. Natural resource decisions should be made on What we do not know, rather than what some individuals or agencies think they know.</p> <p>But I am aware this is not likely to happen. I am also aware that the Navy appears to to me to use the NEPA/SEPA process to justify decisions already made. In this case, the Navy is going to do underwater sonar testing in the designated nearshore marine areas where the number of species potentially affected by sound occur, regardless. The EIS process is a very expensive way to check a regulatory box.</p> <p>And how much did this particular EIS/OEIS process cost?</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Stone D-1	<p>I believe that all the training exercises should be conducted with consideration given to marine animals, local habitats, human communities, and local wildlife. In other words, whales should not suffer in these exercises. All exercises that impact the economy of local communities should be re-located.</p> <p>I am not a scientist so cannot include supporting details and studies. However, I am a U.S. citizen whose life quality and economy will be</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	impacted by these activities. Surely, the lives of local citizens are important to the Navy. If not, they should be. And I consider these comments substantive.	With this in mind, wildlife-dependent recreational activities, such as wildlife viewing, or whale watching, are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.
Stone S-1	Virtually everyday since moving to my land 28 yrs ago the noise of planes has been a very unpleasant fact of life. It is now with the Growlers so awful I'm no longer able to do many of life's pleasures or use my property as I envisioned. No gardening no BBQs w/ family little sleep regardless of ear protection. The constant ringing in my ears. The intense compression I feel on my chest if caught outside during a flyover. The fear of my water and air's integrity and my health. You don't protect me as a taxpayer you assault me and my family and devalue my investment in my land. My state's beautiful natural beauty is diminished from the enemy I am required to support. Sad and angry	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com
Stone S-2	I suppose I could labor all the reasons why destroying one of the truly unique places on the planet is wrong but of course your answer is we aren't changing it that much. The govt will scrow all the studies and reasons why I should welcome this change. But I have been here before through a vast array of studies and promises. Now I deal with contaminated water air and ground and deafening sound.. So I simply will say NO NO NO. Don't save me from a unknown enemy I'm full up, you the Navy and govt have become the true enemy of all I hold dear and love...NO NO NO	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Stover-1	Please create a 100 mile wide corridor that is test free along the Pacific coast's grey whale migration route. We can't afford to endanger these animals that produce such awe in on lookers and are a substantive part of our coastal economy. Thank you.	The Navy's mitigation involves numerous distance-from-shore restrictions for active sonar, explosive, and non-explosive training and testing activities. For example, the Navy will not conduct explosive training or explosive testing (except explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing) 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. For the Final

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures, including development a new mitigation area known as the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. It would not be practical for the Navy to prohibit all training or testing activities within 100 miles from shore for the reasons described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), Chapter 5 (Mitigation), and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Stover-2	<p>I find the assessment regarding marine mammals in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS that, "long term consequences for the species or stocks could not be expected" highly questionable. "Scientists have linked military sonar and live-fire activities to mass whale beaching, exploded eardrums and even death." -Center for Biological Diversity 2018. These findings are also reported in Scientific American and corroborated by many respected scientists.</p> <p>NOAA has recently declared elevated gray whale deaths along the west coast of North America in 2019 an "Unusual Mortality Event" (UME) requiring more research. This call for research is new, and has not yet been completed or incorporated into the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>How will the Navy guarantee that "long term consequences for the species or stocks" of gray whales "could not be expected" in any of the Alternatives, given the recent gray whale UME and the need for more research?</p> <p>How will the Navy guarantee that the stocks of other marine mammals including those on the protected list, will not be significantly reduced when the gray whales are already showing signs of distress?</p> <p>The Mendocino Coast has an economy that depends on tourism. Much of our attraction is due to the 20,000 whales migrating off shore, leading to whale festivals, whale watching tours and related services. Naval testing anywhere along the migration route from Mexico to Alaska, could effect the migration, and harm other marine species we rely on.</p> <p>How will the Navy guarantee that there will not be a loss of much needed revenue in this rural community, due to a disruption in the fragile ecosystem of our coastal waters and the possible diminishment of migrating ocean mammals due to sonar or live-fire testing?</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities. The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Wildlife-dependent recreational activities, such as wildlife viewing, or whale watching, are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p>
Strasserfoc-1	Focus on useful topics instead of hurting animals again and again. Your initiative leads only to disorientation.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Stringer-1	While training is important, it should not impact wildlife or people trying to enjoy life. This is especially true when a species is at risk and now with trump that people need a respite from his lying, saying random sex is okay, having sex traffickers as friends, and defying congress, as well as having putin and kimmy as besties! I consider john McCain a hero, not atraitor,or weakling who got caught, he wasn't stealing halloween candy! Omg How about flying farther out to sea, or conducting practice in the red states, they do not seem-to care about noise or the enviroment, or anomals in enviroment. And they just love guns and explosions. My dad was a navy man, he always said guns belong on ships, some of those states have lakes and planes can fly farther now! Somove east is my conclusion!	The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Stroble-1	When these planes fly low overhead to practice touch-downs, the noise is unbelievable and must be experienced to truly appreciate. It is far more than citizens should be expected to endure. It makes your chest clench, your ears ring, and your whole body vibrate. These body responses actually last well beyond the time of exposure. Furthermore, the intrusion seems to go for endless lengths of time and often late into the nite. Unless the noise factor can be overcome thru advanced technology, these "touch and go" exercises must be ended, or practiced at the Oak Harbor base itself where people seem to accept the punishment.	The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island or OLF Coupeville. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com
Strong-1	Please stop this invasive and extremely harmful testing which causes hearing lots and damage to the echo location ability of these beautiful cetaceans.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Strong-Petersen-1	The Navy should NOT perform any sonar testing anywhere in the Salish Sea. Our Orcas are deafened by this activity and subsequently cannot find food. They are now protected, and should be from these types of activities too. Please consider terminating this practice immediately.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Stuart C-1	This letter is being written to tell you that I hope you will not continue to do testing in our oceans. I say this because of the life that is being lost due to the testing. It's their home they have no other place to go. As it is, we have taken so much of their world away from them already. And we need the oceans and the life that it supports. If we kill off all the fish and mammals... it's all over. The testing is bad for living things. Show some compassion to living things and stop torturing them. Enough of the testing already.... please stop it.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Stuart P-1	Save the sea lives of the Orcas and other sea life.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Stubblefield-1	This proposal is barbaric and thoughtless. This is predetermined terrorism on some of the most intelligent creatures on this planet. Not enough thought or research has been conducted to know the long term effects on these creatures as well as the unintentional effects on us humans because of this testing. I urge you to push back the decision and give more time to hear scientists out and try to understand why this is such a wreck less decision being hastily made.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Sturm-1	Stop that!!! Please....!!!!!! We need the seas and the Individuums in there....	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Styles-1	<p>I believe the proposed Northwest Training and Testing program will have a disastrous impact on marine mammals, due to the severe and excessive sound levels involved. At a time when orcas and other northwestern marine mammals are critically endangered, the acoustic trauma presented by this proposal is unconscionable.</p> <p>The EIS states that hundreds of endangered humpback whales can be expected to experience temporary hearing loss, as well as 100,000 porpoises. This is simply unacceptable. I understand the importance of training, but we have to find a better way. We cannot protect ourselves by destroying the world around us.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Su-1	<p>hi, I just saw the video regarding the sonars testing, it's really hard to watch and my heart is broken. It's not a simple weapon test but a way of killing the whales. Would u pls put the shoots into those lovely beings, what if u r them! Would u pls have more compassion as a good and kind heart human being? Pls stop those testing I, it is do nothing good but hurting, not just those marines beings, actually you are hurting yourself. They r part of you, they r the reflection of your inside. Think about it, use your heart to feel.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Subjeck-1	You are Crazy to think to release these contaminants in our waters, or any! This is a terrible idea and is destructive and irresponsible to the wildlife and the environment. I oppose this!What are you thinking???	<p>Please see Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for the analysis of impacts to water quality from the Navy's proposed activities.</p> <p>Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.</p>
Sugo-1	<p>Please STOP all sonar testing - most urgently those in the Pacific Northwest, affecting the critically endangered southern resident orca. Sonar testing has been proven to be harmful to whales, dolphins, and other marine mammals.</p> <p>There is video evidence circulating on social media of the southern residents swimming away from Navy sonar. In their already fragile state, this additional threat makes survival even more difficult for them.</p> <p>A 2016 study published in the Canadian Journal of Zoology estimated that 11,233 harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters, not including the critically endangered 76 Southern Resident Orcas. Researcher John Calombokidis said, "For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival." Over 7 years, harbor porpoises in inland Washington waters would likely experience temporary hearing loss at some frequencies at least 95,943 times from sonar, according to the Navy's calculations. Sonar would cause the porpoises permanent hearing loss at 1,033 times and a "behavioral reaction" (anything from a distraction to prolonged fleeing from sound) at 101,377 times. Please halt sonar testing!</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Sullivan E-1	Any further impact on already-stressed marine animals in the Salish Sea is completely unacceptable. It must stop. Our future is in your hands.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Sullivan N-1	I am vehemently opposed to this proposed action! Increased sonar activity is bad enough, but blasting!!! We've already threatened too many species with intrusive and destructive technology. Today's news reported a dolphin species with 20 individuals left! 20! They are expected to be extinct by July! Go back to the books!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Sullivan R-1	I recently received a letter from Senator Patti Murray in relation to the noise pollution of the Growlers in which she suggested that the Navy and the community compromise on this issue. However, I have seen nothing from the Navy that would suggest even the hint of compromise. They have exponentially increased their flights, are flying at five a.m. and nine p.m. and on Saturdays and Sundays. I cannot walk on Cappy's Trails for more than fifteen minutes without having my ear canals negatively affected by the sonic booms of the Growlers. This is a recreation area and a tourist town, not an annex of a testing zone for Navy pilots. Please have the Growlers fly east into the empty regions of Eastern Washington or move them to a Pacific atoll where they belong. By the way, this has absolutely nothing to do with respect for the military: my father, grandfather and great grandfather served in the military; it has to with respect for civilians. Right now I feel as if I'm the subject of a bizarre form of aural punishment. Desist!	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces, have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977.</p> <p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Far more training events than involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Summer-Reiger-1	The Navy seems to be intent on destroying the peace in and around the Salish Sea. While I am a patriotic citizen and support our military, this menacing and oblivious flight traffic and accompanying noise seems to be flying in the face of protecting both the land and communities of this vast area. The impacts are only expanding. If the public were experiencing this in any kind of commercial context, there would be mitigating measures, at the least. If our country is going to war, please let us know. It certainly feels like we are under threat.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Suratt-1	I oppose Navy testing along our coast as it is harmful to sea life, especially whales and other sea creatures that rely on sonar for communication. It is dangerous to all sea life and can cause disorientation and death. Noise pollution at its worst. Scientists say there is still much to be learned about how much sonar activity affects marine animals. Studies have shown some species such as grey whales can be adversely affected.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Susan-1	THE DELETERIOUS AND LETHAL EFFECTS OF SONAR ON MARINE MAMMALS ARE WELL DOCUMENTED. THE NAVY MUST NOT TEST SONAR AND WEAPONS ALONG THE PACIFIC COAST'S WHALE MIGRATORY PATH. THE NAVY MUST LEAVE A 100-MILE WIDE TEST-FREE CORRIDOR ALONG THE ENTIRE PACIFIC COAST NOT ONLY FOR GRAY WHALE BUT ALSO FOR HUMPBACK AND BLUE WHALE MIGRATION THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE YEAR.	The Navy's mitigation involves numerous distance-from-shore restrictions for active sonar, explosive, and non-explosive training and testing activities. For example, the Navy will not conduct explosive training or explosive testing (except explosive Mine Countermeasure and Neutralization Testing) 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area. For the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy developed several new mitigation measures, including development a new mitigation area known as the Juan de Fuca Eddy Marine Species Mitigation Area. It would not be practical for the Navy to prohibit all training or testing activities within 100 miles from shore for the reasons described in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives), Chapter 5 (Mitigation), and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS.
Swank-1	The damage done by such testing would be profound and immeasurable. Please put an end to these practices that damage living things in numbers too vast to count.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Sweeney-1	Sir: I have lived here on Whidbey Island for over 30 years. During that time I have felt the Navy and the citizens of the Whidbey had a good relationship. Unfortunately the noise now has become a dividing line between a once good relationship. A few adjustments on both sides need to be made. Plane practice over the desert- citizens accepting some noise could help greatly. Please work with the citizens of Whidbey Island not against us-We All Love The USA. Frances Sweeney	The activities proposed in the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com
Sweigart-1	I am 100% against the underwater sonar testing that very obviously will cause harm to many sea animals. It is cruel. Please reconsider this testing.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Swift-1	Our oceans and it's inhabitants are suffering due to humans. The testing that is being done is not only distressing and harmful to these innocent beings but it is also cruel and unnecessary. Their senses are much higher than ours. The pain they must feel when sonar testing is done must unimaginable at best even for the majority that can even feel empathy. I like many activist and conservationists implore you to stop this and to take into consideration the harm you are causing.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Syltebo-1	Our whales are dying! We need to stop all this testing to stop. Many marine animals rely on sound to communicate, locate food, avoid predators and navigate. Exposure to sound could change their behavior, said John Calambokidis, a research biologist and founder of Cascadia Research Collective.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Intense or repeated exposure to certain frequencies of sonar could also affect animals' ability to hear sounds in those ranges.	Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Sylvester-1	If you know how harmful this testing is how can you continue! The ocean needs help with preservation not more destruction! These cessation whale dolphins all creatures of the sea don't need you causing more peril! Please stop this sonar blasting! It is plane arrogance	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Szurek-1	I AM COMPLETELY AGAINST THE SONAR TESTING BEING DONE IN THE SALISH SEA THAT IS DIRECTLY IMPACTING THE WILDLIFE IN THE SURROUNDING AREAS, ESPECIALLY THE SOUTHERN RESIDENT ORCAS. THE SONAR TESTING IS EXTREMELY CRUEL AND INCONSIDERATE TREATMENT TO THE WILDLIFE. THIS SONAR TESTING ABSOLUTELY NEEDS TO STOP NOW!!!! THESE TESTS SHOULD NOT BE DONE PERIOD. THERE IS NOT A SINGLE PLACE IN THE OCEAN OR IN ANY BODY OF WATER FOR THESE TESTS. I AM DISAPPOINTED IN HUMANITY. THIS IS ABSOLUTELY SICKENING.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
T		
Taifour-1	Dumping materials in Puget Sound is completely unacceptable. Our salmon runs are down, orcas are dying, waters are too polluted for swimming. It is completely unconscionable that the military or any government agency, or any party for that matter, should dump ANY materials in waterways when more appropriate, safer, and less damaging options are available.	The Navy's proposed activities do not include dumping of any materials. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.
Talman-1	Stop flying their Growlers, some of the loudest jets, over one of the quietest paces, the Hoh Rain Forest. You need to assess their jet noise over the northern tier of Olympic National Park (Lake Crescent. Hurricane Ridge	The Navy has expanded the noise analysis to include the transit of aircraft to and from the Olympic MOA.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>areas) as Growlers transit between their Whidbey Island air base and their official military airspace over the west side of the Olympics: they haven't considered that. Consider and move to other places for the Growler's training: there are lots of airbases around the country which do not impact national parks.</p> <p>On-site monitoring of aircraft overflights, rather than modeling, is needed to truly evaluate impacts on people and wildlife in Olympic National Park. The aircraft sound information in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS unrealistically minimizes the jet noise levels and frequency of overflights park visitors are already experiencing. We experience the same noise levels in Western Skagit County and Fidalgo and Whidbey islands. National Parks are, by law, to be preserved in their natural condition. The law does not exempt the Navy. The law passed by the U.S. Congress in 1916 establishing the National Park Service states that the agency's purpose is to, "conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." (https://home.nps.gov/pipe/learn/management/nps-organic-act-of-1916.htm) Noise from Growler overflights which degrade the natural conditions of Olympic National Park are not exempt from this act. It is highly inappropriate, and arguably illegal, to establish a "Military Operations Area" in whole or part over a national park. There are surely other places that the Navy could carry out its important training and equipment testing. These activities do not need to happen over or near a national park.</p> <p>The Navy's training and testing activities are incompatible with the protection of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. The Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary extends 25 to 50 miles seaward of the coastal area of Olympic National Park. As shown on the map at https://www.nwtteis.com/About-the-Study-Area#/images/3, the Navy's Northwest Training and Testing Study Area appears to overlap this Congressionally established Sanctuary in its entirety. As vividly described in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, a wide variety of weapons are tested here involving the use of various ships and aircraft, live ammunition, and explosives: yet we are urged to see the likely impact to marine mammals, birds, and other living things as very minimal. In numerous places in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS we read that the reason for choosing the Olympic Peninsula and its offshore waters, as well as various locations in the Salish Sea/Puget Sound, for naval testing and training is that it is convenient and</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	will save transit money. There are many Navy bases in Puget Sound, and it's convenient to train in the nearest part of the Pacific Ocean and over the mountainous and shoreline terrain of the peninsula. No argument is made for why the Navy's convenience preempts the protection of a premier National Park and a Marine Sanctuary, both established by Congress for preservation in perpetuity for the benefit of the American public. Navy testing and training can be done away from national parks and other protected areas.	environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas. ¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015. ² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.
Talman-2	The Supplemental EIS/OEIS fails to include a reasonable range of alternatives. The scale and complexity of the activities which the EIS/OEIS examines are massive, yet only 3 alternatives are examined: a continuation of the present testing and training with some additions (e.g. more Growler flights), a continuation with a greater increase in activity, and the required no action alternative, which would mean a cessation of training and testing in the study area. That these changes would be inconvenient or more expensive for the Navy are not sufficient reasons for not including such an alternative. Environmental Impact Statements are to examine a range of reasonable alternatives. There is no alternative that looks at avoiding overflights of Olympic National Park, for example, and restricting water-based activities to areas outside the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, which in this case would certainly include more than the three presented. At the very least, the Navy should design a solid, scientifically-based plan for eliminating or severely limiting negative impacts of aircraft overflights to Olympic National Park visitors and wildlife.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training farther from NAS Whidbey Island, either farther at sea or at other land training areas was considered and rejected. Additionally, the Olympic MOA is desirable for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure, environmental conditions that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness, and other factors stated in 2.5.1.1. The Navy complied with NEPA requirements in the development and consideration of alternatives. The Alternatives carried forward meet the Navy's purpose and need (see Section 1.4, Purpose of and Need for Proposed Military Readiness Training and Testing Activities) to ensure that it can fulfill its obligation under Title 10. See Section 2.4 (Action Alternative Development) for more detailed information on the development of alternatives.
Talman-3	The Supplemental EIS/OEIS fails to address all potential areas of negative impact in Olympic National Park. To fly from Whidbey Naval Air Station to the Military Operations Area (MOA), Growlers pass over other parts of Olympic National Park. yet potential impacts in those areas, including such heavily visited year-round sites as Hurricane Ridge, are not examined. The EIS/OEIS only looks at impacts in the part of the park below the MOA. The study of sound which the National Park Service did in the park in 2010 (Olympic National Park Acoustic Monitoring Winter 2010 Natural Resource Report	The Navy has expanded the noise analysis to include the transit of aircraft to and from the Olympic MOA.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	NPS/NRSS/NSNSD\NRR-2016/1310) found that Hurricane Ridge, beaches on the outer coast, the Hoh Rain Forest, and all other areas measured had very low levels of aircraft noise. Navy operations are already changing that condition and will increasingly do so unless there is mitigation to avoid degradation of the national park.	
Talman-4	<p>The proposed mitigation related to Marbled Murrelets at sea is inadequate. The Supplemental EIS/OEIS notes that the Marbled Murrelet is listed as a threatened species under the federal Endangered Species Act. (We would add that because of its precipitous population decline in Washington State, this species is listed under state law as endangered, which is not mentioned in the EIS/OEIS.) The EIS/OEIS states that murrelets in the marine environment where they forage could be affected by such Navy activities as testing and training with live ordnance. There is a vivid list of the harm which underwater explosions can do to the physiology of a Marbled Murrelet (p. 3.6-56): "Marbled murrelets would be exposed to explosives during mine countermeasure and neutralization testing proposed in the Offshore Area, and existing mine warfare areas in Inland Waters (i.e., Crescent Harbor and Hood Canal Explosive Ordnance Disposal Training Ranges).... In Inland Waters, marbled murrelets have an increased likelihood of exposure. Marbled murrelets exposed to underwater explosions may be subject to lethal or non-lethal injuries. Non-lethal injuries may include scarred or ruptured eardrums, or gastrointestinal tract lesions."</p> <p>The related mitigation plan calls for having a single on-board observer watching for marbled murrelets and, when spotting one, calling a stop to the training or testing activity (e.g. at 5.3.2.2 Weapons Firing Noise" on p. 5-24). As birders experienced with observing murrelets off Skagit County shorelines from land, we know how difficult it is to spot this 9.75" long, cryptically-colored, low-profile bird when it is on water anything other than very calm. To do so while using binoculars on a boat that is rocking or underway is especially difficult. From our own experience, we are skeptical that a single observer under typical conditions can effectively and consistently spot Marbled Murrelets on the water. Some more realistic form of mitigation needs to be devised; better yet, this type of potentially highly disruptive weapons training and testing should not take place anywhere near murrelet foraging or resting areas.</p> <p>Speculation about habituation is no substitute for careful study and consideration of cumulative effects on listed species. To speculate that one more stressor in the bird's environment is just another inconsequential</p>	<p>The Navy consulted with USFWS under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act to address potential impacts to marbled murrelets with implementation of the preferred alternative. Discussions about the level of benefit of the Navy's mitigation measures are presented throughout Section 5.3 (Procedural Mitigation to be Implemented) and Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment). The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from applicable acoustic, explosive, and physical disturbance and strike stressors on marine and bird species wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine mammals, sea turtles, birds, and fish in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict all but one type of explosive activity from occurring within 50 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area year-round, which will help the Navy avoid potential impacts from explosives on marbled murrelets in important foraging areas.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>thing for the bird to get used to makes a mockery of the EIS process and the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>There is insufficient information to evaluate whether Navy aircraft overflights will negatively affect Marbled Murrelet nesting success and fledgling survival in and near Olympic National Park.</p> <p>The Supplemental EIS/OEIS depicts Navy jet flight paths over the Olympic Peninsula as being so high above ground level that the noise the planes generate will be at most a minor disturbance to birds such as the Marbled Murrelet. It should be noted that the flight path of murrelets from the marine waters where they forage to their nest sites is not always low and along river courses but can involve flying high enough to clear passes at 5,000 or more feet elevation. Murrelets are known to do this in transiting from the Strait of Juan de Fuca to the Hoh River Valley in Olympic National Park, for example. Pertinent to this point is the footnote in section 3.6: "Note: MOA = Military Operating Area. The Olympic MOAs overlay both land and sea (extending to 3 nautical miles off the Washington coast) and include areas above 6,000 ft. Mean Sea Level but below 1,200 ft. above ground level at the higher terrain elevations of the mountains.")</p> <p>Thus, the proximity of aircraft and the impact of noise from jets such as the Growler are potentially much more severe than described in the EIS/OEIS. The temporary disturbance from aircraft noise which the EIS/OEIS acknowledges could, in the case of the Marbled Murrelet, readily result in nesting failure. The murrelet's single chick leads a precarious existence in its moss bed atop a high, old growth branch. A chick once startled from the nest and fallen to the forest floor is unable to recover. The same is true during the fledgling's first flight, when it must succeed in reaching marine waters as much as 50 miles distant or die on the forest floor. The rapidly declining state of this species in Washington calls for greater caution in adding to the stress it is already under.</p> <p>There is insufficient information to state that Navy aircraft overflights will not jeopardize Spotted Owls in and near Olympic National Park. Like the Marbled Murrelet, the Spotted Owl is in serious decline in Washington. Adding stressors in its environment should not be done without carefully targeted studies rather than simply extrapolating from the very limited and not particularly applicable available science.</p>	
Talman-5	<p>The Supplemental EIS/OEIS gives little or no attention to wildlife species listed under state but not federal law as endangered. Although the Tufted Puffin is not listed under the federal Endangered Species Act, under Washington State law this seabird is listed as endangered. The EIS/OEIS</p>	<p>The Supplemental EIS/OEIS includes an analysis of potential impacts to marine birds found in the NWTT Study Area. The Navy has consulted with USFWS on Federally protected species, including diving birds such as the</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	mentions the species in one place only (Table 3.6-2: Representative Birds of the Northwest Training and Testing Study Area) and gives no attention to how Navy testing and training off the Olympic Coast will affect this iconic bird on its island nesting grounds or where it forages on the open water. It should also be mentioned that while the EIS/OEIS addresses possible impacts to the Northern Sea Otter and correctly states that this species is not federally listed as threatened or endangered, the EIS/OEIS omits that the sea otter is listed as a federal species of concern and is listed under state law as endangered. 3.4.1.37.3 Distribution. p. 3.4-8) For a list of species designated for special protection under Washington State law go to https://wdfw.wa.gov/species-habitats/at-risk/listed .	marbled murrelet. As noted above, all but one of the offshore proposed activities using explosives are conducted at least 50 nautical miles offshore.
Talman-6	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>This is not an exhaustive list of the problems we see with the Northwest Training and Testing Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and the present or future activities which it describes. The much studied but still inconclusive effects of sonar on marine mammals and other marine species is another whole area of concern to us. In conclusion, we urge selection of the No Action alternative rather than Alternative One, which has been identified as the Navy's Preferred.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Tarleton-1	Underwater sonar has been proven to be disruptive to marine life. Both species of orca in the Salish Sea are affected; however the SRKW species is at the brink of extinction due to lack of food. Whales rely on sonar for hunting and if their ability to hunt is compromised, even the actions taken to increase our salmon population will not help.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Taylor A-1	Extinction is forever.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Taylor E-1	<p>In conversation with Navy representatives here it was not clear that the Navy recognizes the enormous peril that climate disruption is causing to the health of the ocean and to terrestrial species. The Navy is the largest single producer of greenhouse gases in the world with the exception of only 34 countries. This harm is greater and more probable than any imagined or provoked threat from one of the countries our government has designated as an enemy.</p> <p>The consequences of climate disruption, if recognized by the Navy and it is truly unwilling to sacrifice life on earth for the sake of military competitiveness, would shut down the exercises and war activity. Please do your best to focus on this overriding issue of survival.</p>	<p>The Navy considers the current affected environment, which includes the affects of climate change. Climate change is addressed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Section 3.2.3.2 (Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change). Climate change, as a cumulative impact was analyzed in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and referred to in this Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Taylor G-1	<p>I am totally against this form of environmental action. I know our whales, dolphins, and other sea/river animals should have priority over human tampering of their natural habitat. Noise is a huge human problem. We should not thrust noise pollution on these animals as they rely on their ears far more than we do. They have a right to be able to communicate and work with each other in their own natural environment.</p> <p>Please wake up to the unnecessary destruction. Surely, you can find harmless way of testing your kill machines!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Taylor La-1	<p>While I do understand that our pilots need to be trained in similar conditions to real battle, it is puzzling why a pristine ecologically sensitive area has to be chosen for this. There are so many places in this country that are neither beautiful or are an outdoor enthusiasts haven. Why is the Navy choosing this area in Washington that is so crucial to our state? It doesn't</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	make sense and it seems as if the Navy is doing whatever it wants whenever it wants. What happened to serve and protect? I am highly supportive of our Armed Forces, but, I also feel taken advantage of and for granted as a citizen by the Naval Command in Washington.	MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Taylor Lo-1	<p>I'm not sure this will do any good, but I am going to try. I see your guidelines on the website regarding comments. I'd like to believe they would make a difference. They didn't. I participated in the largest community effort to respond to your Growler Expansion EIS with referenced documents, thoughtful commentary and solutions. Every single one of our concerns (and there were well over 4,000 comments) were ignored in the Final EIS and y'all did what you wanted to, without regard to the community that supports you.</p> <p>But onto this NW Training EIS. I was a Navy wife for 20 years here on Whidbey and am well aware of the need to train and the importance of the electronic warfare mission. What I have issue with are the sensitive areas in which you are training, and the damage to the environment and public health your operations cause.</p> <p>You have a history of segmenting your EISs in the area, whether its Growler expansion, Navy SEALs, or training in the Olympics. You have decided to turn this military into one big combat training zone with no element of the environment unharmed.</p> <p>Puget Sound is an environmentally sensitive area. Home to the last 76 Southern Resident Killer Whales in the world. They may go extinct in my lifetime due to lack of food, and the noise caused by Growler jet training, just like excess boat noise, makes them spend many extra hours finding food, contributing to their malnutrition and loss of fertility.</p> <p>The Olympic National Forest and Park are so sacred, even the white settlers gave it the name reserved for the home of the Gods. A World Heritage site and Biosphere reserve, it is one of the last quiet places on the planet.</p> <p>Recent studies from the University of Washington show that 85-90% of the noise in the Olympics comes from the constant Growler overflights. Many</p>	<p>The Navy prepares Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) and Environmental Assessments (EA) in order to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). These NEPA documents are intended to ensure decision makers consider the potential environmental effects of a proposed action and its alternatives, provide an opportunity for public involvement, and promote transparency by informing the public of these potential environmental effects. Each NEPA document addresses a specific proposed action, separated from other actions by its purpose and need, independent utility, timing, and geographic location. Some NEPA documents are stand-alone documents; others tier off or expand the analyses of other NEPA documents. NEPA documents for training and testing, including this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, focus on training and testing activities occurring within a range complex or military operation area and involve different types of aircraft, ships, and range complex enhancements. NEPA documents for aircraft homebasing actions focus on aircraft operations in and around the airfield and their facility needs. NEPA documents for installations focus on infrastructure enhancements for host and tenant command missions. Importantly, every environmental document considers the cumulative impacts to the environment from other relevant past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (federal, state, local, and private) in addition to the proposed action.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>animals living there depend on their hearing for survival – which is greatly impacted by 85 dB noise and above.</p> <p>Your own estimation of the “take” to marine mammals is heartbreaking. If any other party or industry in the world harmed as many marine mammals as you do, it would be an outrage. It’s no less an outrage than when done in the name of national defense.</p> <p>I’m asking you to do the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce the concentration of Growlers and overflights in the NWTT area to mitigate your impact on a sensitive environment. Consider areas like Kingsville, TX or Fallon, NV where the areas are less populated and less environmentally fragile. Share the burden across several sites so that no area is disproportionately impacted. This also improves national security by not siting all your electronic warfare jet aircraft in one vulnerable, coastal location. 	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Taylor Lo-2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Make a serious effort to avoid harming marine mammals by reducing the amount of training you do in the NWTT and training when the impact to living beings is the lowest. This isn’t World War II. We can schedule trainings. We are not in some sort of emergency where we can’t think about the impact of what we are doing. 	<p>The alternatives carried forward meet the Navy’s purpose and need to ensure that it can fulfill its obligation under U.S.C. Title 10. As explained in Section 2.5 (Alternatives Development) of the EIS/OEIS, the range of alternatives considered by the Navy must be reasonable alternatives. To be reasonable, an alternative must meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. A curtailment or reduction in the number of training and testing activities would not meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, and would therefore be unreasonable.</p>
Taylor Lo-3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Provide real-time noise monitoring of the impact of your operations in the Olympic National Park, Forest and in areas where the Orcas live and hunt. Then do what you can to reduce that impact. Here on Whidbey we have high noise impacts because the aviators in the FCLP pattern don’t observe their own minimum altitude of 600 feet. Sticking to your own rules goes a long way toward reducing the impact of your operations. Sharing your operations with other sites also reduces the impact to any given site. 4. Consider that in defending our nation, you may be destroying it. Stop training in our National Parks. Our National Parks were set aside for preservation of quiet, of intact environment and wildlife. They were not set aside for military practice. The military has substantial holdings. There are less environmentally fragile <p>Please don't say you don't have the money to do these things. You do. The military spends over 50% of federal discretionary income. You are the biggest part of big government. You're not audited and you routinely misplace millions upon millions of dollars. Spend some of that money to preserve what you are trying to protect.</p>	<p>DoD’s position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD’s position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>I know that some person in the Navy somewhere, maybe one person will read this document. If that is you, what will you tell your children? How did you preserve and protect our beautiful country? Please use the voice and the advocacy you have to find some balanced way for the military to train that preserves these beautiful and sacred places, and doesn't harm the people or environment that gives us the quality of life we do have.</p> <p>I gave 20 years of my young life supporting the Navy mission. I know you can do better and be better. Please show some care about how you train and don't run roughshod and without respect over the citizenry that pays for what you do and supports you in your service.</p>	<p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Taylor P-1	<p>Idaho and Nevada training areas were designed for warfare training, the Olympic Peninsula was not.</p> <p>There is no reason the Navy can not continue electronic warfare training in Idaho and Nevada as they have done for decades.</p> <p>This will disturb visitors to, and the wildlife of, Olympic National Park which is the eighth most visited park in the National Park System; 3.4 million visitors to the Olympic National Park in 2017.</p> <p>It includes International Biosphere Reserve and a World Heritage Site.</p> <p>The 2011 World Health Organization report titled 'Burden of disease from environmental noise' documented health problems. The studies analysed environmental noise from planes, trains and vehicles, as well as other city sources, and then looked at links to health conditions such as cardiovascular disease, sleep disturbance, tinnitus, cognitive impairment in children, and annoyance. The WHO team used the information to calculate the disability-adjusted life-years or DALYs—basically the healthy years of life—lost to 'unwanted' human-induced dissonance. See the Australian Academy of Science article: Health effects of environmental noise pollution</p> <p>The sound profile of the Growler is not only loud but includes a low-frequency vibration that travels farther and vibrates objects in its path. This aspect creates a deadly combination beyond annoyance that impacts human health.</p> <p>Impact to our economy:</p> <p>People spent \$279 million in communities near the park. That spending supported 3,556 jobs in the local area and had a cumulative benefit to the local economy of \$385 million.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Nevada are not reasonable. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety). The potential impacts to the economy are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	In this EIS the Navy is asking NOAA for a continuation of their 2015 NOAA permit which states" reauthorization of incidental takes of marine mammals under the MMPA and incidental takes of threatened and endangered marine species'	The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism and Recreation). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.
Taylor R-1	My name is Rachel and by leaving this public comment I am hereby signing my name to a future petition to stop underwater sonar testing for the sake of our marine mammals. I go to school and work for the Guy Harvey institution and we sit right in between a naval base and the coast guard. We love and respect our US military, especially me. We understand that with the age and technology progressing, the Navy is trying to find techniques to further their testing and preparation for war and/or seeking out unorthodox territory. However, we are doing very productive research on these mammals and they're ability to help humans. The extensive research and work we have done has helped us get closer and closer to finding a healing immunity to cure cancer and Alzheimer's. We have worked hard on trying to rescue these stranded animals who are in distress because of mixed signals, hearing loss and hazardous conditions. When their population decreases, you're messing with the entire ecosystem and food chain...which in turn, impacts us. Please stop these types of testing, if there is anyway else you can go about your training it would save lives. We thank you for all that you do. We thank you for dedicating your lives to our country. We thank you for your innovative technology and your hard work to do your job to save your country despite all of the political hate that goes on. And we thank you in advance for your careful consideration to our request and your perspective on how to better everyone's lives, including yours. God bless each and everyone of you, and God bless America.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Taylor V-1	Please stop under water sonar testing that has been proven to cause harm to marine animals. I am 100% against this testing along with so many others.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Teller-1	Greetings. As a Navy veteran and local resident who has experienced sonic transponders from offshore oil exploration, I know how loud and potentially destructive underwater sonic testing can be. The ocean and its resident wildlife are fragile. Having a liquid desert is not desirable. I believe the proposed testing would be destructive and is inappropriate. There is no acceptable level of losses of marine life. Please cancel the tests.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Templer-1	<p>I am a 50-year resident of the coastal community of Fort Bragg in Mendocino County, California. We are an ocean-front community dependent on the health of the ocean and marine wildlife for our economic well-being. Fort Bragg is a blue-collar former mill town; our lumber mill shut down abruptly in 2002 and threw the town into economic free-fall from which it is still recovering. Recovery has been very dependent on attracting tourists to our community, and the removal of the mill structures has had a positive effect, as access to the ocean within city limits was limited while the mill was operative. Local meetings and surveys have determined that most residents want the former mill property to be a marine science center, and with that goal in mind, the Noyo Marine Center is already up and running. Our economic recovery depends on bringing tourists to the coast and educating them about the ocean and its inhabitants.</p> <p>Whale watching is a major tourist draw. People flock to this area to enjoy the majestic passage of the whales. They certainly don't come here to view dead whales, though more and more dead whales are turning up along the California Coast. Until a year ago, they also came to Fort Bragg in large numbers to go abalone diving. Now there are no abalone, because there is no longer kelp, most likely due to climate change and the increasingly acidified ocean. Now we no longer have the revenue stream from the abalone divers.</p> <p>The sonar testing proposed by the Navy will have a serious and detrimental effect on marine wildlife off our coast. This has been established by research and studies too numerous to mention. The Navy is proposing actions that will harm and kill marine species at a time when, again according to well-published studies, it is predicted that climate change will bring about the extinction of 90% of existing species. The Navy testing will also introduce more toxic waste into the ocean, as if there isn't enough</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment, such as water quality and socioeconomic impacts can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	there already. This cruel destruction and maiming of marine wildlife, and the addition of harmful toxins, will exacerbate the disastrous trends already set in motion by climate change. My community is trying to stay afloat financially by attracting people to our coast to enjoy the wonders of our marine environment, which navy sonar testing will put in serious jeopardy. For the immediate and long-term benefit of my community, and for all the already imperiled marine wildlife struggling to hold on, I urge the navy to abandon its plans for sonar testing.	
Teplow-1	I am very upset that our Navy has decided to practice their equipment which includes sonic booms which are extremely detrimental to our whale group which is currently going up north to feed. Global warming has already harmed whales, and they are not getting enough krill to eat; thus they are already weaken. I request that the Navy operate their practice out of the line of the whale migration.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
terHorst-1	I live at 4734 Magnolia Street in Port Townsend, on the north side of the Quimper Peninsula (see attached). I love planes and the Navy. But there's a time and place for everything, and the sound of Growlers in the vicinity, especially in the evenings, is just plain annoying, not to mention nerve-racking. In the warmer months, we like to sleep with our windows open, but there is no way we can sleep with the constant jet noise unless we close up everything and turn on a fan for white noise. It's like living in a dungeon. Honestly, it reminds me of when we lived at the end of the runway at Love Field in Dallas right after we got married 40 years ago. This is supposed to be a tranquil place, and with so much nature around us, it is. But when the Growlers are in the area, I feel like I am back in the big city. Seriously, there must be something you can do to mitigate this. Increasing the number of flights is definitely not the answer! Don't turn this patriot against the fine men and women who serve our country.	Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year. When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context: 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Terpstra-1	I am submitting this comment to protest the use of underwater sonar testing by the US Navy. This form of testing has been shown to cause temporary and permanent hearing loss in whales and dolphins and sends them into distress even far away from testing ships. This is 100% unacceptable! I ask for this damaging practice and reckless disregard for cetacean life to stop immediately. Considering that the southern residential killer whale population is critically endangered and on the verge of collapse due to the lack of food and stress the human population is putting on them I find the sonar testing to be ignorant and wildly irresponsible by a branch of the US government. As a resident of the west coast of this continent I care deeply about the health, well-being and future of our ocean and the wildlife that calls it home. I once again ask for these testing practices to cease immediately in order to let whales and dolphins as well as all other wildlife in our ocean live in peace. Thank you.	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Thaldorf-1	It's important to understand that the ocean is a world of sound, not sight. These animals use sound to find food, meet mates, avoid predators, and navigate the seas. We do not need to gut this earth and further destroy every beautiful thing that remains. Please do not allow this to continue to disrupt the lives of already dwindling species.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Thayer-1	After a brief reading of the proposal and attending an informational meeting held by the Noyo Center in Fort Bragg on the Mendocino Coast it is my opinion that the disruptive effect of the current sonar technology will adversely effect the protected species off our coast. This disruptive impact on Grey and Humpback whales species will have an adverse effect on our	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	eco-tourist trade. Tourists come from all over California, and the US for that matter, to see and enjoy the migrating whales. If they are negatively impacted by the sonar use our local economy will be negatively effected. I do not feel the Navy has adequately balanced their needs with our economic needs.	<p>Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The potential impacts to the economy are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism and Recreation). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p>
Thie-1	The number and noise of over flights must be reduced to protect human health and the environment. DOD must prioritize noise reduction through research, development and use of cutting edge noise reduction technology.	The alternatives carried forward meet the Navy's purpose and need to ensure that it can fulfill its obligation under U.S.C. Title 10. As explained in Section 2.5 (Alternatives Development) of the EIS/OEIS, the range of alternatives considered by the Navy must be reasonable alternatives. To be reasonable, an alternative must meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. A curtailment or reduction in the number of training and testing activities would not meet the stated purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, and would therefore be unreasonable.
Thiel-1	It is sad to see thousands of these beautiful creatures being killed in the oceans around the world because of sonar testing. It's their home the sea not ours to destroy!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Thomas C-1	<p>I support and am in solidarity with the position of the InterTribal Sinkiyone Wilderness Council and its member Tribes and the Seventh Generation Fund for Indigenous Peoples regarding the cultural and environmental protections that are needed for the Navy's proposed training and testing activities in the Northwest Training Range Complex. The following points are of particular importance.</p> <p>1. The adequacy of the assessment of Tribal cultural impacts as well as environmental impacts from the Navy's training and testing activities is especially important because these activities take place in the Pacific</p>	Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Ocean, which holds great cultural and spiritual significance for the Tribes and is critically important for the wellbeing of all people and lifeforms on this planet.</p> <p>2. The Navy should work meaningfully with the Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities. I attended the public input meeting in Fort Bragg this Spring and was deeply disappointed to hear that the Navy's Scientists present did not know that its sister Agency EPA Region 9 holds an annual meeting of the Region 9 Tribal Environmental Department Officers from all Region 9 federally recognized tribes. As an environmental scientist, I have attended these meetings and found them to be substantially informative and enlightening. I know of no other meeting that provides such a valuable collection of traditional environmental knowledge as well and recent research. I strongly recommend that Navy biological impact scientists attend this meeting annually to cross fertilize their limited knowledge base.</p> <p>3. The Navy should prohibit use of sonar within the 50-mile mitigation area. Sonar causes serious harm to the health and wellbeing of whales and other marine mammals. I applaud the 2004 Report of the Scientific Committee of the International Whaling Commission, the preeminent international body of scientists studying whale populations which clearly documents that many species of marine life are affected by active sonar https://www.acousticecology.org/docs/IWC56-noisesymposium.doc. The use of sonar in training and testing exercises is known to seriously damage the hearing and alter the behavior of marine mammals when in the vicinity of such activities. Sound waves in the water medium, are key to sensory perception and communications for diverse sea life forms. To indicate that no harm is done to marine life is equivalent to indicating that interrupting the traffic signal system of a major city would not cause harm to humans. Disabling either system is well documented to cause significant direct and indirect harm to the inhabitants. In 2016, a federal court found that the National Marine Fisheries Service's "systematic under protection of" whales and other marine life in its permit for the Navy's use of low-frequency sonar across the globe violated the law and ordered the government to consider additional mitigation measures for this activity. The impacts of sonar and other Navy training and testing activities on the marine environment should not be measured solely according to whether</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>entire populations of marine species are harmed. The goal of mitigation of harm to marine plant and animal species should be to reduce the effect of training and testing to the lowest humanly possible impact.</p> <p>4. The “best available science” referenced in the draft SEIS should be expanded to meaningfully take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy’s NWTRC. See item 2 above</p> <p>5. The Navy’s monitoring program should be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species. Individual as well as population impacts have profound importance when considering that individuals carry the genetic diversity required for long term resilience, not a general population</p> <p>6. The Navy should expand its list of environmental “stressors” to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing.</p> <p>7. The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy’s 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered.</p> <p>As a concerned member of the public, who has lived on the California north coast at shoreline for over 22 years, I call on the Navy to honor the reasonable request of the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council’s member Tribes that testing and training activities be conducted outside of marine waters offshore from California. This area can be avoided entirely without undermining military readiness, since the Navy estimates that less than one percent of its activities will take place off the coast of Northern California.</p> <p>As an academic research field biologist with over 38 years of experience and numerous published peer-reviewed scientific research articles, I ask that the Navy cooperate with the Tribes in meaningful ways to help ensure that military training and testing do not harm marine life and areas of cultural concern to the Tribes. The Navy’s obligation to consult with sovereign Tribal Nations under federal law provides a framework for the</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Tribal-Navy consultation being facilitated by the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Navy to collaborate with the member Tribes of the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council in developing robust monitoring and mitigation measures to address impacts of the Navy's training and testing activities that are planned for the Northwest Training Range Complex. I request that public meetings be held in Fort Bragg, CA following the release of the Draft Supplemental EIS in early 2019.</p> <p>I request and look forward to a timely response to my concerns from NWTTC Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager.</p>	
Thomas C-2	<p>It is essential that the Navy engage in meaningful conversation with Tribal Councils and citizens that result in workable actions and practices based on Indigenous ecological knowledge and recent scientific knowledge based on actual biological systems.</p> <p>Population changes are not the metric to base decisions. Inappropriate decisions on changes on marine populations have a bias that minimizes the message, particularly for larger populations. I'm deeply concerned that the zone needs to be extended out beyond 20 miles to 50 miles.</p> <p>I am deeply concerned about the use of sonar in the presence of marine animals & fish. It should be included as a stressor in all Navy activities.</p> <p>Using the best available science and Tribal Traditional Knowledge monitoring should be expanded to include experts in non-military organizations and including tribal EPA scientists. As an ecologist and plant health expert, the interdependency on species mix and ecological health of all species requires prolonged & multidisciplinary monitoring before decisions & practices are chosen.</p>	<p>The Navy will continue to consult with the Tribes. Through Government-to-Government consultations, the Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Thomas D-1	<p>Sonar testing is harmful to marine animals and should not be used especially as they are already endangered. This is cruelty because it causes them distress. Please stop!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Thomas G-1	<p>For the purposes of its environmental impact study, the Navy utilized a standard noise metric, Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) and dBA, A-Weighted Sound Pressure Level. See Appendix J, Airspace Noise Analysis for</p>	<p>A-weighting, which was used in the noise modeling described in Appendix J, best replicates human hearing and is the most appropriate for the assessment of annoyance from aircraft noise. A-weighted sound levels form the basis of</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the Olympic Military Operations Areas.</p> <p>The DNL is a noise measure used for assessing cumulative sound levels. This measure accounts for the exposure of all noise events in an average 24-hour period. DNL, also denoted as Ldn, is an average sound level, expressed in decibels (dB), which is commonly used to assess aircraft noise exposures in communities in the vicinity of airfields and under SUA (FICUN, 1980; EPA, 1982; ANSI, 2005). Not directly related to any singular sound event a person may hear, DNL values normally only define compatible/incompatible land use parameters.</p> <p>The NWTT EIS/OEIS does mention any assessment of the environmental impact of low-frequency noise (LFN) on humans, terrestrial wildlife, or sea mammals. Moreover, some recent scientific literature suggests that LFN may also affect shellfish because the perceived vibration. (See https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0185353#abstract0)</p> <p>Since dBA, A-Weighted Sound Pressure Level, does not measure (detect) LFN sound/energy emissions below 80 Hz, the NWTT EIS/OEIS will need to consider And examine the environment impact from that portion of the energy spectrum. Without a thorough examination of the environmental impacts from low-frequency noise the NWTT EIS/OEIS is incomplete. Please see link below, for example, as you begin your investigation. https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130403165414/http://archive.defra.gov.uk/environment/quality/noise/research/lowfrequency/documents/lowfreqnoise.pdf</p>	<p>the day-night average sound level (DNL) metric, which is the best available metric to relate aircraft noise to long-term annoyance. The Federal Interagency Committee on Noise found that “There are no new descriptors or metrics of sufficient scientific standing to substitute for the present DNL cumulative noise exposure metric.” The comment suggests that A-weighted measures may not be as accurate in determining the disturbing effects of noises with strong low-frequency components. However, the alternative measurement methodology using C-weighting increases the emphasis on lower frequencies when compared with A-weighting. C-weighting is most appropriate for impulsive or repetitive sounds, such as blast noise and machine gun fire, which contain significant low-frequency noise, as well as continuous noise sources such as pumps and compressors.</p> <p>For potential wildlife impacts, A-weighted sound levels are used as an indicator. The wildlife population underneath and around the Olympic MOA have been exposed to military aircraft noise for an extended period. The proposed action does not represent new noise exposure events to the wildlife. The Navy has consulted numerous studies that the DoD has sponsored in the past three decades. Many of these studies were included in the analysis of impacts to birds found in Section 3.6.2.1.4 (Impacts from Aircraft Noise) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and other animals. In addition, the Navy has consulted with the USFWS regarding the potential of proposed Navy activities to impact ESA-listed species in the Study Area.</p>
Thompson H-1	<p>https://www.theverge.com/2016/7/18/12213780/low-frequency-sonar-navy-whales-dolphins-marine-mammals-us-court</p> <p>https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marine_mammals_and_sonar</p> <p>https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2015/09/us-navy-limit-sonar-testing-protect-whales</p> <p>https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmars.2017.00295/full</p> <p>https://www.nature.com/news/2008/080801/full/news.2008.997.html</p> <p>https://www.hakaimagazine.com/news/us-navys-new-sonar-rules-may-be-worse-dolphins-and-whales/</p> <p>https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/does-military-sonar-kill/?redirect=1</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy’s ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy’s Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Thompson H-2	I am against underwater sonar testing which has proven to cause harm to our vitally important marine animals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Thompson Jam-1	<p>I live in Mendocino county and strongly and emphatically oppose the conducting of naval exercises off the Mendocino coast. I urge the navy to follow the No-Action Alternative for the following reasons:</p> <p>A recent, 2019, study by the Royal Society found Northern bottlenose whales in a pristine environment respond strongly to close and distant navy sonar signals. (https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.2592)</p> <p>In addition the study done in 2011 by the Scottish Oceans Institute found "our observations indicated a large number of changes in behaviour during exposure to sonar that can be considered "negative effects" of the sonar." While the cetaceans tested are not the exact species that exist or travel through the water off the Mendocino coast their behavior and the disruption caused needs to be considered for local cetaceans. (https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Paul_Wensveen2/publication/259654570_The_3S_experiments_studying_the_behavioral_effects_of_sonar_on_killer_whales_Orcinus_orca_sperm_whales_Physeter_macrocephalus_and_long-finned_pilot_whales_Globicephala_melas_in_Norwegian_waters/links/00b4952d291362642c000000/The-3S-experiments-studying-the-behavioral-effects-of-sonar-on-killer-whales-Orcinus-orca-sperm-whales-Physeter-macrocephalus-and-long-finned-pilot-whales-Globicephala-melas-in-Norwegian-waters.pdf)</p> <p>As described in the two studies above Increased sonar and electromagnetic underwater testing has the potential to interfere or injure marine mammals' ability to navigate and communicate.</p> <p>The Navy itself predicts that there would be more than 500,000 instances</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment, such as vessel strike, entanglement, and ingestion can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>of marine mammal behavioral impacts, harassment, and injuries over five years, including 275,000 instances of temporary hearing loss, and more than 600 instances of permanent hearing loss.</p> <p>Vessel strikes from increased water traffic will increase marine mammal death rate. We have already seen the loss of nine grey whales in the San Francisco Bay area in the last six weeks from malnourishment and vessel strikes. The western North Pacific population of grey whales is estimated to include fewer than 200 individuals. We cannot afford to put these animals in greater danger.</p> <p>Risks to marine mammals, fish, and birds from entanglement in wires, cables, and parachutes, and ingestion of expended military materials and toxic debris will increase. The Navy holds no responsibility to clean up their spent munitions and debris.</p> <p>The Navy's training and testing harmfully impact the cultural and spiritual significance of marine species and habitat for the Tribes of the West Coast.</p>	
Thompson Jan-1	I am requesting an additional 14 days to provide comments to the Navy on the EIS/OEIS March 2019 fir Northwest Training and Testing. This would provide a full 90 day comment period.	The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.
Thompson Jan-2	<p>I have only recently become aware of the proposal to move the jet training facility to the Olympic Peninsula. I am dismayed that the Navy has not provided the full 90 days comment period to review the Navy EIS/OEIS March 2019 for Northwest Training and Testing. My comments are submitted to meet the current deadline. Based upon what I know about the Olympic Peninsula the only acceptable alternative is the No Action Alternative. Our environmental security is important in this age of climate change.</p> <p>I am opposed to alternatives 1 and 2 which would establish an electronic warfare training area on the Olympic Peninsula. The Olympic Peninsula and the National Marine Sanctuary are unique and these areas should not be a military warfare training area. We have very few places in the United States that provide the peace and quiet found on the Olympic Peninsula. The Navy's training areas in Idaho and Nevada are designed for warfare training. These sites have been used for decades and the environmental costs already incurred. The Olympic Peninsula was not so designated. In fact areas of the Olympic Peninsula have been set aside for protection since 1907. The environment on the Olympic Peninsula is unique. My family and I have gone to the Olympic Peninsula many times to whale watch, hike and backpack, enjoy the beaches, take pictures of wildlife, the Olympic National Park and attend the many community events. We could not enjoy these</p>	<p>The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p> <p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment, such as socioeconomic impacts and impacts to wildlife can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>activities due to the noise generated by the proposed Growler training patterns. It is my belief that the degradation to the Olympic Peninsula's environment will be catastrophic.</p> <p>The noise from the 5,000 jet flights per year over the western and northern parts of the Peninsula will chase residents and visitors away. This will affect the health and economy of the Peninsula and the state of Washington. The tourism industry has become an important part of the Olympic Peninsula economy. The search pattern of jet Growler flights looking for emitters would roar above the ocean beaches, the Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges, Washington State Department of Natural Resources land, The Olympic National Forest, Quinault, Quileute and Hoh Reservations, and thousands of acres of private land, including the towns of Forks and Amanda Park. The EIS/OEIS identifies that each pass will sustain 85-100 Decibels of noise per pass. The People in Forks recorded 94 decibel flights under the current operations. As a retired Speech-Language Pathologist, I have concerns about the cumulative impacts of the noise levels on the bearing and communication abilities of adults and children, particularly children in schools and patients and staff in hospitals located in the proposed training area and surrounding areas. I am concerned that these noise levels will also have detrimental effects on tourists visiting Olympic National Park, the National Refuges, the Olympic National Marine Sanctuary and the surrounding areas. They come for the quiet and the unique environment. The conditions set up by the noise levels generated by the Growlers are not consistent with a restful vacation. We know that noise causes stress in people, and that long term stress is related to high blood pressure, heart disease and mental health problems, which would increase the strain on rural health systems.</p> <p>These noise effects are not limited to the people on the Peninsula, but also to the wildlife. It is unfortunate that there are no studies at the present time done on the iconic Olympic elk, but it is not difficult to reason they would be affected similarly to humans, being mammals of a similar weight. One outcome I have wondered about is the startle reflex created by loud noises. Conceivably, startled wildlife would run, which could result in underweight conditions because the animals have less time to search for food.</p> <p>The Military training in the Marine Sanctuary would do damage to the ocean beaches, the marine animals of the coast, the nesting areas of many of Washington's shorebirds, migrating whales, and the birds that use the Pacific Flyway. Specifically, the electromagnetic waves emitted will</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>negatively impact the many birds living and flying on the West side of the Peninsula. We already know that both Orca pods are under stress with current conditions. The request for an extension to the NOAA permit allowing "incidental takes of marine mammals... and incidental takes of threatened and endangered marine species (EIS P. ES-4) should be denied. Many millions of dollars have been spent to move threatened and endangered marine species off of the list. The Navy's proposal is inconsistent with these efforts and should not be permitted. The degradation of the Olympic Peninsula's coastal and marine environment would be catastrophic.</p> <p>I strongly endorse the No Action Alternative as the only acceptable alternative. The other options are unacceptable to the environment and life on the Olympic Peninsula. Alternative 1 and 2 would cause unforgiveable and unnecessary damage to Olympic National Park and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. Alternative 2 is even more extreme. The warfare training as described in this Navy EIS/OEIS can and is being done elsewhere. The degradation to the Olympic Peninsula under Alternatives 1 and 2 is unacceptable. For 112 years, the citizens of Washington have worked hard with Congress and presidents, to designate areas of the Peninsula with the goal of protecting its valuable environment in perpetuity. Irreparable damage would be caused by activities done as stated in the Navy EIS/OEIS March 2019 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Northwest training and Testing.</p> <p>While I believe in Military readiness, the Navy has other options in other parts of our country. These options should be exercised. Specifically the Navy should continue to use their existing training sites. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Navy EIS/OEIS March 2019 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Northwest training and Testing.</p>	
Thompson M-1	<p>I am a resident of Mendocino County and a homeowner in the town of Gualala. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed increase in testing off of our shores.</p> <p>We know objectively, and it has been substantiated through peer reviewed research, that Navy sonar use and testing has a negative impact on marine life. This fact has not changed in the years that the Navy has repeatedly attempted to increase testing off of the Northern California coast and throughout the Pacific Northwest. A study just released this March further validates the harmful effects that sonar can have on marine life, regardless</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>of distance or frequency: https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2592 Knowing objectively and scientifically that Navy sonar testing and use has caused and will continue to cause harm to marine life regardless of how it is rationalized, the proposition to increase this testing when our local marine ecosystems are already at a vulnerable, fragile tipping point is horrifying. We have seen record deaths of gray whales throughout California this year, many due to ship strikes and entanglement. The Southern Resident Orcas are on the brink of extinction. Climate change is wreaking havoc on our coast in the form of mass bird, abalone and kelp die-offs.</p> <p>Many people in our community are fighting desperately to help protect sustain the delicate web of life that our local ecosystems (and in some ways, economies) depend on. The fact that the Navy continues to push for this increased testing shows a blatant disrespect for the voice of the people who live on the North Coast, as this is not the first time the community has expressed significant opposition to Naval testing activities from both environmental and personal perspectives. If the Navy truly honors the voice and needs of the people who live on the North Coast, they will listen to this feedback and cease plans for increased testing immediately.</p>	<p>EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Thompson R-1	<p>I have major concerns that this project will negatively affect the wildlife that inhabit the region where the tests are planned to take place. The first concern of mine is the location, and its close proximity to an endangered population of orcas known as the Southern Resident Killer Whales. The Southern Resident killer whales comprise a small group and are one of the four resident whale communities that inhabit the northwest coast of America. Right now they are a critically endangered species because of a substantial decrease in their food supply of Chinook salmon caused by commercial fishing and river diversion by dams. Other factors that are threatening their survival are noise disruption from vessel traffic and the dumping of toxic waste into Puget Sound. Their population currently consists of 76 whales, and this small number came only years after the clan suffered numerous deaths from starvation, unsuccessful births, boat accidents and most significantly, the capture of its members by humans in the 1960s & 1970s for marinepark entertainment.</p> <p>These whales are already at serious risk of extinction and these proposed sonar tests will almost guarantee this possibility is reached much sooner than anticipated. When these type of tests were conducted in the past in various parts of the world, there is evidence to prove that it resulted in a</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Regarding previous strandings, see Section 3.4.3.1.8 (Stranding) of the 2015 NWT Final EIS/OEIS, and the “Marine Mammal Strandings Associated with U.S. Navy Sonar Activities (June 2017)” (https://www.nwtteis.com/Documents/2019-Northwest-Training-and-</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>huge number of whale and dolphin deaths. High frequency sonar affects whales' hearing, which is a crucial sensory function that they need for locating food, avoiding objects, identifying predators and finding other members of their pod. Most often than not, they go deaf from the sonar blasts and will subsequently strand themselves on the nearest beach. Necropsy results produced from mass whale and dolphin strandings across the world, consistently show the cause of death as internal hemorrhaging from damaged ear drums. In each case, the military had conducted several sonar tests in an area of the ocean where marine mammals were known to be present. Sources: Schroepe, Mark. (2002). Whale deaths caused by US Navy's sonar. Nature. 415. 106. 10.1038/415106a. https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/does-military-sonar-kill/?redirect=1 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3056662/ I do not want this to be the same fate for the Southern Resident Killer Whales. This particular group of killer whales are highly valued by the communities that reside near Puget Sound in Washington state. They are a part of the cultural identity and tourism industry that are unique to Washington. They also hold significant spiritual value for Native American tribes who have inhabited the Pacific Northwest region for centuries. This level of reverence that people have for the Southern Resident Killer Whales is evident in the recent legislation that has passed to ensure their protection and survival. Source: https://medium.com/wagovernor/inslee-signs-bill-package-to-protect-aid-grow-orca-and-salmon-population-in-salish-sea-721b2d4758c9 Harming these whales with sonar technology will undoubtedly cause public outrage and I believe would not reflect well on the U.S. Navy's long-standing reputation. My second concern is the impact that this sonar testing will have on the entire ecosystem of the Salish Sea. Transient killer whales, humpback whales, otters, sea lions, crabs, sea gulls and various other marine life also inhabit this area. How will this affect their sensitive hearing? From a food chain standpoint, the role that resident and transient killer whales play in keeping salmon and sea lion populations that they prey on within a healthy range is vital; namely because it prevents proliferation of those species. This mechanism of checks and balances trickles down the food chain to the tiniest of organisms. So in theory, if the whales perished and were removed from this delicate system, the whole ecosystem might suddenly collapse. This change would consequently affect the fishing industry and the</p>	<p>Testing-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Documents/2019-Supplemental-EIS-OEIS-Supporting-Technical-Documents).</p> <p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy has considered conducting training and testing in other locations; however, as stated in Section 2.4.1.1 (Alternate Training and Testing Locations), other locations fail to provide all the attributes necessary for effective training and testing.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>livelihoods of people that depend on it. It is a matter of science, a matter of ecological systems knowledge to understand how interdependent the relationship is between nature and humans.</p> <p>My third and final concern is more of a question: What other options can be explored for sonar testing? I understand the importance that sonar technology serves for navigation and surveillance in underwater military operations; however can its functionality be tested at a naval ship port instead of out in the ocean? And if not, can it be done in a more isolated section of the ocean where marine mammals are known not to frequent very often? I believe these questions should be taken into consideration before moving forward with this action.</p> <p>To be clear on my stance, I am deeply opposed to this plan and I ask that you please reevaluate all the mitigating factors involved to ensure that the negative effects of sonar tests on whales, dolphins and porpoises are kept to an absolute minimum.</p>	
Thompson S-1	I am 100% against the US Naval sonar testing. It's not fair for you to perform those tests in someones home.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Thornton Ang-1	I urge the Navy NOT to increase the volume or types of testing used as marine mammals are already under sever strain due to climate change. Adding this excessive sonar stress to their environment is counter to the wellbeing of our oceans, and harms the cultural and spiritual well-being of marine species and habitat for the indigenous tribes of the west coast. I stand with the Intertribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council against the Navy's proposed course of action.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Thornton Ann-1	Please stop Sonar testing it is harmful for many forms of Marine life	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Thornton M-1	Please prohibit Sonar testing it harms Marine creatures	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Thornton W-1	How can the claim that the testing will not be detrimental to marine mammals and wildlife be substantiated? I don't believe you can. Please provide proof your sonar testing will not be harmful to whales. Please convince me how the aquatic species mammals, fish, will be protected.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Thunen-1	I have been a resident of the Mendocino coastal area for over 40 years. I am writing with concerns about the proposed Naval sonar and explosive testing off the Mendocino coast. We know that sonar damages, at the very least, the hearing of whales and other sea mammals. Whales navigate, feed, and communicate by sound. A whale who cannot hear, cannot survive. We know that underwater mines and missiles the navy explodes are live ammunition, full of toxins which will sink to the ocean floor. Gray Whales are bottom feeders. Also, changes in prey species (fish) would be affected by sonar transmissions, probably killing or at least damaging the development of the eggs of one or more important mammal prey species, and disrupting the life cycles of such species. Even if the results were not fatal, they would be	The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities. The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>liable to cause relocation, at the very least.</p> <p>Of late (within the last month), there have been recurring whale deaths along the Pacific Coast. NOAA has been studying this phenomenon to attempt to ascertain the cause of the die-offs. The SEIS needs to take into account the already stressed gray whale population. Considering this, will the Navy provide updated studies in the SEIS reflecting the current crisis?</p> <p>Would you consider slowing down your proposed procedures to allow enough time for current scientific data to be added to your SEIS?</p> <p>Sonar and explosive testing off the Mendocino coast would be very damaging to the fragile oceanic ecosystem on which our human population relies. Our ocean and its sea life are vital to the economy of our area, and must be preserved.</p>	<p>Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Thurston-1	<p>STOP torturing the Olympic Peninsula, Olympic National Park, Forest and the waters off the Olympic peninsula. This EIS is bogus. There is already the ability to use the Yakima Range with so much less harmful impact - so please do so. The Navy is harming people, the environment, the peninsula's economy, the animals and much more. Stop this bogus deployment. In the name of protecting our country the Navy is the terrorists.</p> <p>The noise from flights over my home (in Port Townsend) are obnoxious, but even worse these noise levels are physically harming people on Whidbey Is and in Forks (high blood pressure, heart disease, mental health issues). Time for the Navy to look at the facts.</p> <p>We have unique coastal waters off our coast, with sensitive ecosystems and wildlife, including endangered species, which are being harmed by Navy activity. There are thousands of miles of ocean waters that could be used instead.</p> <p>This EIS does not consider any accumulative impacts and therefore is so short sighted to be totally inappropriate. And the impacts on wildlife are not anticipated.</p> <p>If this EIS becomes fully operational, the noise level will make vacationing on the Olympic Peninsula no longer a destination, thereby harming the economy of our communities.</p> <p>These are just some of the reasons the EIS is bogus. We the people demand that you protect the environment and the people by ceasing your operation of growlers over the Olympic Peninsula, over the National Park and other operations in and through the waters off the coast of the Olympic peninsula. We demand that you PROTECT for real, NOT harming with the false and limited analysis in the EIS. Please do your job correctly - Protect the people and the land.</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Nevada are not reasonable. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety).</p> <p>The analysis of impacts on wildlife is covered in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences), and the cumulative effects are found in Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Tidwell-1	<p>My name is Ken Tidwell. I've lived for a number of years on the Big Island of Hawaii, where I studied Hawaiian language. Ho Opono Pono. I was a member of Intenders of the Highest Good, and I've had many spiritual awakenings, one of which was in relation to whales, which was a telepathic gut-level communication. When the Navy first started operations on the sonar off the Big Island, people were noticing the humpbacks were leaving the islands prematurely than they used to do. And in my gut-level communications with the whales, I felt that they were trying to tell me that they understood human beings, that they loved us. And I felt some remorse that there was something I should do on behalf of the whales. My teacher, my kumu, gave me an ancient Hawaiian name of Kohola, which is an ancient Hawaiian word for whale. My mother used to live with Byrd Baker, who was one of the first people in the state of California, in the late sixties and early seventies, to drive down to the Bay Area with a carved whale on top of his jeep to boycott the Japanese embassy for their continual slaughter of the whales. I am in contact with a diver who is working on behalf of Hawaii wildlife, who has monitored, filmed, and been an advocate for the environment there for many years. His name is Terry Lily. And I have been told by him that these Navy-sponsored public input things are typically just a formality, because they are required by law to do so, which I've just been told by one of the Navy members here to substantiate my belief as to why these public opportunities to speak up on this subject exist. I am also told by a number of people that have worked for many years that NOAA typically green-flags these operations. And to date there has never been opposition to say no. In other words, even with the public outputs, nothing has changed. My desire, my curiosity in participating here tonight, is to find out if there are any members here from the Coastal Commission. Because I am told that the only thing that's different about California than Hawaii is we do have a Coastal Commission. And my purpose of being here is to find out if there's a member of the Coastal Commission, if they've attended this, and if not, why not. And I will follow up after my statement this evening to find out if the Coastal Commission could perhaps be more effective than just simply green-lighting another Navy operation. Just because the public's allowed to speak does not mean that things can change on behalf of sea creatures or the environment. I believe that the ongoing experiments for weapons is an irreversible madness to be the one that has the most weapons that can do the most damage on a global scale, which is a form of sickness in mankind's mind. It's destructive, and it ends in the ultimate doom of all life on this planet, which I think a more</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	reasonable human being would oppose. These are my comments, and I thank you for your time.	
Timm-1	Sonar hurts my ears, Radar etc does not allow me to sleep at night due the the high frequency vibrations I hear. We don't need war machines we need something that will make peace with the environment and development of more sustainable technologies to live in harmony with everyone. Your activities will add to global warming and pollution of the environment. Please no war games along the California Coast.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Timmers-1	I am 100% against underwater sonar testing. It is harmful to marine mammals. Please stop.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Timpson-1	This sonar testing is devastating to marine mammals especially the endangered southern resident orcas who are regularly in the area. Someone explain to me why idling boats must stay 300 yards away because the mouse noise they make is affecting these cetaceans so adversely yet this incredible mouse noise is acceptable. There is no "national security" reasons possible that make this acceptable. Ban sonar testing. Shameful.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Tippett-1	<p>The Navy argues that it has been doing training of this time for a long time and it's "No Action Alternative" is to continue the levels of damage as in the past. Unfortunately, the newer equipment being tested will have significantly more destructive impact on wildlife than that tested in the past. The Navy needs to balance its mission to "properly defend itself" and the well being of the Nation it purports to defend. Within the training area are the transit zones of migratory birds and marine mammals including whales.. Whales have very acute hearing capabilities that marine biologists have shown are damaged by the loud sound pressure levels in seawater that the Navy uses and tests. In addition, whales' "hearing" underwater can range for hundreds of nautical miles. Science has also shows that sudden concussions cause deep diving whales to suddenly charge for the surface, causing nitrogen narcosis in their circulatory systems and death. It is certainly within the range of the Navy's actions to consider the natural world of the planet expendable to its mission of pursuing and defending the imperial incursions of the United States Government, protecting and enabling U.S. based corporations around the world. The Navy could also choose a course of action which defends the future of our Nation's children for generations to come. These two missions, given the climate crisis, would seem to be mutually exclusive. The Navy's testing proposal supports the first, not the second.</p> <p>For these reasons, I request that the Navy re-think its proposed testing regimen, and I support rejecting the proposed EIS as inadequate and drawing inappropriate conclusions.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Tivel-1	<p>We live on the North Fork of the Skagit River directly in line of flights going in and out of Ault Field on Whidbey Island. As the Growlers fly over us they are low and slow on their approach to Ault Field. As a pilot at one of the open house's we attended pointed out to us, we live in one of the maximum noise areas for these flights because of the flight corrections taking place in that space. We have owned our property here for 28 years. During that time we have definitely noticed a big increase in flying and noise levels in our area. We love living here most of the time. It has been our dream home and we hope to live here for a long time going forward. The only negative to that, and it is a huge negative, is the noise levels we have been exposed to when the older Prowlers and now the newer Growlers fly over. As stated in a recent scoping meeting pamphlet the Navy identified the Growler as quieter because scientific measurements indicated that the Growler emits less sound than the Prowler during most flight profiles. Noise levels vary depending on where you are in the flight</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>pattern. The comprehensive noise study conducted for the 2012 EA acknowledged that the Growler is louder during arrival than the Prowler was. Unfortunately, as far as our neighborhood is concerned, given that we are on the arrival path of the Growler, we experience a much louder noise level, consistently over 105 decibels and sometimes reaching 120 decibels, than the average level reported in your study. NIOSH, the National Institute of Safety and Health, states that noise levels above 85 decibels are considered hazardous and levels above 100 decibels risk permanent hearing loss. At one of the open house's we attended we had a conversation with the folks studying noise levels. They informed us that the average decibel readings, over a 24 hour period, were done using simulations and computer modeling. We don't feel that these models are accurately able to measure the real time maximum sound level experienced in our neighborhoods. It is simply unbearable to be outside and not much better in the house. We can feel the house and windows shake as the planes pass over. We have to plug our ears as the planes fly over. This is no exaggeration. We have observed the wildlife and domestic animals cower and try to get away from the deafening level of jet noise. Conversation, talking on the phone, listening to or playing music or watching TV is impossible. My wife is a medical provider and is unable to consult with other providers or her patients when the need arises when she is at home during periods of flight training exercises. We had to spend over \$2000 for hearing aids for my wife at the age of 61. She had to purchase a \$400 amplified stethoscope so that she could continue to work in her family practice clinic. Our guess was the jet noise played a part in that hearing loss. We have had good neighbors move away because of the noise and our property values are going down. We are approaching 70 years old now. With the Navy's decision to add aircraft and increase flights we are afraid we will also have to move instead of enjoying our retirement where we had hoped.</p> <p>We know that training is essential. We would urge you to use actual field measurements in the affected areas of the noise level readings during different phases of flying. It is our hope that the navy will reconsider the concerns of all its neighbors, environmental agencies, and health organizations and not add more planes and flights to Whidbey Island. We also hope that all alternatives will be looked at including noise suppression and relocating training to less populated areas.</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Toffoli-1	PLEASE! Stop that cruelty, please. You do not own the animals. The world is being destroyed because humans have no compassion. Enough to take so many lives 😞😞😞😞	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Tolotti-1	Stop Navy Sonar testing in PNW waters! This effects ALL marine life but most importantly our precious endangered group of southern resident orca!! These whales need our help not more destruction in their native waters!	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Tomczak-1	The area under consideration is one of the most peaceful and stunning places on earth. The species potential affected are numerous. My family and I implore you to consider these factors and deny a renewed permit. Human beings need quiet places to escape from the pressures of city life. These spaces should be preserved as sanctuaries for humans and animals. Thank you for your consideration.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Tooch-1	This has got to stop!! Our oceans are directly related to our survival. Killing sea life just isn't acceptable in this fragile state that we are in presently. Stop sonar!!	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Torrance-1	This will deeply affect the PNW. Whales are a wonder of this world that need to be preserved and nurtured NOT exposed to testing merely because of their habitat.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Tough-1	<p>I am very upset that Growlers are flying over Olympic National Park disturbing the quiet of this beautiful natural area that has been set aside for the pleasure and NEEDS of Americans. Specifically I am concerned about Vets who have served our nation and have come home with psychic scars because of battles and warfare they have been in.</p> <p>Many vets had found their way here to the Peninsula, specifically Olympic National Park, a place known as the park that is the quietest in our nation. Here they found peace and solitude, here they could begin to heal, here they began to shed anxiety and stress left from their time serving in the military.</p> <p>I live in Uptown Port Townsend and hear the Growlers and wonder what damage is happening to the historic buildings which I adore. I would risk these buildings and offer more flyovers here to save the park, to save the quiet, so those vets and any of the rest of humanity who need quietness and nature to have the opportunity to recover and heal.</p> <p>Please stop the Growlers going over the Olympic National Park!</p>	<p>Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year. When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year).</p> <p>3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day.</p> <p>4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.</p>
Toulgoat-1	<p>the navy is the biggest polluter, poisoner, and destroyer, the biggest threat to a safe, healthy environment...there is nothing safe about Coupeville OLF....NO crash zones unless you count our homes, schools, and hospital. Taxpayers have already bought and paid for state of art infrastructure at LEMOORE use it and get the hell out of Whibey, no room for jets.navy is the worst neighbor ever. remember the navys operating code.."PROTECTING YOUR FREEDOM WHILE WE POISON YOUR ENVIRONMENT" after the navy has f!@\$%^ed up everything nice, what the hell will you defend then ?</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com</p>
Toulgoat-2	<p>Stop The Rape of Whidbey by navy jet trash... protecting your freedom while we poison your environment. <i>[expletive deleted]</i> the jets...</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Whidbey Island. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com</p>
Tracy-1	<p>U.S. Navy get the plastics out of our Pacific Ocean and our food chain! I demand a true public hearing where those attending can hear and respond to the community's comments in total. The slick marketing of your plan by non-naval personnel is off putting and not appropriate to activities with such a magnitude of harm.</p>	<p>The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.</p>
Tracy-2	<p>Your plan to monitor potential harm is ineffective as many species deaths will sink undetected to the ocean floor. The National Marine Fisheries Service permit that allows harm to blue whales 9,248 times and short beaked common dolphins 6.8 millions is a mockery of protecting our</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	marine mammals & other species. A deaf whale is a dead whale. No sonar soundings are safe or acceptable. Your plan will harm our viable tourist industry with such pollution as well as our migratory whale festivals each year of which we are economically dependent. U.S. Navy Dept. of Defense, not Offense, to US citizens and the millions of ocean individuals under our protection.	EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Tracy-3	I don't believe the Draft EIS/OEIS takes into account the acidification of the ocean and the effects that will have on the tonnage of heavy metals that will be left to pollute our fragile marine ecosystem. I witnessed the effects of high pitched sound on a pod of orcas and it was clear that they grouped together trying to avoid the sound with no way to avoid. This is cruel and unusual punishment to mammals who we still have so much to learn about. Sonar can explode the eardrums of not only whales but other marine species causing irreparable harm when our fishing industry is threatened by the loss of kelp. A recent whale beaching in SoCal showed significant amounts of plastic. That is the real threat to Americans. Micro plastics at every depth of the ocean.	The Navy discusses ocean acidification in the context of climate change in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) and 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality) of the SEIS and includes information from scientific studies conducted since 2015. The Navy acknowledged in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) that "metals tend to dissociate" in more acidic ocean conditions. The Navy added a reference back to these two sections in the sections analyzing the impacts of explosives (Section 3.1.4.1) and metals (Section 3.1.4.2). Note that corrosion can also act to insulate ordnance and other metal items from contact with seawater and sediments, slowing or even halting further corrosion and movement of metals into the adjacent sediments and water column. The effects of climate change on the ocean environment, particularly effects specific to a particular region like ocean waters in the Pacific Northwest, continue to be researched and to evolve and are not necessarily predictable. For example, as described in Section 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality), increases in ocean acidity are believed to reduce the availability of carbonate in the water column, which is needed by organisms to generate calcium carbonate structures. However, increases in sea surface temperature associated with climate change appear to stimulate calcification at an even greater rate, essentially overriding the inhibiting effects of lower pH levels and leading to unexpected high abundance of coccolithophores (which build protective scales from calcium carbonate) in some ocean regions.
Traversino-1	Please move this operation to somewhere that does not have the real possibility of hurting or killing endangered whales.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Treadway-1	Please I implore you not to conduct these tests! They are cruel immoral inhumane torture criminal not necessary! You all are educated people of science you know better...please do better! Empathy love compassion and a morale compass should be required in every and all fields!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Treanor-1	<p>Please respect the Southern Resident Orcas' Endangered Species status and take steps to mitigate further harm - prohibit testing and training in these waters. Please ban sonar and explosives in these waters, as these activities can harm marine life. Our Southern Residents need quiet in order to "hear" their prey.</p> <p>As a reminder, during a 2003 training session, the J pod quit foraging and instead spent time and calories trying to leave the area instead of hunting and eating.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Please read the discussion of the event involving the USS SHOUP presented in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, this Supplemental EIS/OEIS, and the cited U.S. Department of the Navy (2004) <i>Report on the Results of the Inquiry into Allegations of Marine Mammal Impacts Surrounding the Use of Active Sonar by USS SHOUP (DDG 86) in the Haro Strait on or about 5 May 2003</i>. Pearl Harbor, HI: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for an accurate understanding of the event involving the USS SHOUP in 2003.</p>
Treesinger-1	<p>Using studies that were conducted as far back as 1984 for source material for your EIS/OEIS draft is wholly unacceptable. So far this year, 70 gray whales washed ashore on the west coast, five times the average rate. And I am concerned.</p> <p>NOAA has declared a wildlife emergency. The SEIS at 3.4.282 states that "military expended materials will sink to the ocean floor". At 3.4.302 the SEIS states that "for the most part," this material will be ingested by bottom feeders, including the Gray whales which is a bottom feeder. The SEIS needs to take into account the already stressed gray whale population. Scientific studies have shown that explosives and SONAR are detrimental to marine animals. For whales and dolphins, listening is the way they see and communicate and is integral to their survival. Under these circumstances, will the Navy provide updated studies in the OEIS reflecting the current crisis? Until NOAA's study on the die-off on the Gray Whales is complete, shouldn't any disruption of the ocean by sonar and explosive activity be halted?</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy uses the most current marine mammal population data available from the National Marine Fisheries Service. The 2008 and 2010 references cited in the comment were not used by the Navy to determine current populations.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/gray-whales-stranded-west-coast-1.5119056 https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533 The economic considerations are well-stated in the letter of opposition to sonar testing off the coast of Mendocino County by the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors in their letter to you dated April 21, 2019. To paraphrase: sonar and explosive testing off the Mendocino coast is detrimental to the fragile oceanic ecosystem on which we rely. The wide variety of sea life is a key economic source for our county and must not be damaged in any way. Will you please slow down this process to allow enough time for current scientific data to be added to your SEIS?</p>	<p>partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p>
Trejo-1	<p>My first comment would be that I really appreciate you guys coming over and giving us information of what is going on. Although I like the setup, I don't like where it's at. I don't feel like a school site is appropriate for a public hearing like this, because I feel like it puts the teachers that would otherwise come and voice their opinion or make a comment or want to learn more in a pickle. The superintendent approved me to be here, but they did not approve any other organizations to be here tonight. So we have about 500-plus administrative people between all the sites, and I don't think it's okay that they would feel in a pickle, just from my personal conversations with the teachers around this area, that they feel uncomfortable coming and voicing their opinion. I also believe that's why we have a lot of people missing here. Because they're the most informed in what's going on in the community. I know that you guys got this for free, so for future reference, there is the library that has a free room to do this at. And it's a public library, so that everyone could come and share their comments. The second thing is I was talking to some of your information people, and I feel like I got a lot of good information. Overall, my final decision is that I don't agree with any of the testing, not just in this area, but in the whole northwest coast. I know that you guys have a base in Washington and that it would mostly be based there; however, if it gets permitted in the whole area that they're proposing it to, then we as civilians wouldn't get notice, the fisherman would, and you guys can change your minds at any point over what site you would choose to use. Over here in Fort Bragg, it's a very seasonal place. And we have whale festivals, we have multiple whale activities, and people come to visit because they see the whales offshore. And I know that it doesn't kill them, but the fact that it does Level B harassment on the whales and that it could</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Navy will continue to evaluate the best locations to conduct its public meetings, and the concern you raise will be helpful.</p> <p>The potential impacts to the economy are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism and Recreation). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	change their behavioral patterns and whether they come around or not would be a huge impact to our community here in Mendocino. Because we have whale watching, whale festivals, we base everything off of the sea life. And that is our main resource of income now that we don't have logging. So I think that's something to consider when they are making their final decision, that it could impact a whole economy on the coast.	
Trick-Thornton-1	<p>"Is the Navy going to continue on with testing without the results of the NOAA investigation into the 2019 mass beachings/deaths of West Coast whales"? How could they continue without results?</p> <p>Since the Navy is currently testing, and the Navy is asking for permission to continue testing, the above question needs an answer !!</p> <p>The Navy's soundings, detonated explosions will have a residual affect on ALL mammals and leave a residue in the ocean.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Trinh-1	Please stop the naval sonar testing. It kills marine life. Please.	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Trolin-1	<p>Ecosystems are not complicated, they are complex systems— in a complicated system one can pull out and repair the offending mistake, re-insert, and voila, complicated system fixed. Ecosystem complexity is a chain of irreplaceable relationships tied to a place. If these relationships are not maintained, the system fails.</p> <p>We have mistaken our relationship with our ecosystems, in our centuries-old industrial delight with ourselves, as tinkering with yet another complicated system. We are finally having to reckon with the fact that we do not comprehend the brilliant complexity of our earth's wild and complex</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>systems and that we are killing our own home.</p> <p>To me, and if you as the branch of government tasked with protecting me and keeping me safe, in fact want to actually do that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spend half of your budget helping restore the tipping and damaged eco-balance of our water, earth & air. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stop disrupting our already fragile watery balance of our coast, with harmful & unnatural sound and pollutants. Our necessary quiet with growlers and pollutants. And our earth with more compacting, noise making & pollution spewing. b. Roughly 50 years ago humans began using more of our earth's resources than can be replenished. You are the largest military behemoth on the planet and responsible for an oversized portion of this resource loss. Without the ecosystem balance of this planet intact, money is a meaningless "resource". 2. Spend the other half of your budget developing technologies of peace. Image that world! <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. In the name protection you destabilize every ecosystem to which you come in contact. Look to how to protect through peaceful engagement-- (towards people, animals, plants air, earth & water). b. Example: the equatorial band of our planet will be uninhabitable in less than 50 years, and every human and animal in that band will attempt to migrate north or south on our fragile blue pearl. These people (and animals) are not our enemy, they are us. How will you help? <p>I realize that this is not a technological refuting of your plans for my home, but I'm sure you will have received a lot of that in this comment period. What I am asking is that you really look around. I am asking that you see that the paradigm has already shifted. Rise to that challenge with all your brain power and resources as my military. You could actually be of help. The earth has room for us, but it does not need us. The wildness of this planet in all its complexity is the reason we survive as a species. Earth cannot and will not tolerate-- and in fact is not, tolerating human domination. (paraphrase of writer Robert Bringham)</p>	
Trugenberger -1	Don't use the Dolphins as bomb. It's not correct	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Trugenberger -1	Please don't use dolphins or any other animals for your purposes. It's cruel and they are born to be free and we as humans have no right to use them as objects.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Trygstad-1	I strongly oppose all weapons testing and military practice activity that even might possibly affect wildlife off the pristine coasts of Sonoma, Mendocino and Humboldt counties of California. I am a registered voter and have participated in every election since I was 18 in 1981.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Tsantis-1	<p>Dear Sonar Representatives,</p> <p>Under no circumstances is sonar testing acceptable when marine life is so threatened by human impact as it is. We already have decimated species with oil leaks, plastic and chemical waste, crowded seaways where whales are run over by shipping liners and killed, shall I go on??</p> <p>Please please be respectful of the Orca population that are dwindling and need our help to survive. Please be mindful that NO WILDLIFE SHOULD SUFFER FROM PAINFUL SONAR vibrations and sounds. That's disgusting!! That you would think this is ok!!! It's not!! Our wealth is in our wildlife and flourishing ecosystems! Not in armaments!! Our planet and it's wildlife are calling for us to STOP KILLING OUR PLANET!! It's more important, now more than ever, to give to our planet, prioritize and care for it. Before it's too late 🌍🙏</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Tuck-1	<p>I believe the NAVY already knows what this does to cetaceans. I am a US citizen and I am 100% against sonar blasting a and testing of any kind! I would like to see an end to all sonar frequencies that Ken Balcomb has researched to be harmful. The book by him, War of the Whales, shows how much effort has been made to stop this barbaric practice to save the whales. Let's end this and never revisit this topic again. Please stop using harmful sonar testing and blasting at all but, especially where a critically endangered species is actively trying to survive! There are two babies out there, for goodness sakes have a dam heart!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Tucker-1	<p>Imagine living in an environment where you couldn't get away from that awful noise, day in day out and couldn't protect your family from it either. It has to stop we are killing our oceans and their inhabitants which will eventually be our downfall as we need the oceans to survive</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Turley-1	<p>Our orca populations are struggling. It's vitally important that we as a people recognize this, and do what we can to mitigate it.</p> <p>If that means sonar can only be used in certain places or times, then that's what we need to do. We are going to wind up presiding over the final years of many of our oceanic species if we don't understand and care about the affect we have on these creatures' populations.</p> <p>Human beings have long passed the point that they can do what they want in the natural world without repercussions. We have to do what we must now to make up for the mistakes of the past.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Turnoy-1	<p>The things I want to see avoided are as follows:</p> <p>Navy personnel emerging on beaches where families are recreating.</p> <p>Sonar that disturbs whales, who are currently threatened with extinction in our area.</p> <p>Electromagnetic radiation that affects animals.</p> <p>Growler flights that are so loud that they stop school classes from being conducted.</p> <p>If you can avoid these things while still conducting your training, then go for it. But what is the point of training your people to protect our quality of life if there is no quality of life due to your actions?</p>	<p>The Navy's proposed activities do not include Navy personnel emerging on beaches where families are recreating.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>
Turnoy-2	<p>The Navy is ruining the quality of life in the Northwest for not only humans but other creatures as well. Your Growler flights have just been increased</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>with the addition of 36 new jets. The noise from these flights is unbelievable, even interrupting classrooms. Is this the sound of freedom? I don't think so. This whole flight training needs to be moved to where there aren't people living.</p> <p>As to nonhuman creatures, our Orca whales are currently at a 30-year low in population. Their communication system is very advanced, and your sonar totally interrupts their communication and is helping to cause their demise. The Orca is the signature animal in the Northwest, and you are causing its eventual extinction.</p> <p>The US needs to stop doing so much training and focus on war. The world is so dangerous because of our bellicose, aggressive, intrusive foreign policy and the maintenance of an empire. Let's end this and spend our money for life, not for killing. Someone needs to say no to this military industrial complex warned about 60 years ago by President Eisenhower, a military man. Why don't the folks with the Navy in the Northwest make it their business to end this madness?</p>	<p>the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved. <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Twieten-1	<p>The government and big businesses need to stop <i>[expletive deleted]</i> with the oceans. You work for the ppl.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Twomey-1	<p>Approximately 26 gray whales have been found dead since the beginning of the year 2019 along the California coast. Since dead whales can sink, there probably are many more that did not show up on land.</p> <p>Populations of starfish, giant kelp, and abalone have been devastated in recent years. Purple sea urchins are thriving and appear to be monopolizing the delicate ecosystem along the California coast. Diversity of species is noticeably declining.</p> <p>Small particles of plastic are being digested by many sea creatures and the long term consequences are not yet known.</p> <p>Large masses of plastic, other man made debris, and possibly traces of Fukushima nuclear waste have made their way into the Pacific Ocean.</p> <p>Can the U.S. Navy guarantee that the proposed Northwest Training and Testing combined with all or any of the above will not be the TIPPING POINT for accelerated decline of an already threatened and fragile ecosystem and food chain ?</p> <p>In the spirit of symbiosis, can the U.S. Navy re-direct these funds to more dolphin and whale research to better understand their sonar abilities and apply what is learned to improving US Navy Sonar technology ? Although a Science Fiction novel, the book LEAP by Michael C Grumley can show how to use creativity to ultimately improve our understanding of sound, tones, acoustics, and movement and apply this better understanding to improving sonar technology and our ability to detect foreign objects in the sea. Has the US Navy team involved in the testing EIS done any creative brainstorming to assess alternatives to this testing ?</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Tyner-1	<p>Do NOT release these so called "stressors" into Any environment. The ocean is a living organism and supports living creatures. Introducing</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	anything into this environment will have a negative impact on the lives within.	(Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
U		
Uphoff-1	<p>To those it should concern,</p> <p>If those suggesting this EIS is valid take the time to live for even 2 weeks on the Mendocino Coast and become in touch with the marine environment there, then they would know, that such testing off the Mendocino Coast would mean environmental disaster. Any scientist who has done even the most basic research and is truthful in their findings would include the facts that the sonar the navy uses bursts and/or leads to burst eardrums of sea mammals, and the underwater mines and missiles they explode are live ammunition and full of toxins - that need to be cleaned up but aren't! None of this testing is necessary close to shore or at all. Most particularly NOT in our local Mendocino ocean where the marine life congregates to breed and feed on a great upwelling of nutrients and the entire food web that supports.</p> <p>Our oceans have barely hung on through the effects of Fukushima and current climate changes. We have had massive kelp, bird and fish die-offs and whales and dolphins have to reroute even more densely to shore due to effects of cold current changes. We have more species to support coming from the south where waters have become too warm.</p> <p>Please pay attention to the fact that if the ocean is ruined - so are all those whose it supports - including human and whole communities.</p> <p>View these below and wake up!</p> <p>In peace and wellness,</p> <p>Karin Uphoff</p> <p>https://earthjustice.org/news/press/2013/court-rules-that-federal-agency-failed-to-protect-thousands-of-whales-and-dolphins-from-navy-sonar</p> <p>https://www.biologicaldiversity.org/news/press_releases/2018/navy-training-exercises-12-20-2018.php</p> <p>https://www.hcn.org/articles/military-alaskans-at-war-with-u-s-military-over-readiness-exercises</p> <p>https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/does-military-sonar-kill/</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Urbano-1	<p>Please do not continue with the fossil fuel death sentence to our planet.</p> <p>Please have mercy with the remainder individuals of this endangered creatures.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Utamie-1	Orca needs help A.S.A.P Please join	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
V		
Van Buskirk-1	Please stop the "WAR PLAY". You as an ELITE GROUP PAID TO PROTECT AND DEFEND or ENJOY THE POWER AND GAMING. BETWEEN THE TOXINS LEFT BEHIND AND DISREGARD FOR OUR PLANET AND LIFE IN GENERAL...UNBELIEVABLE PERMANENT LOSS FOR ALL!!! Blessed Be Mother Earth 🙏🙏🙏	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Van der Eerden-1	Stop testing in Our oceans	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Van Galder-1	<p>So disheartening to learn of plans to greatly expand training exercises for Growler pilots in our pristine Pacific Northwest where our wildlife and citizens enjoy scenic tranquility so rarely found in our country. I've learned there are many other suitable sites for such training among 6 or 7 states.</p> <p>Hard to understand how justification is provided with the casual'cavilier statement for justification: "it's convenient".</p> <p>My understanding is first and foremost our government is to foster the concept of "pursuit of liberty and happiness" for us all. Well, what's happening seems to be oppositional to this. What truly mystifies me is that the government is not only not protecting our citizenry but is deliberating taking action to promote the decimation of the aforementioned ideals. The incessant noise of these growlers should be transferred to one of various sites relatively uninhabited (i.e. Utah, Texas, etc.).</p> <p>I'm not arguing with our need for military protection, but have serious questions related to the cavalier attitude expressed regarding a decision that will have long lasting adverse consequences on the quality and livability of life on our beautiful peninsula.</p>	<p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTE Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
van Groning-1	I urge you to end with the underwater sonar testing wich have been proven to cause massive harm to marine animals. I am 100% against underwater sonar testing. I hope and pray you will decide to end these underwater sonar testings.	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
van Kuijk-1	Please stop sonar testing. I work with marine animals and sonar sounds are extremely harmful to them.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Van Ness-1	Please do not empty these harmful items into Puget Sound. We are trying to clean up the waters not contaminate them more. People and sealife go in these waters. The orcas are disappearing. We eat fish from these waters. Please do not dispose of these items in such a thoughtless harmful way.	In the course of the Navy proposed activities (listed in Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) of the EIS/OEIS), some expended materials are left behind in the ocean. The potential impacts of these actions was thoroughly analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the EIS/OEIS. Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals. All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
van Noppen-1	Please do not move your electronic warfare training to NW Washington. The "Growler" jets flying 5,000 times a year will disturb, scare the whole Olympic Peninsula. The people, the bird flyway, other birds and animals. It will also disturb the Marine Sanctuary. The Olympic National Park is one of	Aircraft flights over the Olympic Peninsula are not new. The Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	the last quiet places on earth. Your jets will ruin that. Thank you for considering these things.	<p>While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year. When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved.
Van Strum-1	<p>The Supplemental EIS with a few magic keystrokes completely redefines the No Action Alternative, a key element of all previous Navy environmental documents, thus precluding any valid comparison to the 2015 EIS that it supposedly supplements:</p> <p>ES-4: No-Action Alternative: "Under this approach, which was used in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS, the analysis compares the effects of continuing current activity levels (i.e., the "status quo") with the effects of the Proposed Action. The second approach depicts a scenario where no authorizations or permits are issued, in which the Proposed Action does not take place, and the resulting environmental effects from taking no action are compared with the effects of implementing the proposed action. The Navy applied the second approach in this Supplemental in response to comments.... Consequently, the No Action Alternative is inherently unreasonable because it does not meet the purpose and need."</p> <p>To clarify the import of this change: -- ALL previous Navy environmental statements and documents have</p>	<p>In regards to providing a "continuing action" No Action Alternative, the Navy applied a scenario where no authorizations or permits are issued, the Navy's training and testing activities do not take place, and the resulting environmental effects from taking no action were compared with the effects of the Proposed Action (refer to Section 2.4.2.1 [No Action Alternative] of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS). This approach supports NMFS' regulatory process by presenting the scenario where no authorization will be issued. Additionally, this approach responds to comments submitted at various stages regarding the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and during the scoping process of this SEIS/OEIS. However, Section 2.4.1 (Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration) has been expanded to include a Continuing Action Alternative. This alternative considers no change to the training and testing activities as approved in the 2015 NWTT Final EIS/OEIS and the Navy consulting with NMFS under the MMPA. The Navy determined that this alternative did not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action after thorough consideration.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>defined the No Action Alternative to mean the alternative of maintaining the status quo, i.e., current levels of actions and impacts. Proposed alternatives were compared to those current levels of actions and impacts, clearly showing increases in actions and impacts.</p> <p>-- The No Action Alternative is now arbitrarily redefined in the Supplement to mean the Alternative of no Navy activities whatsoever.</p> <p>-- This redefinition removes from all consideration the option of continuing status quo current levels of activities. In short, the only Supplement alternatives are to cease all Navy operations or to accept a proposed/preferred alternative.</p> <p>-- Removing the status quo from its analyses also removes any comparison between current levels of actions and impacts with proposed levels, i.e., removing any data showing how greatly such levels and impacts will increase over previous ones.</p> <p>This redefinition creates havoc with all discussions, tables, and appendices addressing the increased or decreased number of activities, bombs, ordnance, expended materials, etc., in which the "No Action Alternative" column or statement is either omitted entirely, or is inexplicably replaced in the Supplement by a "2015 Final EIS/OEIS" column or statement.</p> <p>To change so fundamental an element of an EIS requires an entirely new EIS, rather than a confusing and ultimately pointless supplement, since it most definitely does NOT supplement the 2015 EIS, it supplants it completely. In so doing, it destroys any possibility of rational decision-making by the Navy, or rational observations and comments by scientists, legislators, concerned members of the public et al., required by NEPA..</p> <p>THE FORMAT, ORGANIZATION, AND CONTENT OF THE SUPPLEMENT DIFFER RADICALLY FROM THE 2015 EIS/OEIS</p> <p>Largely due to the redefined No Action alternative, the format, organization, and content of the Supplement differ so drastically from the 2015 EIS/OEIS that it is difficult if not impossible to compare amounts and impacts of past, current, and proposed actions.</p> <p>For example, see Supplement, Appendix F Military Expended Material and Direct Strike Impact Analyses, Table F-2 (page F-11): "Number and Impacts of Military Expended Materials Proposed for Use During Training Activities in a Single Year Under Alternatives 1 and 2." This table lists the number of bombs, bullets, chaff, targets, sonobuoys, torpedoes, etc. for Alternatives 1 and 2, with totals of each category for each alternative. Table F-3 (F-14) lists the amounts of such expended materials during Testing Activities, again with totals of each category for each alternative. However, because</p>	<p>As stated in Section 2.4.2.1 (No Action Alternative) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, "the analysis associated with the No Action Alternative is carried forward in order to compare the magnitude of the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Actions with the conditions that would occur if the Proposed Action did not occur." The No Action Alternative was sufficiently analyzed, and a Supplemental Draft EIS/OEIS is not warranted.</p> <p>The Navy has taken a hard look at the cumulative effects of the incremental impact of its proposed actions when added to other past present and future actions, against the appropriate resources and regulatory baselines. The Navy used the best available science and a comprehensive review of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to develop its Cumulative Impacts analysis. As required under NEPA, the level and scope of the analysis is commensurate with the potential impacts of the action as reflected in the resource-specific EIS, discussions in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental consequences). The EIS/OEIS considered its activities alongside other actions in the region when those impacts are cumulatively significant. Past and present actions are also included in the analytical process as part of the affected environment baseline conditions presented in Chapter 3. The Navy has done so in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality 1997 guidance. Per the guidance, a qualitative approach and best professional judgment are appropriate where precise measurements are not available. Where precise measurements and/or methodologies were available they were used. Guidance from the Council on Environmental Quality states it "is not practical to analyze cumulative effects of an action on the universe; the list of environmental effects must focus on those that are truly meaningful."</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>the Supplement tables do not include a column of 2015 status quo data and because there are no corresponding discussions or tables in the 2015 EIS/OEIS, there is simply no way to tell how much any activity or item will be increased or decreased since 2015. Given that the whole point of issuing a supplement is to indicate such increases or decreases, this massive discrepancy renders the Supplement useless.</p> <p>This is not an insignificant issue. For example, comparing the annual expended training materials totals for the preferred alternative in Supplement Table F-2 (above) to the only comparable data available, annual totals for preferred alternative in Table 3.4-33 (page 3.4-55) in the 2010 NWTT Final EIS, the increases since then are well beyond unequivocally significant:</p> <p>2010: "No Action" status quo total = 98,161 expended training materials total</p> <p>2010: Preferred alternative total = 189,299 expended training materials total</p> <p>Increase from No Action status quo = 98,138</p> <p>2019: Preferred alternative total = 321,364 expended training materials total</p> <p>Increase from 2010 preferred alternative = 131,065</p> <p>Increase from 2010 status quo = 229,203</p> <p>Nor is this an isolated fluke in the Supplement, which repeatedly omits any baseline data in its proposed alternatives, such as the useless charts in Appendix E, which supposedly estimates impacts to various marine species from sonar and explosions. There are NO data from 2015 or any other time to compare these impacts to, making it impossible to determine whether the impacts have increased or decreased.</p> <p>By changing the definition of "No Action alternative," the Supplement conveniently and misleadingly omits such comparisons, so the public has no idea of the magnitude of the Navy's continuously metastasizing activities and clogging of our ocean with its "expended" materials, especially when the Supplement admits openly to analyzing impacts without looking at such increases, e.g., "Although the overall amount of metals introduced to the Study Area would increase, the analysis is not dependent on quantifying that amount." (Supplement, p. 3.1-27).</p> <p>Because the 2010 "No Action" status quo data are, as the Navy asserts, "representative of activities the military has been conducting in the study area for decades," one must assume at least two prior decades at the same level. Furthermore, it is important to recognize that these data represent</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>annual deposition of such materials, year after year, increasing by more than 100 percent each decade. One need only look up the Navy's record of such behavior in Vieques, or a map of the Gulf of Mexico seafloor, littered with Navy expended and unexploded ordnance dumped there, to question severely the Navy's repeated cavalier assumptions of no significant impact. REDEFINING NO ACTION INVALIDATES THE ENTIRE DISCUSSION OF CUMULATIVE IMPACT</p> <p>By redefining "No Action," thereby absolving themselves of quantifying increases in activities and impacts, the Supplement nullifies any possibility of analyzing the cumulative impacts of such increases. Instead, the "Cumulative Impacts" section of the Supplement repeatedly refers back to itself or to the 2015 EIS/OEIS to reach entirely unsupported boiler-plate conclusions -- repeated like a mantra for every habitat, animal, bird, sea turtle, etc. -- that "further analysis of cumulative impacts on [insert animal here] is not warranted."</p> <p>The "Cumulative Impacts" section is also seriously defective in omitting any mention of similar, often identical, U.S. Navy activities in the Pacific Ocean. While the Navy issues environmental impact statements for its activities off southern California, Hawaii, Alaska, the Mariana Islands, etc., nowhere does it examine or analyze the combined effects of all these activities on the entirety of the ocean itself. These Navy activities all together have profound impacts that are not limited to the geographical confines of any Navy operation areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Hazardous materials, toxics, heavy metals, plastics, solvents, etc. are carried throughout the ocean, as was so dramatically demonstrated by the arrival on our shores of debris and radiation from the Fukushima disaster in Japan. -- Each Navy operations area contributes incrementally to rising carbon dioxide levels and the warming and acidification of the entire Pacific Ocean. -- Whales, turtles, fish, and other marine life move freely throughout the Pacific Ocean, which in its entirety is their habitat. <p>The cumulative impacts of all Navy activities in the Pacific must therefore be addressed, either in a new EIS including all Navy operations areas, or at the very least in the "Cumulative Impacts" sections of this Supplement and other separate Navy EIS documents. (See 40 CFR § 1508.25)</p> <p>For the above reasons, the 2019 Supplement should be withdrawn and either a new EIS or totally rewritten Supplement be issued, without redefinitions of alternatives compromising all analyses.</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Van Wyck-1	I am a Former Bellingham / Seattle resident And the safety of the southern resident orca populations as well as the protection of our other marine life is very important to me, I understand that the Navy is required to run tests and drills however there needs to be more regulations for doing so, such as the navy doing their best to stay away from sensitive marine life and habitats. Sonar testing is very painful to these animals the southern resident killer whales already have enough problems as it is without being bombarded by our Navy	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Vanderhoek-1	We need to protect our sea life, not hurt it by testing things that don't need to be improved.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Vashnevsky-1	Navy's Sonars exercise in the Oceans costing lives of Mammals. Sonars noise burning all the tissues in their ears eventually deafness & death. If we lose all these creatures ? What's going to happen to our own future ? You think we can exist without them ? Not a chance. Our future depends on every Mammals we got in the Oceans. I am asking this for next generations 🙏 Thank you	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Vashnevsky-2	Navy Sonars exercise in the Oceans damaging all mammals ears, this noise will burn their ears Tissues & they will be def in no time and eventually they	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	die 🙏 Whiteout these creatures God knows what will happen to our own lives and our future existence. Which we all should be worried.	and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Veitch-1	Against it!	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Venarchick-1	No more military training in the national parks located on the Olympic Peninsula. Our natural habitat needs to be preserved, completely and in solitude for the mental health of our people's and for the physical health of our parks and the wildlife within. The military already has vast swaths of land under its control and within the borders of military bases. Use that land.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Vergara-1	I'm against what U.D navy is doing in the ocean affecting marine life. This doubt be more control by government and respect other beings life.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Vermeulen-1	<p>Rachel Carson, author and environmentalist, called the oceans "the great mother of life".</p> <p>Without healthy oceans there will little future for the land. The marine mammals that are being deafened, terrified, killed due to military testing, are essential to the ocean's balance. Please halt this assault for the present and future of " the great mother". Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Vernet-1	<p>Sonars must not be allowed to disrupt whales and other marine animals. It means certain death to them.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Verschuyt-1	<p>I live six miles from the Ault Field runways in Oak Harbor, Washington. I hear Jets passing over my home frequently, daily. I go to the Olympic National Park and the coast of the Olympic peninsula to have a break from all the noise, the pollution of the Jets, the low-flying Jets below FAA</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	regulated altitudes, the stress of it all. Please do not take away my refuge of peace and quiet by flying over the Olympic Peninsula Coast.	MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.
Vidayer-1	The military including the Navy is amongst the most polluting activities on the planet. These past & planned activities kill thousands of marine mammals and dump tons of toxic materials into the already stressed ocean. The cumulative effects are disastrous in this time of climate change catastrophe. Who is the Navy's enemy? Who will protect us from the Navy.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Vilardo-1	Sonar testing harms marine mammals. Please reconsider your decision to allow such testing. I own a dive store and am very concerned about the health and well-being of all ocean inhabitants.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Vincenzi-1	From Italy we say stop this and save the srkw	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Viola-1	Please please please stop doing underwater stressful sounds for the conservation and protecting of marine life. They already are under so much	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	stress, searching for food they don't find, sounds from boats, plastic and chemicals pollution, and more. Please, if you care a little for our planet and nature, stop it now.	Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Vitorino-1	I am 100% against sonar testing. It is unacceptable.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Vitorino-2	I ask that you stop sonar testing in the Salish Sea. This is harmful to the animals in this ecosystem; which is already in a fragile state. Your testing is unnecessary and dangerous to this ecosystem and the animals that live here. I ask that you stop this testing promptly.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Voigtlander-Panagiotou-1	It is time to stop bombarding the oceans and the seas with noise pollution! The evidence is clear that all marine creatures are adversely affected by sonar testing, by underwater explosions, and by the constant bombardment of their senses. It is harmful, affecting their hearing, their bodies and their brains(cognitively making them disoriented, causing them to beach themselves and even causing death). There is too much overall pollution and harmful garbage in the seas already. The Navy should not be using these weapons, for that is what they have become, when it is proven that there are other methods. The seas are not ours to destroy. The harm and subsequent death of marine life affects the overall biodiversity as such also affecting us. Enough is enough!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
von Christierson-1	See attached comments Please extend the comment period to a total of 90 days. The "No Action Alternative" is the only one that makes sense for the Olympic Peninsula.	The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The activities stated in this EIS will damage Olympic National Park and Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. • This training operation will change one of the quietest places in America, Olympic National Park/Hoh Rainforest, to never again. • Since 1907, areas of the Olympic Peninsula have been set aside to protect the Peninsula wildlife. Beginning with Theodore Roosevelt and a series of congressional acts, this protection is in wildlife refuges, a national park for the enjoyment of its citizens, elk, other unique wildlife, wilderness areas to protect the resources from human damage, and a national marine sanctuary. The area the Navy wishes to convert into an electronic warfare training area has been designated as an environmentally sensitive area for 112 years. • In the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, the EIS is asking for extension of a NOAA permit for "incidental takes of marine mammals... and incidental takes of threatened and endangered marine species." [EIS p. ES-4] • The Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary was set aside by Congress to protect the sea life of the area. The Naval activities will cause unnecessary damage and should be and can be, done elsewhere. • The noise of jet training emitter search flights will be harmful to the wildlife, people of the Peninsula, and the visitors to it. This makes the plan a detriment to the health and economy of the Peninsula and the state of Washington. • Idaho and Nevada training areas were designed for warfare training—the Olympic Peninsula was not. • This is not the way to treat a national park or a marine sanctuary. They were created to protect our environment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy says there will be 5,000 "Growler" jet flights a year over the Olympics. [EIS Appendix J, p. 12] (This would be an average of more than 19 search flights per day over the "Study Area"-5000 flights/260 days). This does not include training flights going out to and from vessels off the coast. • Noise levels (admitted to by the Navy) within the Olympic airspace range from over 80 dB to 100 dB at times [EIS J-22], which the Navy compares to hearing a garbage disposal to a handheld drill [EIS p. J-5]. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Continued exposure to noise above 85 dBA (adjusted decibels) over time will cause hearing loss. The volume (dBA) and the length of exposure to the sound will tell you how harmful the noise is. In general, the louder the noise, the less time required before hearing loss will occur." [Center for Hearing and Communication] 	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Nevada are not reasonable. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>To ensure compliance with the National Marine Sanctuary Program regulations and the interagency consultation requirements of National Marine Sanctuaries Act section 304(d), the Navy considered all proposed modifications to training and testing activities to determine whether they have the potential to destroy, cause the loss of, or injure sanctuary resources, or result in adverse impacts on sanctuary resources or qualities. Accordingly, the Navy and NMFS submitted a joint Sanctuary Resource Statement to the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries.</p> <p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People in Forks have reported hearing 94 dBA flights under current EIS • There are other health problems that are caused or made worse by noise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise causes & aggravates health problems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High blood pressure (hypertension) • Heart disease (ischemic heart disease) • Increases or creates mental health problems • Other locations for this training are dismissed in 7 lines (out of 1,800 pages) as not offering the same proximity of ships and planes elsewhere in the Pacific Northwest (EIS Section 2, p. 2-21). But with millions of miles of coastline in the U.S., what about other parts of the country? • Growlers will be routed over Olympic National Park, Lake Crescent, Sequim and Port Townsend as they transit back and forth between their Whidbey Island base and the Olympic training areas over the Hoh Rainforest and Forks (map on p. 2-19) (19-20 times 2 = 38-40 passes over this area a day). The map also shows arrows of flight over the Olympic Mountains. The Navy has denied flying over Olympic National Park. This is untrue. Not only is this untrue, it is nearly impossible not to fly these missions over the Park. • "This Supplemental (EIS) does consider the cumulative impacts from these three projects as well as other past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future actions in Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts)" [NAVY EIS p. 1-9]. This is an unacceptable statement because the EIS does not. The EIS assumes if there is no study, then none is needed. There is a list of activities that could be cumulative; the list is far from complete. • Information on off-shore activities are vague but asking for "incidental takes" of threatened and endangered mammals is very concerning. • Many of the wildlife impact statements end with "are not anticipated." This usually means the result is unknown because of a lack of experience or knowledge. • Noise effects on people: EIS research reference is "Miller, J. D. (1974), Effects of noise on people. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 56(3), 729-764." [EIS p. 3.9-110] Unbelievable that there are not more recent studies on this subject. • If this EIS becomes operational, vacation trips to the Peninsula will no longer be a relaxing getaway. 	
von der Lahr-1	<p>Stopp sonar! Because it's the right thing to do!</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Von vacano J-1	Please protect The Orcas! It is so important to do this! These are wonderful animals and we must Help them.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Vonlanthen-1	Please stop.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Vrooman-1	<p>I'm very concerned about the training and testing you have planned. After reading lots of information about the negative ecological and environmental impacts your training and testing will have I don't agree with you proceeding in the direction you have planned.</p> <p>I ask you to please include use of sonar in the prohibited activities in the 50-mile mitigation area. As you know sonar causes serious harm to the health of whales and other marine mammals and can lead to their death.</p>	<p>Training and testing with active sonar is essential to national security. The Navy uses active sonar during military readiness activities only when it is essential to training missions or testing program requirements since active sonar has the potential to alert opposing forces to the operating platform's presence. Passive sonar and other available sensors are used in concert with active sonar to the maximum extent practicable. The Navy will implement procedural mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals wherever and whenever activities occur in the Study Area. In addition to procedural mitigation, the Navy developed mitigation</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		areas to further avoid or reduce potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important habitat areas. For example, the Navy will restrict certain activities or types of sonar year-round within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, seasonally within the Point St. George Humpback Whale Mitigation Area and Stonewall and Heceta Bank Humpback Whale Mitigation Area, and year-round in the Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca Mitigation Area to help the Navy avoid potential impacts from active sonar on marine mammals in important foraging and migration areas. Additional mitigation for active sonar (e.g., prohibiting sonar within 50 NM from shore) would be impractical to implement for the reasons described in the Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) and Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar).
Vrooman-2	Your testing will have a cumulative effect of ocean acidification that should be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives byproducts in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. This conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.	The Navy discusses ocean acidification in the context of climate change in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) and 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality) of the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS and includes information from scientific studies conducted since 2015. The Navy acknowledged in Section 3.1.3.3 (Climate Change and Sediments) that "metals tend to dissociate" in more acidic ocean conditions. The Navy added a reference back to these two sections in the sections analyzing the impacts of explosives (Section 3.1.4.1) and metals (Section 3.1.4.2). Note that corrosion can also act to insulate ordnance and other metal items from contact with seawater and sediments, slowing or even halting further corrosion and movement of metals into the adjacent sediments and water column. The effects of climate change on the ocean environment, particularly effects specific to a particular region like ocean waters in the Pacific Northwest, continue to be researched and to evolve and are not necessarily predictable. For example, as described in Section 3.1.3.6 (Climate Change and Marine Water Quality), increases in ocean acidity are believed to reduce the availability of carbonate in the water column, which is needed by organisms to generate calcium carbonate structures. However, increases in sea surface temperature associated with climate change appear to stimulate calcification at an even greater rate, essentially overriding the inhibiting effects of lower pH levels and leading to unexpected high abundance of cocolithophores (which build protective scales from calcium carbonate) in some ocean regions.
Vrooman-3	In the Draft SEIS you referenced the "best available science" - please expand this to take into account Tribal Traditional Knowledge. They have vast knowledge and years of experience along the coast. Please reconsider your training and testing plans.	The Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		As stated in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the term “traditional resources” is used to encompass protected tribal resources.
W		
Wachtin-1	<p>Hello, firstly thank you for giving a chance for feedback. I strongly oppose the U.S. navy sonar testing and training in the Salish sea. This would most definitely adversely affect so many Salish sea mammal residents not to mention the very at risk southern resident Orcas!! These endangered mammals rely desperately on hearing with communication (as they are extremely social with their families)and also their hunting for food. The last thing they need at this vulnerable time is one more obstacle in their fight for survival! This is 100% unacceptable</p> <p>“ For marine mammals that utilize sound extensively, limiting their ability to recognize these frequencies in sound is going to limit their survival, “Calambokidis said</p> <p>This is their home, we are suppose to be doing everything we can to ensure their survival, not jeopardize them further!!!</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Waddell-1	<p>I am against holding military trainings over and within sensitive and protected lands of Puget Sound and Salish Sea. This is not the location to be carrying on the proposed activities. There are many other options with fewer impacts on people, marine life, animals, parks that draw tourists and residents.</p> <p>Please re-consider the proposal to include other areas better suited to the proposed activities that have not been considered heretofore.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy has considered conducting training and testing in other locations; however, as stated in Section 2.4.1.1 (Alternate Training and Testing Locations), other locations fail to provide all the attributes necessary for effective training and testing.</p>
Wagner-1	<p>The Olympic Peninsula is a sanctuary and as such contains Olympic National Park. Navy flights and electronic testing are directly counter to the purpose for which this park was designated. The movie Plane Truths should be attached to this comment as support for this assertion.</p> <p>Sonar testing is counter to the preservation of our native Orca population, which the Governor has proposed a budget of \$1billion to protect. Endangered species will be impacted. This is not news to the Navy - and choosing to ignore these impacts is irresponsible and illegal.</p> <p>WA State citizens cherish the Olympic Peninsula, and I anticipate that the Navy will be facing legal action if this proposal is put into effect. Please consider the costs of a protracted legal battle as part of the consequences of proceeding.</p> <p>My Dad is a Navy WWII Veteran from Port Angeles, and considers this proposal by the Navy to be a betrayal of the Navy duty to preserve and protect.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA’s designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA’s designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Waitkevich-1	I am 100% against underwater sonar testing which is proven to harm sea life. There are 76 critically endangered orcas as well as other necessary sea life for the health and wellbeing of our environment. We all depend on good stewardship. This is so much more impressive than continued harm and disregard Do the right thing	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Walden-1	Underwater sonar has been proven to be very harmful and even fatal for some species of marine life. It has caused hundreds of whales and dolphins to be driven into shore where they die. This is an unacceptable practice, especially in whale breeding and calving areas.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Wales-1	I am appalled at the Navy's decision to increase the Growler Training force based at Whidbey Naval Air Station. With the vast number of sites available to use nation-wide, it strikes me as CRUEL and OBLIVIOUSLY SELFISH that the Navy would choose this site over so many other potential ones in less-populated or desirable locations. How can destroying property values, livelihoods, marine and wildlife protections and finally, showing a little RESPECT for others compromise it's mission? If factoring in such other variables somehow seems to compromise the mission, then perhaps the mission is the Problem!! There is simply dwindling shoreline and island places available on our coasts and the property values are proof of that. Thousands of people have spent their lives earning enough to afford such property. The increasing roar of those jets is already ruining what people have spent their lives trying to acquire. Frankly, if the Navy proceeds with this plan, I believe they should have to re-imburse those millions of dollars people have sacrificed to invest in their homes. Others can discuss all the other serious negative impacts on wildlife and marine ecosystems, but my question remains: What is the Navy prepared to do to compensate for or replace the dreams and fortunes of thousands	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Final Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training farther from NAS Whidbey Island, either farther at sea or at other land training areas was considered and rejected. Additionally, the Olympic MOA is desirable for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure, environmental conditions that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness, and other factors stated in 2.5.1.1.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>of people? And how would that even work in this day when such properties are no longer available?</p> <p>In a word: the Navy's thinking is about 75 years out of date---wake up to what's currently our reality. And while you entertain this kind of thinking, you might also want to simply ask: HAVE YOU NO SHAME???</p> <p>The majority of these training exercises do not have to be conducted along our shoreline and could instead be conducted far from shore minimizing the impact on birds, fish, marine mammals, other wildlife and communities. There is no evaluation for other locations which could significantly reduce the harmful impacts of these exercises. Training around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas could be avoided if that was a priority for the Department of Defense.</p>	
Walker L-1	<p>I am writing to voice my opinion on the planned naval exercises off the Mendocino coast in Northern California. These exercises have been known to cause severe damage to whales, pinnipeds, seabirds, etc. Please reconsider, especially since it appears that these exercises may run right through the gray whale migration path? Our oceans are valuable to all creatures.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Walker S-1	<p>As a marine scientist and citizen, I am very concerned about sonar testing, as an experimental and destructive forceful underwater activity detrimental to many marine mammals, species and biological resources of Puget Sound and the Washington Coast. Many marine species are on the brink of extinction now. The expanded Navy practices will push them over quickly into extinction - forever. Sonar testing decimates the hearing, ability to hunt and eat, communication and health of many of the iconic marine species of Puget Sound. Many of these marine animals could be exposed to sonar multiple times. Tens of thousands of harbor porpoises live in inland Puget Sound waters. Dozens of other creatures in the Salish Sea would be affected in lesser numbers. The endangered southern resident killer whales are desperate for protection! for they are already on the brink of extinction. Because of sonar testing, the southern resident orcas will die and endangered humpback whales in waters off California, Oregon and Washington would suffer temporary hearing loss 277 times and alter their behavior 221 times.</p> <p>Please stop! and think about what you are doing to the planet and the people you claim to defend! Please reduce the number, extent, volume and frequency of sonar testing proposed, dramatically. Show how smart you are and completely avoid the need to test in critical habitat, sensitive areas</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	and marine sanctuaries. Reduce your sonar testing proposal to the bare minimum in critical habitats for endangered marine animals and be real protectors, set good examples as human beings tasked with caring for others.	
Walker S-2	<p>I am writing due to our grave concerns about the Navy plans for Northwest Training and Testing over the Olympic Peninsula. The Olympic Peninsula is home to tens of thousands of people, living, working, playing, visiting towns, cities, beaches, mountains and experiencing the National Park, a World Heritage Site, an International Biosphere Reserve with a coastal Marine Sanctuary. The Olympic Peninsula is home to farms and fisherman, loggers and families, forests and wildlife. It is home to National Wildlife Refuges and DNR camps and wilderness. It is home to food and music festivals, maritime trades and colleges. It is not a place suitable for warfare training! The Navy's plans for increased Growlers and warfare training is wholly incompatible with the people that live and depend on a healthy and peaceful way of life on the Olympic Peninsula. We have been here for decades; some centuries; building relationships and businesses, contributing to family and community. The Navy's plans for expanded warfare training over our home will devastate our families, our communities, our livelihoods, not to mention the forest sanctuaries and the wildlife. The economic effect of the Peninsula would be absolutely devastating!</p> <p>Your plan is also unacceptable due to the health risks to humans and animals that live in this region. The extremely loud Growler noise causes my blood pressure to rise, ruin our days off, drown out our family gatherings and keep us sleepless at night as they growl to late into the night overhead. It is like living in a war zone. The Growlers very loud and low noise profile impacts human health in a very negative manner causing problems to people's health and to the economy they depend upon for survival. Why would visitors or tourists want to come and visit here anymore if it becomes even more of a warfare training area? I can only imagine what the noise is doing to the sensitive species on the brink of extinction and to the first peoples, our Treaty Tribes that live on the Quinault, Quileute, Makah and Hoh Reservations. Your expansion plans are wholly unacceptable for they will destroy all of our ways of life. Finally, the Navy has demonstrated a complete lack of respect for the environment and the people it pretends to protect and support. The public meetings have been few and far between and the comment periods have been woefully inadequate. Please extend the comment period to a total of</p>	<p>The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. For this reason training complexes in Nevada are not reasonable. The training complex in Idaho is controlled by the Air Force and does not have the capacity for both Air Force and Navy operations. The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA) is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>The Navy's proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential health effects of Growler and other activities on humans are discussed in Section 3.13 (Public Health and Safety).</p> <p>The potential impacts to the economy are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism and Recreation). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>90 days! This is very important since the people of the Olympic Peninsula have not been adequately informed or given time to understand and/or comment.!</p> <p>The only acceptable option to me and my family is the No Action Option Alternative. This Alternative may not meet the wishes of the Navy, but it is the only Alternative that allows us to continue to survive here. The Navy needs to consider other options for its training and demonstrate their desire to protect us, not harm us. The Navy needs to return to train in areas like Idaho and Nevada like they have been for decades. These areas were designed for warfare training. The Olympic Peninsula is NOT a warfare training area!</p>	
Walker S-3	<p>The Navy is conducting sonar (active sound navigation and ranging) and setting off underwater explosives in the Olympic Marine Sanctuary, Straits of Juan de Fuca and areas of Puget Sound. What is there to mitigate once you have damaged and decimated marine species which depend on sonar to find food and quiet waters in which to navigate and survive? These loud and damaging underwater training and testing measures directly and very negatively impact multiple marine species, including endangered salmon and orca. What type of marine species mitigation measures are effective when all of these species are currently being decimated to extinction?</p> <p>Please stop testing explosives underwater and eliminate or minimize your sonar testing within inland and protected waters, such as Puget Sound, the Straits of Juan de Fuca and the Olympic Marine Sanctuary where salmon, orcas and other marine species feed to survive. It is a tiny consideration and very small favor to ask you to move your testing into deeper, outer waters beyond the Olympic Marine Sanctuary to protect an entire marine ecosystem. Is it any wonder our salmon and orcas are starving and dying in the Pacific Northwest? The Navy's continued practices in the name of sonar and explosives training should be fully revealed to the public as being the primary reason we have decimating loss of marine species to the brink of extinction in these same waters of the Pacific Northwest.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Wall-1	<p>Feeling good about the "Visualization" and "Accuracy" associated with the Navy Acoustic Effects Model is a mistake. The model's "correctness" depends upon having predictable marine mammal location/behavior data as input to the modeling process. Ongoing data collection on marine species, especially in this time of our changing oceans would indicate that migration patterns and feeding patterns are in a time of uncertainty relative to preceding years. In addition, the Navy's real-time mitigation plan</p>	<p>Please see the 2018 technical report titled Quantifying Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Methods and Analytical Approach for Phase III Training and Testing (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2017) for details on how the Navy accounted for the differences in captive and wild animals in the development of the BRFs.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	is far too dependent on the on-deck, binocularized marine mammal spotter. The area chosen for acoustic and weapons testing is a known migration path, feeding ground nesting place and home for many sea creatures and birds. While it is relatively easy to measure and model variables such as current, sea bottom type, sea water density, temperature. However, it is not easy to predict or to discern the presence of marine life in a certain area. And it is also essentially impossible to identify and catalogue the damage done to our sea creatures and their food chain by this testing. Why choose such an area to conduct live testing? And why would the National Marine Fisheries Services approve it?	The Navy uses the best available science in the analysis which has been reviewed by external scientists and approved by NMFS. The Navy has utilized all available data for the development of updated criteria and threshold, as well as presence and behavior of marine mammals.
Wallace-1	Sonar testing has been proven time and time again to severely injure these living beings. You know that is caused them to feel pain and to suffer, often leading to death. And yet you STILL want to use sonar? I can't help but feel sorry for you. What is wrong with your mindset that you feel it's okay to do this kind of harm? I, as an American Citizen, in the land of the oppressors and home of the terrorized, urge you to stand against harmful testing such as sonar.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Wallis-1	Just some common sense and Care, for these Amazing Mammals,, Wake up, do we have to Lose these,,sea animals to wake up! 😊	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Wallner-1	We live in a society where we are so driven to see what can be achieved that we continuously fail to assess whether or not we should. Why is it that we are ok to destroy wild life and the planet? Our progress is at best moving us towards our own annihilation. Please don't do something which once again harms an endangered species. We need to do better for our kids and not the pocketbooks.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Walsh A-1	Totally against any underwater noise that negatively affects the lives of marine mammals.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Walsh K-1	During the past five months over 30 gray whale carcasses have been spotted along the West Coast. This is the largest die off in 19 years. Starvation is the primary cause according to the results of several necropsies that were conducted. Clearly the marine food chain is not functioning well at this point in time and the results may be far reaching to numerous other marine organisms. I am strongly recommending that the Navy cease and desist from the training activities described in the draft supplemental EIS/OEIS until there is evidence of a recovery of the marine food chain. Of Particular concerns are the activities that involve hydro-acoustical impacts and explosives. Valuable training activities can be conducted without the monetary and environmental cost that deployment of these devices entail. When the ocean dies, we die. Now is the time to	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	seek solutions to what we are witnessing occurring on the Pacific Coast; we cannot afford to continue to impact the marine environment with the training exercises that are described in the EIS/OEIS.	Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. As described in Section 5.2.1 (Procedural Mitigation Development), the Navy's analysis assumes that due to limitations such as those mentioned in the comment, Lookouts will not be 100% effective at detecting all individual marine mammals.
Walsh P-1	Must stop sonar testing in the endangered pnw orca habitat.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Waltz-1	<p>I am against the decision to allow the United States Navy to conduct sonar tests and exercises in the Salish Sea, off the Washington Coast. Numerous scientific studies have been conducted on the harmful and damaging impacts of sonar testing on marine life. The US Navy has already been taken to federal court and been told to limit long-rang sonar testing for the sake of marine mammals (https://www.nrdc.org/media/2016/160718) s following an incident in 2000, where sonar exercises in the Bahamas were direct cause of death for 17 beaked whales. Their hearing was severely damaged and were so disoriented, they became stranded. (https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2002/01/navy-admits-sonar-killed-whales)</p> <p>The Salish Sea is also pivotal habitat for the local orca population, the Southern Residents, who are federally designated as endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>Video shot in 2001 by Ken Balcomb, founder of Center for Whale Research, of a Navy ship conducting exercises in the sea showed distressed Southern Resident orcas fleeing from the source of sound.</p> <p>On top of that, having these exercises scaring off the local wildlife will potentially cause damage to the local economies (San Juan Island, Victoria [CAN]) and communities that rely on ecotourism. Visitors from all over the</p>	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>US and the world come to the Salish Sea to not only visit the orcas, but to see the unique ecosystem.</p> <p>War games are not an excuse to wreck local communities and local fauna.</p>	
Wanagel-1	<p>Why is there no Alternative for Quiet?</p> <p>I am an extremely avid backpacker in the Olympic National Park. More than that, I am a volunteer Chief Crew Leader for Washington Trails Association. I lead crews all over the Olympics, mostly in the Olympic National Park, to clear, repair and maintain trails. With all that time in the mountains that should be peaceful and quiet, after all, the Olympics are (were) considered one of the quietest places in the lower 48, one would think I am experiencing nothing but peace and joy while in the mountains. Unfortunately, the noise from the Growlers are inducing stress to an unhealthy level. Recently while attending a Navy open house in Port Angeles, I was shown a monitoring report from 2010 (nothing more recent than that?). The gentleman showing me that report had never been in the Olympic National Park. He did not know where those monitoring stations were. But I know. They were all at sea level or nearly so. Absolutely no monitoring has been done at higher elevations where backpackers and trail workers spend most of their time.</p> <p>I can tell you what it sounds like up there: absolutely awful. The noise is rattling and massively stress-inducing.</p> <p>Here is how loud it is: I am a deaf person who functions with cochlear implants. My cochlear implants put me back in the hearing world, allowing me to do my paid job as well as volunteer to lead those crews on trails all over the Olympics. They allow me to function. The cochlear implant processors have an automated compression when noise gets too loud. Obviously someone who has cochlear implants does not have natural hearing to protect, but the compression serves the purpose of making the noise more comfortable. It takes an extremely loud sound to make the processors go into compression mode. A sound that will set off the compression, for example, is a chain saw at close proximity. Your Growlers, many frustrating times per day, make my processors go into compression mode. That is loud! You know what happens then? I cannot communicate with the other volunteers in my crew. We will be working on a project or sawing out a large tree, where safety is critical, but I cannot hear what they are saying. The compression mode clamps down on the loudness of the Growlers, but makes it so I cannot function until the noise abates and my processors go back to normal mode. Even in compression mode, I can still hear them (and they are still loud), but the sound quality of the processors</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy considered noise impacts at higher elevations in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The analysis of impacts on wildlife is covered in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>goes all weird and it's disconcerting, to say the least. I can no longer judge the loudness of my voice and I cannot tell how much I need to project my voice so my crew members can hear me over the jets. Mostly we just stop what we're doing until the Growler noise has passed, which is never fast. Many times per day. It is aggravating beyond belief.</p> <p>Then there is the despair I feel as someone who loves the Olympics more than the air we breathe. They should be the quietest place in the Lower 48. It's a unique and diverse National Park with unparalleled beauty and ruggedness. You say your lowest elevation for flying is 6000 feet. What about us who spend many dozens of days per year anywhere from 3,000-7,000 feet? Can you imagine the noise? No, you cannot, because you don't go out there in that pristine wilderness to listen for yourself. It's brutal. It's aggravating. It's stressful and it makes me deeply sad.</p> <p>And what about the wildlife? If your noise is that troublesome for humans, what of the wildlife who depend on hearing each other to survive and thrive? Have you no concern for them? That contributes to my sadness.</p> <p>As someone who uses cochlear implants to hear, I do not like the noisy nature of humans. All human noises to me, without exception, are not pleasant. I cannot understand music. It is distorted, flatline and quite ugly, yet it's ubiquitous. Cars, dishes, background noise ... it's an ever-present onslaught of noise. Humans are a loud species. So I escape to the mountains as often as I can. It's a place that brings me joy and QUIET so that I can be at true peace. You have ruined that. There is nowhere left that is truly quiet. The Olympics should be one of the last remaining places.</p> <p>After all, it is a National Park, a uniquely special one at that, and it is way out on the edge of the country. Why can't it be left quiet? The quiet was one of the most endearing things about this Park. Can't you take that awful noise elsewhere?</p> <p>Arm me with noise monitors. I am in the mountains enough that I can collect a lot of data. You don't really know what's going on out there because you haven't been there to hear it.</p>	
Wanionek-1	<p>Please stop sonar testing! It harms marine life by disrupting their communication and feeding.</p> <p>At closer ranges, the marine mammals can become deaf and disoriented, which can affect their migration, leading them to become stranded. It's painful for them, physically and psychologically.</p> <p>On a larger scale, this effects biodiversity and the health of our planet. Humans also need biodiversity to survive as a species.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Thank you for taking the time to read these public comments and for your consideration regarding this matter!	EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ware-1	Please do not compromise my much needed quiet time on the Olympic Peninsula. We need our undisturbed nature time to rejuvenate.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Warnke-1	Hey there As a bc resident it is really important to me to preserve our habitat and the animals in it. Your sonar testing is severely effecting our marine life, please stop doing it!!!!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Warren-1	The use of sonar testing is incredibly destructive and has a severe effect on the already threatened cetacean populations. The majority of whale and dolphin species hunt through ecolocation, exposure to military sonar can damage their inner ear causing deafness making it difficult for them to feed, leading to starvation. Sonar is also incredibly distressing and disorientating and has led to cases of mass strandings caused by nitrogen poisoning.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Warrick-1	Practice navel maneuvers in a location that doesn't harm whales.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Waters-1	I am Very concerned about the Damage to Marine life and it's effects on coastal communities that DEPEND on the ocean for a major part of the Revenues that keep these communities afloat. We have Commercial Fishing industry, Sportfish industry which ALSO encompasses Whale watching,	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	abalone diving, kayaking, which intern effects the Hotels, Restaurants and Campgrounds that these visitors contribute to. What about the Tribal Nations that DEPEND on the ocean for their existance? With the damage your testing will cause, HOW do you propose a COMPENSATION package to the LOSSES these communities will endure?	<p>to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The potential impacts to the economy are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism and Recreation). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p>
Waters-2	I strongly oppose any war games off our coast, or anywhere for that matter! You only pollute, and kill our environment and innocent lives animal & human.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Watkins-1	How will the Navy guarantee that ALL forms of marine life will be not harmed by the Navy's Northwest Training and Testing? "Right now scientists are calling it a Wildlife Emergency! This includes our oceans, and right here at home on our West Coast. This is a big issue for our coastal community — including tourism and fishermen's livelihood. Many species living here have already been compromised by warming seas and overfishing—not to mention the record numbers of curious deaths of whales and recently of the common murre found dead on our beaches. I do not see how your operations will do anything but add to the already fragile situation in our ocean and in our coastal community. Please respond to my question.	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The potential impacts to the economy are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism and Recreation). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Watson M-1	Please cease all testing where cetaceans can be sensitive to sounds and driven off or injured.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Watson Y-1	We need to ensure we don't infringe any further on this animals habitat. We are slowly killing this planet and it's animals it has to stop soon. Do your tests in an area they don't frequent.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTEIS.com
Wax-1	Please halt sonar tests. Sea life depends on clear access to sounds that are relevant to them. Constant loud sounds disorient them. Have some compassion, please for fellow beings on this planet. Grey whales are dying in California! What will happen in breeding season, for instance. I beg you, please stop the tests.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Weakland-1	Goal and benefits of exercise? What are the regulations, rules, laws that exempt the Navy from harming wildlife? What guarantees, certainties,	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	absolutes that assure no wildlife are killed or injured? The necessity that no alternatives exist? Will you be honest and truthful in the negatives or outcome of maneuvers? How does this make us safer? Please explain why compensation to fisheries?	Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Wearn-1	Would any Navy official have the courage to man up and expose their ears to the intense sound testing they are doing in the oceans? The Navy is killing sea animals with these deafening sound tests. It must stop!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Weaver-1	Sonar testing is a significant way to speed up extinction for animals that use sonar communication to survive. So many ocean species are already endangered. Why harm the oceans ecosystem and terminate an entire species for military use? Please, don't continue sonar testing underwater. Our earth as a whole is already at stake.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Webb A-1	The people who live here do not want this under any circumstance.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Webb C-1	Please don't do any testing in the Salish sea	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Webb J-1	Please stop. Your harming our oceans and marine life's.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Weberg-1	Please do not harass these orcas, they are already fighting a losing battle with the decline of their food source....it is cruel and unnecessary to do your testing so close to this threatened species.	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Weerasingam -1	To Whom It May Concern: The practice of sonar testing is extremely harmful to beings that call the ocean their home. After years of conducting research, results indicate negative harmful effects to them. This practice leaves such beings with high levels of distress and some with loss of hearing. It is unacceptable and needs to be stopped immediately. Thank you for your time and consideration.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Weibel-1	I believe I commented on your NOP, the Scoping Session and now again. I am very concerned about your proposed increase of your war games in the North Pacific in the path of the Gray Whales' annual migration. Only the NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE, to deny the U.S. Navy permission to conduct warfare training and testing activities off the Northwest Coast of the US, is acceptable. Why did you call for final comments in 2017 before you asked for comments on the Draft EIS/OEIS? You apparently evaluated new relevant info, recent marine mammal density data & scientific info. After all, it was not final as some might believe. I attended your "promo" gathering run by MANTECH's staff in Fort Bragg. Against the request & wishes of the Mendocino & Lake Tribes that have since 2005 opposed Navy training and testing in the Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT) range and local people, you gave us no opportunity to hear each other's questions and your representatives' answers, and learn from each other. https://www.mantech.com/about/mission-vision-and-values In an effort to justify your war games you have funded scientific institutions and public relations firms to the tune of tens of millions of dollars per year. You buy off many oceanographic schools, research facilities, etc. to do "research" for you - exactly so you can present science fair/social	The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>engineering/dog-and-pony shows like we experienced in Fort Bragg. The culture of oceanographic schools/research grants/industry/government/military is a tight one. This process is a fraud and is not legal under the Supplemental Environm. Impact Statement (EIS)/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (OEIS).</p> <p>You are not truly describing the impacts on the environment as a result of a proposed action. Until we end the madness of nuclear sabre rattling, and by extension submarine warfare, through international diplomacy and mutually enforced treaties, no one and nothing on this planet is safe. You could play a primary role in enforcing an international treaty to ban submarine warfare, and by extension, nuclear weapons. You could also take an active role in combating climate change, to eliminate the vessel's footprint (not reduce) and do something about the large quantities of plastic that are choking the life from our oceans. If humanity is going to survive, much less the marine species that are the inevitable "collateral damage" of mankind's never-ending quest for military superiority it is time to change course 180 degrees. We need international cooperation instead of antagonism.</p> <p>We might find the answers to some of our questions if we read 1,700 pages, but your brochure and presentation were a joke. There is no way to mitigate all the issues that you will read about in all the comments unless you choose a NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE.</p> <p>You have been conducting training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades. That does not mean it is safe. The word testing sounds harmless, but you do not describe clearly what you do when you test. You indicate that you use the most current and best available science and analytical methods. If you would do that, you would not use this area for testing. You describe that you are stewards, that you protect people, their heritage, the human & natural environment for future generations. Why is it that a teacher on one of your ships observed garbage being thrown overboard? You indicate that it is likely that marine mammal populations might only have short term consequences from your war games when we face a massive loss of whales, other animals and plants.</p> <p>I am a mother, teacher, landowner and tax payer and have lived on the Mendocino Coast for 40 years I hope that my grandchildren will be able to see these "giants of the sea" and other species as well. Please protect them! Peace, not war.</p>	
Weibel-2	I live in Northern California off the Mendocino Coast and get to see Gray Whales, Humpback Whales, Orcas and dolphins. Underwater sonar is	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>detrimental to the health and livelihood of whales. Whales and dolphins rely on communicating with their pod and others. Due to the way water absorbs light (hindering the ability to see accurately) and limits smell, whales have to rely largely on sound to navigate the ocean, especially in areas where there is no light. While water may limit some of their primary senses, sound is actually enhanced in the ocean. The reason for this is that sound travels four times faster in the water than it does on land making it extremely important to the whale species in terms of survival. Whales and dolphins rely on echolocation and can therefore get an early warning sign of predators in the area and are better able to travel safely and locate potential food sources. Because of the ever increasing use of ambient sounds some researchers and scientists are concerned that these sounds being created by people may hinder the whales ability to communicate and echo-locate which is extremely important for their survival. Sonar transmitters confuses these animals and interferes with basic biological functions such as feeding and mating.</p> <p>Increased whale beachings are believed to be one of many results caused by ambient sounds. Often whales try to move rapidly away from the source of the sonar, a response that disrupts their feeding and can cause mass strandings. Environmental groups claimed that some of the beached whales were bleeding from the eyes and ears, which they considered an indication of acoustically-induced trauma.</p> <p>We can not allow this to happen to them.</p> <p>Studies have shown whales experience decompression sickness, a disease that forces nitrogen into gas bubbles in the tissues and is caused by rapid and prolonged surfacing. Although whales were originally thought to be immune to this disease, sonar has been implicated in causing behavioral changes that can lead to decompression sickness.</p> <p>Other issues that may arise from the increase in artificial sounds include brain hemorrhaging from loud noises and loss of direction as these sounds may interfere with echolocation and hinder their communication with other pod members.</p> <p>Whales are extremely intelligent species and it is believed that their communication is one of the most sophisticated forms of communication among all animal species.</p> <p>A 2005 lawsuit filed by the National Resources Defense Council in Santa Monica, California contended that the U.S. Navy has conducted sonar exercises in violation of several environmental laws, including the National Environmental Policy Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the</p>	<p>and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Endangered Species Act. Sonar has been in use by the world's Navies, and has been widely deployed since the 1960s. The Navy must follow environmental laws placing strict limits on sonar.	
Weibel-3	Navies need to follow these mitigation requirements: Not operating at nighttime or at specific areas of the ocean that are considered sensitive; slow ramp-up of intensity of signal to give whales a warning; air cover to search for mammals; not operating when a mammal is known to be within a certain range; on board observers from civilian groups; using fish-finders to look for whales in the vicinity; large margins of safety for exposure levels; not operating when dolphins are bow-riding; operations at less than full power; paid teams of veterans to investigate strandings after sonar operation; no helicopter use or other aircraft above the waterways; consider geographic mitigations; no use of explosives; follow the National Environmental Policy Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the Endangered Species Act. Some whales might be able to avoid Navy sonar from ships, but not from helicopters. The Navy sonar is so loud around the San Juan Islands that it can drown out the calls of the Orcas on the hydrophones put in place to monitor them. http://blog.seattlepi.com/candacewhiting/2017/08/30/these-whales-can-avoid-navy-sonar-from-ships-but-not-from-helicopters-public-opinion-sought-on-naval-exercises/ I am a mother, teacher, landowner and tax payer and have lived on the Mendocino Coast for 40 years I hope that my grandchildren will be able to see these "giants of the sea" and other species as well. Please protect them! Peace, not war. Thanks	The Navy considered the mitigation measures suggested in the comment. Please see Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) regarding nighttime training and testing requirements, slow ramp-up of sonar, and operations at less than full power. The Navy does use aircraft for Lookout duties when aircraft are available. When marine mammals are known to be within a certain range, the Navy applies procedural mitigation, which includes powering down sonar or ceasing the activity, which provides large margins of safety for exposure levels. Please see Section 5.5.5 (Third-Party Observers) for a discussion of on board observers from civilian groups. Please see Section 5.5.3 (Active and Passive Acoustic Monitoring Devices) for a discussion of using fish-finders to look for whales. Active sonar transmission is authorized when dolphins are bow riding because they are out of the main transmission axis of the active sonar while in the shallow-wave area of the ship bow. NMFS is responsible for investigating strandings and other unusual mortality events, so any discussion about how those investigations are conducted would be best directed to NMFS. The use of explosives and aircraft are integral to the Navy completing required training and testing and meet its Purpose and Need (see Chapter 1), so eliminating their use was not considered. Regarding avoiding specific areas of the ocean (i.e., geographic mitigations), please see Appendix K (Geographic Mitigation Assessment) for a description of the new mitigation areas the Navy is implementing. The Navy continues to conduct its proposed activities in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the Endangered Species act.
Weibel-4	GRAY WHALES The SEIS cites a study done in 2008 and 2010 to claim that there are between 17,000 and 20,000 gray whales on the West Coast. Will the SEIS update information and impacts etc. on the current population of Gray whales? See attached SEIS references in the SEIS are dated from 1984-2014 Will the SEIS address the 70+ whale deaths on the West Coast so far this year, that represent only 10% of the actual loss and take in to account that the Stressors outlined in the SEIS will exacerbated this situation? How will the SEIS address the Wildlife Emergency just announced by NOAA? https://www.paradisepost.com/2019/05/31/feds-declare-emergency-as-	The Navy uses the most current marine mammal population data available from the National Marine Fisheries Service. The 2008 and 2010 references cited in the comment were not used by the Navy to determine current populations. The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>gray-whale-deaths-reach-highest-level-in-nearly-20-years/ https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/grey-whales-stranded-west-coast-1.5119056 A recent study published in January 2019 documents the severe effect sonar has on whales. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533 Scientific studies have shown, without a doubt, that explosives and SONAR are detrimental to marine animals. For whales and dolphins, ‘listening’ is as important as ‘seeing’ is for humans, as they live in a world of water and sound. Noise pollution threatens whale and dolphin populations, interrupting their normal behavior, driving them away from areas important to their survival and at worst injuring or sometimes even causing the deaths of some whales and dolphins. 3.4-107 of the SEIS states that Gray whales in Baja abandoned an historical breeding ground due to an increase in noise and shipping activity. Until NOAA’s study of the die off on the Gray Whales is complete shouldn’t any disruption of the Ocean by Sonar and Explosive activity should be halted? The SEIS at 3.4-135 acknowledges that Gray whales are slow moving and sometimes exhibit “snorkeling activity,” they surface quietly and exhale without of any visible blow. The Navy claims they have lookouts watching for whales before they use sonar and explosives and are “very unlikely” to have their feeding and migration impacted by the Navy’s activities. How does the SEIS take into account this “snorkeling” and fog and rough seas in watching for whales? The SEIS details the presence of gray whales in six of the NWTT areas for short periods and claims that the gray whales have “low risk” of being impacted. How much risk is acceptable given NOAA’s Wildlife Emergency? The SEIS at 3.4.282 states that “military expended materials will sink to the ocean floor”. At 3.4.302 the SEIS states that “for the most part,” this material will be incidentally ingested by bottom feeders. Gray Whales are bottom feeders. Given the already stressed gray whale population should the SEIS take this into account? https://news.nationalgeographic.com/2016/03/160331-car-parts-plastics-dead-whales-germany-animals/ https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/03/whale-dies-88-pounds-plastic-philippines/ https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/04/dead-pregnant-whale-plastic-italy/ https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Two-dead-gray-whales- </p>	<p>examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. As described in Section 5.2.1 (Procedural Mitigation Development), the Navy’s analysis assumes that due to limitations such as those mentioned in the comment, Lookouts will not be 100% effective at detecting all individual marine mammals.</p> <p>The analysis of the potential impacts related to the other issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Climate change is addressed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS in Section 3.2.3.2 (Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change).</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>found-in-San-Francisco-Bay-13690102.php https://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-6954333/SEVEN-grey-whales-wash-dead-San-Francisco-beaches-just-month.html?utm_source=fb&utm_medium=post&utm_campaign=Whales&fbclid=IwAR3SRQVpBiuVILXYfTxcEEuT-oVYv_NqchZhVUwaeugAY6AgUc-4Q62B4 It is common knowledge and accepted science that military sonar causes mass strandings of marine mammals. These creatures have no defense against the lethal and debilitating effects from major underwater blasts of active sonar and explosives, and no amount of corrupt, paid-off “scientific data” will alter this fact. In 2015, the Navy asserted in its EIS that their activities will have zero mortality effects on marine mammals. The current EIS reasserts these claims, with minor changes. In addition human-caused climate change is a direct driver that is exacerbating the effects of over fishing, widespread pesticide use and urban expansion. We don’t need any more assaults! https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2019/05/06/one-million-species-face-extinction-un-panel-says-humans-will-suffer-result/?tid=ss_mail&utm_term=.3a7490738f43 With the drastic effects of radiation poisoning from Fukushima we do not need any additional toxins. Remember, we have up welling. Toxins do not just dis sapper and mix on the bottom, they end up on our dinner plate. Damage can not be undone! http://www.greenmedinfo.com/blog/28-signs-west-coast-being-absolutely-fried-nuclear-radiation-fukushima I am a mother, teacher, landowner and tax payer and have lived on the Mendocino Coast for 40 years I hope that my grandchildren will be able to see these “giants of the sea” and other species as well. Please protect them! Peace, not war.</p>	
Weir-1	<p>We are at a critical point in climate change and ecosystem/biodiversity collapse and we cannot afford to release ANY more toxic compounds or additional harmful acoustics into our environment! Making smart long-term decisions for the sake of a livable planet is the most important thing we can do right now. Please do not to release ANY heavy metals, depleted uranium, toxic chemicals, or harmful acoustics into the Puget Sound (or any oceans) or its surrounding environment.</p>	<p>Please see Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for the analysis of impacts to water quality from the Navy's proposed activities.</p> <p>Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Weiss-1	I am concerned about impacts on migrating whales off our Pacific Coasts. They migrate twice a year to and from their calving grounds, with young and sensitive animals. I would like to see restrictions on timing that would avoid the migration seasons, or on location, to avoid the corridors the animals typically use. The data discussed for example in 3.4-106-7 indicate that the impacts aren't well understood. Instead of avoiding potential impacts in the absence of clear data, you are assuming that ambiguous data is a license to proceed. I reject this assumption and support a more precaautonary approach. These are sensitive at risk populations protected by the Marine Mammal Protection Act. I encourage you to revise your plans to avoid adverse impacts on these animals.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Weisz-1	I am opposed to the use of MF SONAR in the Whidbey Island Training Areas adjacent to Whidbey Island in any capacity.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Welch-1	I am opposed to the Navy Sonar testing. It will harm the already endangered orcas and other pinniped, dolphin and whale species that live in the area.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Weller A-1	Sonar testing in the Salish would be detrimental to the ecosystem, which in turn is detrimental to the citizens that depend on those waters- for income, for beauty, and for recreation. We visit Washington annually, and the Salish has been a big part of our visits.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Weller C-1	<p>Subject: Comments on NWTT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS</p> <p>Our community is a quiet rural residential neighborhood along Dungeness Bay near the Dungeness Spit in Clallam County. When the Growler jets came to NASWI, they became the loudest, most intrusive recurring noises by far. These occur primarily from jets westbound from NASWI, but occasionally eastbound to NASWI, as they transit to and from operating areas on the west side of the Olympic Peninsula. Based upon the EIS Map Figure 2.3-1, "Aircraft Transit to and from Olympic Military Operations Areas", and discussions with Navy personnel at the Open House in Port Angeles on 4/26/2019, the Growler jet noise problem occurs as the jets follow a route to the navigation point MCCUL, about 5 nautical miles east of north from us, and then follow a route to the Olympic operating areas that passes about 3 nautical miles west of north from us. The overwhelming majority of loud aircraft noise events we are subjected to are the Growler jets.</p> <p>The EIS relies on "aircraft noise modeling" in which assumed airplane and operating information are used in a computer model. Using time averaging and logarithmic compression, seemingly innocuous numbers result. Modeling results of this sort are often offered to neighborhoods near airports in noisy urban areas.</p> <p>However, the communities affected by NASWI jets are generally low-noise rural areas. That this noise modeling is clearly not adequate is demonstrated by a sentence in Paragraph 1 of page 3.12.29, "The</p>	<p>DoD's position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD's position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p> <p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>disturbance from a single aircraft transiting over land or nearshore areas to conduct a training or testing activity in the offshore area would be brief (seconds)...” Seconds?! No! The noise disturbance here typically goes on for one to three MINUTES! Noise modeling is seriously underestimating the jet noise impact!</p> <p>But there is no need to rely on “modeling”. The NASWI jet noise and normal background levels in our communities can be reliably recorded by on-site noise monitoring equipment. Acoustic noise monitoring by the National Park Service at its Hoh River Trail site (Paragraph 4 of page 3.12.29) found the startling result that aircraft were audible 12% of the time! Monitoring would both clearly display the extent of the problem and point to methods of reduction.</p> <p>Although there is no mitigation of jet noise discussed in the EIS, there is a great opportunity here for taking some positive mitigating steps. And on-site monitoring could provide the data to identify methods and test them. These could include route adjustments and changes to jet aircraft operation such as power.</p> <p>At the Navy Open House in Port Angeles on 4/26/2019, I had the opportunity to both learn and to discuss possible mitigation with the NASWI Commanding Officer, Captain Army, and other officers. He encouraged me to submit these as comments and said that they could look into mitigation possibilities.</p> <p>(These comments were sent to you by US Mail in my letter of May 10, 2019. I have not received any acknowledgement of receipt from you, and perhaps none are being sent. So I am sending my comments to you via this electronic form also.)</p>	<p>environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>The Navy considered but did not develop mitigation for aircraft overflights, such as shifting transit routes, relocating aircrew training activities, or modifying flight altitudes, because such mitigation would not be practical to implement due to implications for safety and mission requirements. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) controls the National Airspace System and routes that overlap the NWTT Study Area. The FAA designed the routes to efficiently manage air traffic in the region and to safely deconflict military traffic from commercial and general aviation aircraft, with consideration given to the presence of Canadian National Airspace and traffic to the north. The FAA is the responsible federal agency for determining transit routes and any changes to such routes must be approved by the FAA. The Navy is currently in discussions with the FAA exploring the possibility of shifting the FAA-established transit routes for military aircraft transiting to and from the Olympic MOA from Naval Air Station Whidbey Island to the north of the Olympic Peninsula. The purpose of these discussions is to consider the efficient and safe use of navigable airspace. While ultimately any shift in transit routes is the FAA’s decision, it is possible that, if approved, such a shift will have the added benefit of reducing military aircraft noise over the Olympic National Park.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Weller C-2	<p>Subject: Comments on NWTT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS</p> <p>Our community is a quiet rural residential neighborhood along Dungeness Bay near the Dungeness Spit in Clallam County. When the Growler jets came to NASWI, they became the loudest, most intrusive recurring noises by far. These occur primarily from jets westbound from NASWI, but occasionally eastbound to NASWI, as they transit to and from operating areas on the west side of the Olympic Peninsula. Based upon the EIS Map Figure 2.3-1, “Aircraft Transit to and from Olympic Military Operations Areas”, and discussions with Navy personnel at the Open House in Port Angeles on 4/26/2019, the Growler jet noise problem occurs as the jets follow a route to the navigation point MCCUL, about 5 nautical miles east of north from us, and then follow a route to the Olympic operating areas that passes about 3 nautical miles west of north from us. The</p>	<p>DoD’s position is to utilize modeling over monitoring for activities in a MOA. Additionally, the noise model used, MR_NMap is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses¹. The following text² states DoD’s position regarding the preference for modeling:</p> <p>5.2. Noise Model Use. Operational/environmental noise scientists employ noise modeling to predict noise levels near an installation in a cost-effective, accurate manner. Noise modeling allows the prediction of noise levels at many locations for a given set of conditions, including current and proposed conditions. Noise modeling allows accurate prediction of noise levels through careful collection of data on noise source operations, robust and accurate databases of noise-source sound levels, and validated acoustic propagation prediction methods.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>overwhelming majority of loud aircraft noise events we are subjected to are the Growler jets.</p> <p>The EIS relies on “aircraft noise modeling” in which assumed airplane and operating information are used in a computer model. Using time averaging and logarithmic compression, seemingly innocuous numbers result. Modeling results of this sort are often offered to neighborhoods near airports in noisy urban areas.</p> <p>However, the communities affected by NASWI jets are generally low-noise rural areas. That this noise modeling is clearly not adequate is demonstrated by a sentence in Paragraph 1 of page 3.12.29, “The disturbance from a single aircraft transiting over land or nearshore areas to conduct a training or testing activity in the offshore area would be brief (seconds)...” Seconds?! No! The noise disturbance here typically goes on for one to three MINUTES! Noise modeling is seriously underestimating the jet noise impact!</p> <p>But there is no need to rely on “modeling”. The NASWI jet noise and normal background levels in our communities can be reliably recorded by on-site noise monitoring equipment. Acoustic noise monitoring by the National Park Service at its Hoh River Trail site (Paragraph 4 of page 3.12.29) found the startling result that aircraft were audible 12% of the time! Monitoring would both clearly display the extent of the problem and point to methods of reduction.</p> <p>Although there is no mitigation of jet noise discussed in the EIS, there is a great opportunity here for taking some positive mitigating steps. And on-site monitoring could provide the data to identify methods and test them. These could include route adjustments and changes to jet aircraft operation such as power.</p> <p>At the Navy Open House in Port Angeles on 4/26/2019, I had the opportunity to both learn and to discuss possible mitigation with the NASWI Commanding Officer, Captain Army, and other officers. He encouraged me to submit these as comments and said that they could look into mitigation possibilities.</p> <p>(These comments were sent to you by US Mail in my letter of May 10, 2019. I have not received any acknowledgement of receipt from you, and perhaps none are being sent. So I am sending my comments to you via this electronic form also.)</p>	<p>In addition, the Air Force Handbook also states the following overview of noise monitoring for noise assessment:</p> <p>6.1.1. [C]omputer modeling is the preferred and most common method of analyzing the military noise environment. Monitoring is at best a sampling of activity. Computer modeling accurately predicts the noise environment for all military operations because the Services collect source data under strictly controlled conditions. For example, each measured sound level is associated with a specific operating condition, such as power, distance, and, if a moving source, speed. In addition, noise models can account for widely varying environmental conditions. The models also can predict noise exposure from existing and proposed operations over vast geographical areas.</p> <p>The Navy considered but did not develop mitigation for aircraft overflights, such as shifting transit routes, relocating aircrew training activities, or modifying flight altitudes, because such mitigation would not be practical to implement due to implications for safety and mission requirements. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) controls the National Airspace System and routes that overlap the NWT Study Area. The FAA designed the routes to efficiently manage air traffic in the region and to safely deconflict military traffic from commercial and general aviation aircraft, with consideration given to the presence of Canadian National Airspace and traffic to the north. The FAA is the responsible federal agency for determining transit routes and any changes to such routes must be approved by the FAA. The Navy is currently in discussions with the FAA exploring the possibility of shifting the FAA-established transit routes for military aircraft transiting to and from the Olympic MOA from Naval Air Station Whidbey Island to the north of the Olympic Peninsula. The purpose of these discussions is to consider the efficient and safe use of navigable airspace. While ultimately any shift in transit routes is the FAA’s decision, it is possible that, if approved, such a shift will have the added benefit of reducing military aircraft noise over the Olympic National Park.</p> <p>¹ FAA 1050.1F Desk Reference, Section 11. Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use, July 2015.</p> <p>² Air Force Handbook 32-7067, Planning in the Noise Environment – DRAFT, June 2019.</p>
Wellings-1	<p>Dear fail army,</p> <p>I am against the use of sonar testing in marine life waters,because its a no brainer,if you have empathy for the intelligent cestaceans that have to put</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>up with your bullshit noise.</p> <p>Oceans are homes to sensitive communicating wildlife that hate you and your tax wasting test runs.</p> <p>Do your [expletive deleted] sonar testing in the lab please.</p> <p>Are you fucking intelligent or plain not listening.</p>	<p>Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Wells A-1	<p>I am volunteer at the Point Cabrillo Light Station and have spent time in Baja California, Mexico with Pacific Gray Whales. I also volunteer with the Noyo Marine Science Center in Fort Bragg, CA, helping with the effort to restore the kelp forests. I live on the coastal bluffs and observe marine life daily. I am not opposed to all testing by the Navy. My stepson served in the Navy and I respect its role in protecting the United States; however, I am strongly opposed to the type of testing and the duration planned because of its deleterious effects on a precarious ocean at this delicate time. NOW IS NOT THE TIME! The number of gray whale deaths this year is FIVE TIMES last year or any year previous. The kelp forests are reduced by 93% resulting in starving abalone and the canceling of abalone season, a vital economic resource for the north coast. Bird counts are way down this year. The Mendocino Coast is precious, beautiful and largely unspoiled. DO NOT SPOIL IT! Use your good sense and look to the future. DO NOT SACRIFICE MARINE MAMMAL LIFE AND OUR OWN FUTURES FOR TESTING! Please! NOW IS NOT THE TIME TO TEST AND FURTHER RISK ILL EFFECTS! Keep in mind, too, whales are mammals, intelligent, and long-living. Their suffering matters.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Wells T-1	<p>My wife and I appreciate all the Navy does for us. We are not disturbed by the noise the jets make.</p> <p>In fact we enjoy seeing them overhead doing their thing. We are assured then that our country is training the next generation of protectors. Thank you</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>
Wellspring A-1	<p>I ask that the Navy work fully with Pacific coast Tribes to develop measures that will reduce impacts to the Tribes' cultural ways of life, including culturally and spiritually significant marine species and habitat that are vulnerable to Navy training and testing activities. Working fully with the Tribes means the Navy will meet with them government-to-government. Sonar technology has become so powerful, I have seen videos of whales sticking their heads out of the water to visually try and see the source of their torture when sonar is being used in their environment. The Navy should restrict the use of sonar in all areas of the NWTT zone that weapons</p>	<p>Please see the Navy's response to comments received from the Yurok Tribe.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>are restricted.</p> <p>The Navy should also expand its definition of "best available science" referenced in the Draft SEIS to include Tribal Traditional Knowledge. Since time immemorial, Pacific coast Tribes have used and managed their traditional marine environment, including those areas situated within the Navy's NWTT zone.</p> <p>The Navy's monitoring program must be expanded to include effects of training and testing beyond potential harm to species population levels. Population level effects are insufficient to fully take into account the potential harm that Navy training and testing may cause, because this standard does not fully incorporate the concept that impacts to Tribal cultural resources may not be manifested in physical impacts on marine species. Meaningful, government to government meetings with the Tribes can help the Navy meet their requirement to support cultural survival for these Tribes, which goes beyond counting how many whales did not die from the Navy's use of sonar in an already stressful ecosystem. For example, the Navy should expand its list of environmental "stressors" to include those parts of the Study Area that encompass Tribal cultural resources, and the concept that those resources have intangible features, such as spiritual connections, which will be impacted by the training and testing.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of ocean acidification should be considered in the SEIS. The Draft SEIS concludes that the assessment in the Navy's 2015 Final EIS that impacts to water quality from explosives and explosives by-products in training and testing remains valid and does not need to be reconsidered. Based on studies conducted since 2015, this conclusion neglects to take into account the effect that changes in climate may have on the corrosive power of an increasingly acidic ocean. Specifically, the Draft SEIS does not consider the likelihood that acidification of ocean waters will accelerate corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing.</p> <p>Given this I ask, Does the Navy consider ocean acidification to have no affect on the proposed testing? Does the Navy consider ocean acidification will accelerate the corrosion of explosive devices and byproducts of training and testing?</p>	
Wellspring A-2	<p>Since the Navy wrote this draft supplemental EIS/OEIS, the public on the West Coast has seen and smelled a massive die-off of gray whales. "Federal scientists on Friday, May 31 opened an investigation into what is causing a spike in gray whale deaths along the West Coast this year. So far, about 70</p>	<p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>whales have stranded on the coasts of Washington, Oregon, Alaska and California, the most since 2000" (SFGate June 4, 2019). I do not see in this report an analysis of how many dead sea mammals sink compared to how many humans are able to find. I have read that only 1 of 10 are seen by humans.</p> <p>Given this, I ask that the Navy SEIS address the question: How does the Navy intend to accurately estimate the total number of animals harmed by increased testing of sonar and live weapons, is the Navy using the statistic that 9/10 sink or a different percentage?</p> <p>I strongly believe the Navy must also send scientists out into the Pacific to determine what has caused this gray whale die-off this year, this is new information not included in this SEIS. The Navy must join with the other team of Federal scientists or do their own study. NOAA has called this die-off a "wildlife emergency," there are unknown stressors causing this problem for whales right now. This behooves the Navy to not proceed with the proposed increase in testing, which the Navy admits will have negative consequences on gray whales, during an era of extreme stress for gray whales.</p> <p>As the article quoted above states, this level of gray whale death has not been seen since the year 2000, and by the way, the year is not over and we may see more gray whale deaths to the level that surpasses the year 2000. We are in the midst of this crisis as I write, so I demand that the Navy study the current issues facing gray whales before this EIS is approved.</p> <p>Given this, I ask: What studies has the Navy done to assess the current stressors facing gray whales in the Pacific Ocean? What year, and during what months, and in what locations was the study done, and how does the Navy describe that year as "current"? Does the Navy intend to include the news from Spring 2019 about massive gray whale die-off in this SEIS?</p> <p>Most of the coastal towns in the NWTT area rely on tourism to support us economically, including where I live and work. We have whale festivals and other ocean-themed events to draw tourists to our area. If the Navy introduces more testing of weapons and sonar into the whales' environment, when we are seeing an increase in whale die-off, we will see even more dead whales. This will hurt our economy, especially in towns that have to smell the dead whales that wash to shore.</p> <p>Don't expand Navy testing in the NWTT! Test sonar and explosives farther away from shore, where there are fewer marine mammal species, and time the testing to be when the migrating species are in a different location. This is the most basic environmental choice that could be made, and it is</p>	<p>emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities. The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The potential impacts to the economy are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The impacts of the training and testing activities in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism and Recreation). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	required now that the whales and all living things are already incredibly stressed by ocean warming, acidification, and die-offs. Thank you for addressing the pressing issues in my comment	
Wellspring V-1	I want to express my dissatisfaction with the state of this meeting. It was my impression that this was going to be a public comment period where people were going to be able to speak into a microphone and say their comments and be heard by the crowd instead of this, where it's a melee of noise. Nobody can hear anything. You can't hear what the official people are saying, nor the comments or questions from the public. I want to request there to be another public comment here in Fort Bragg at Cotton Auditorium where the public can be heard. And also, I do not want the Navy to go forward with these practices and exercises, sonar testing.	The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.
Wenham-1	These orca are on the brink of extinction and need protection in every way	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/• The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org• The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr• The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology• The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Wesley-1	I am totally against underwater sonar tests etc because of the harm and destruction caused to mammals such as dolphins and whales. Great pods can be torn apart or destroyed, and in a world where we already have the Chinese and Japanese out there killing these beings for greed I think we should do all we can to protect them. Please do what you can, time is running out and things need to change. Thankyou for allowing this public opinion.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
West-1	<p>What are you thinking?! --</p> <p>According to the instructions on this page, to the right of this comment box, I'm supposed to do hours of research, be analytical and specific about what's wrong with your plans to dump "stressors" into the ocean off *our* Pacific Northwest Coastline, and then offer you solutions. Really?</p> <p>I am not a scientist. I am not a political analyst, or an analyst of any kind. I have neither the background knowledge nor the expertise, the resources, nor the time to do all that. I'm just a private citizen -- a "little old lady" -- but having lived on this planet at least as long, if not longer, than most of you, I can tell you that yours is a plan for disaster.</p> <p>The ocean off our coastline -- from the water to all the life in it -- is already under enormous stress.</p> <p>Whatever your purpose, the "stressors" you plan to add are not going to relieve that stress or help the ocean and its inhabitants recover their health.</p> <p>You think of the ocean as your personal, private, highway, play ground and dumping ground. It is not that. The world's oceans are the very heart and lungs of the planet. Destroy them and you destroy the planet and everything living on it -- including yourselves.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Westerholm-1	<p>After 3 generations of vibratory testing all around the Sound, which includes all forms, in air- on land – and sea...we are all pretty much frog smoothys.</p> <p>With the 1958-1960s time frame of Ivy Bells, all of the rest of life was hung out to dry...as we all...have been...[illegible]...disrupted.</p> <p>My job now...as I see it, is to tell folks, that all of you...did not set out to be arses!</p> <p>Out to...'steal a march'...on Russia, and China, you all blundered & buggered life forms...with no way...to fight back.</p> <p>Raise a tankard mates...the rest of us will die...never knowing what was done to us...in the aggregate.</p> <p>We do watch/evaluate our male cousin, who was into Ivy Bells. Now a brittle fundamentalist...who sometimes remembers to...take his lithium.</p> <p>Who it is...who writes you.</p> <p>1938 Jan. 6 Born</p> <p>Farm life - WWII</p> <p>1944-from age 6--packed into "the grey ghost" dad's comm. Fishing boat,</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>subs be damned. (Col. Rivers violent drift. 1945-First grade. Hiked a mile - twice a day. 1946-Herds of animals tame & wild. I learned to read scat. Wonder Woman..Sheena of the jungle. Empowering!!! 1948-Red Fox..to Portland zoo. 1949-1956. Entire month Jan, left [illegible]. school dist. to work trapline with my father. Set traps, gut & [illegible] 1950--to present Rescued: porcupines, crows, lost dogs, wandering people..nonfunctional. Coons. Abused women. The LGBT community.</p>	
Weston-1	Stop sonar testing - please	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Whalen-1	<p>Your intention to test this sonar equipment in the Salish sea will result in the barbaric torture and death of whales and dolphins who navigate by echo location. Humans are not the only species on this planet. Every species is a vital link in nature. Without whales and dolphins, the oceans will die. Without oceans we will die. Your weapons are not going to protect us. Ultimately they will bring about our demise.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Wheeland-1	Please do not use sonar in the ocean!!	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Whirlledge-Karp-1	<p>As a resident of San Juan County, living on Lopez Island I am extremely opposed to any increase in practice landing on Whidbey Island and flights over Island County, San Juan County and Skagit County. Since moving to Lopez Island 15 years ago we have endured an increase in the number and duration of noise from Growler practice flights originating on Whidbey Island. The noise generated by these flights is truly incredibly toxic to every part of one's body and devastating to one's spirit by completely obliterating one's sense of peace of mind and safety. Being outside when these flights occur overhead feels like you are being blasted by a surge of vibrating waves so intense, at times it makes you want to fall to the ground in a fetal position. A moving aircraft causes compression and rarefaction, setting air molecules in motion and producing pressure waves. High-thrust engines, like those in the Growlers, emit low-frequency "windows rattling" pressure waves that penetrate into body organs and cause medical problems. The intensity, frequency, duration, and altitude of the Growlers is a threat to public health because of the deafening and toxic noise they produce. I have been at Lopez School when all activity has had to stop until the noise dissipates enough to continue with the educational programs. I have been in meetings when no conversation could continue until the horrible vibrating roar ceased after 1 to 2 minutes. The Navy's noise assessment is inaccurate and misleading. The affect of weather, cloud cover and location along the waters edge all intensify the vibration and duration of the Growler noise.</p> <p>Many communities around the Salish Sea depend on tourisms. The noise generated from Growler practice landings and flights, creates an element of sheer terror due to the horrendous noise on all those visiting and living in our communities.</p> <p>We grow a large portion of our food for the year in our organic garden areas. Jet engines do not burn cleanly, but their toxic by-products tend to disperse high in the atmosphere. Toxic particulates fill our air, fall into our waters, and drift down to our soils. Healthy food cannot grow on acreage exposed to constant pollution from above, which is why California—with strict clean air regulations— prohibits such maneuvers.</p> <p>The pod of Southern resident orcas that inhabits the Salish Sea is on the decline; only 75 remain. The two newborn calves are especially at high risk for survival. Both high and low frequency noise have negative impacts on whales' ability to navigate and identify food. The carbon dioxide in jet exhaust acidifies the water, damaging the web of marine life that sustain salmon, the orca's primary food source. Additionally, chemical compounds</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>from the Navy's fire fighting fire retardant, already in Whidbey's aquifer, enter Puget Sound as surface run-off. These effects, taken together, will further stress the pod and may make the difference between survival and extinction.</p> <p>Pacific Northwest reserves, parks, and monuments provide a home for birds, mammals, and marine life. Migration patterns, mating habits, and feeding patterns are disturbed by noise from the Growlers. The presence of the Growlers conflicts with an important mission of the National Parks Service to preserve the soundscape of parks. Pets at our homes cower under the duress of the noise from overhead flights even with our comforting and reassurances. How stressful this must be to all wildlife. A four-fold increase in Grouler flights will add 60,000 metric tons of additional carbon dioxide—a known cause of climate change— and speed ocean acidification, harming coral reefs, shellfish, and marine ecosystems. Finally, I have recently learned that the runway where practice take off/landings occur is unsafe. The 5,400-foot runway, built prior to 1943 to accommodate aircraft built in the 1940s, is nearly 3,500 feet too short for Grouler jet "touch and go" operations, which require 8,800 feet. The runway cannot be extended. For 32 years, the runway has failed to meet Navy runway safety standards. Thus, the Navy is putting its own pilots in danger by asking them to train on an inadequate runway. Pilots should have the best possible training, and the Navy should provide a training site that provides realistic carrier landing and takeoff conditions in a way that does not needlessly endanger pilots or civilians.</p> <p>Please hear my comments and desist from further flight training of Growlers from Whidbey Island and any training flights over San Juan County and other areas in our region.</p>	
White E-1	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to underwater sonar testing in the Puget Sound and Salish Sea area where the Souther Resident Killer Whales often reside. It is incredibly harmful to marine creatures in the water and how in 2019 is this still what the navy is using underwater sonar technology when it is well known and documented, by scientists and the Navy that it kills marine animals.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
White K-1	I am strongly apposed to any further sonar testing,I don't think it is necessary anymore,if you don't know how harmful it is to our marine life by now there is no hope for your program and I think you should scrap it.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
White S-1	<p>The Navy must not be allowed to conduct training exercises around Olympic National Park, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and other sensitive areas in Puget Sound. The majority of these training exercises do not have to be conducted along our shoreline and could instead be conducted far from shore minimizing the impact on birds, fish, marine mammals, other wildlife and communities. There has been no evaluation for other locations which could significantly reduce the harmful impacts of these exercises. The Department of Defense is charged with defending the United States—not destroying all of its beauty and natural resources.</p> <p>Further:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many communities around Puget Sound depend on tourism, especially those on the Olympic Peninsula and our islands. (Olympic National Park is by far the largest contributor to the Olympic Peninsula economy.) Allowing the area to become a giant military staging ground will cripple the tourism industry and threaten small businesses: inns, B&Bs, restaurants, farms, wineries/distilleries, retailers, and outdoor recreation (whalewatching, diving, kayaking, paddle boarding, boating). Outdoor recreation is valued at \$21.6 billion and helps to create 199,000 jobs. Outdoor enthusiasts spend the most when they are recreating on the water. This is more than the \$15 billion contributed to our economy by military and defense industries. Jobs in Washington depend on its pristine skies, lands, and waters. • Puget Sound is the nation's second largest estuary. The waters of the Salish Sea are some of the most biologically significant and productive marine areas in the world, home to both abundant and threatened species of marine life, including six endangered whale species, threatened Stellar sea lions, threatened and endangered salmon, steelhead, and rockfish species, and endangered leatherback sea turtles. The rivers of Olympic Peninsula are important habitat where salmon reproduce. Aircraft noise 	The analysis of the potential impacts related to the issues described in the comment can be found in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>and sonic booms have been implicated as a cause of lowered reproduction in a variety of animals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pod of Southern resident orcas that inhabits the Salish Sea is on the decline; only 74 remain. Both high and low frequency noise have negative impacts on whales' ability to navigate and identify food. The carbon dioxide in jet exhaust acidifies the water, damaging the web of marine life that sustain salmon, the orca's primary food source. Additionally, chemical compounds from the Navy's fire fighting fire retardant, already in Whidbey's aquifer, enter Puget Sound as surface run-off. These effects, taken together, will further stress the pod and may make the difference between survival and extinction. • The Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary includes 3,188 square miles of marine waters off the rugged Olympic Peninsula coastline. The sanctuary extends 25 to 50 miles seaward, covering much of the continental shelf and several major submarine canyons. The sanctuary protects a productive upwelling zone, home to marine mammals and seabirds. Along its shores are thriving kelp and intertidal communities, teeming with fishes and other sea life. Scattered communities of deepsea coral and sponges form habitats for fish and other important marine wildlife. • Olympic National Park is home to the endangered spotted owl and the endangered marbled murrelet. Its coastline is the biannual flyway for billions of migrating birds that depend on navigational signals disrupted by the jets. Growlers also collide with birds. • Increased noise over the Olympic National Park may threaten its status as a UNESCO World Heritage Site and Biosphere Reserve. • The San Juan Islands National Monument encompasses 1,000 acres spread across a unique archipelago of 450 islands, rocks, and pinnacles that includes scientific and historic treasures, a refuge for wildlife, and a classroom for generations of Americans. • America has a proud tradition of setting aside lands for public enjoyment. Public enjoyment is inconsistent with the purposes of a military installation conducting warfare exercises. • Pacific Northwest reserves, parks, and monuments provide a home for birds, mammals, and marine life. Migration patterns, mating habits, and feeding patterns are disturbed by noise from the Growlers. The presence of the Growlers conflicts with an important mission of the National Parks Service to preserve the soundscape of parks. 	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Whitesavage-1	<p>The Navy planes create noise that is seriously disruptive to a large area on Whidbey Island reaching across the inlet to Port Townsend and the Olympic Peninsula. This region is highly sensitive in that it is a hub of commerce with the international shipping canal, a protected farmland hub for Washington State, water that is home to endangered resident Orca Whales, and a ever growing tourist economy.</p> <p>The poisoning of aquifers due to dumping of flame retardants by the planes is a serious and deadly crime that cannot be fixed by throwing money at it. The planes have outgrown their place in this region. Time to relocate.</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Wichert-1	<p>It is clear that testing hurts the marine life in the area. Those animals are suffering enough. Take your testing elsewhere.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Wickens-Jobling-1	<p>We have lived in Oak Bay for almost six years now and the only complaint we have is about the 'Growlers' that continue to fly above us and make an incredible racket. Please do not increase the number of these planes in our area.</p>	<p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment in the vicinity of Oak Bay. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.</p>
Wiegand-1	<p>I live thousands of miles away from the US or the waters off Seattle. But I strongly urge the navy to not use sonar in the salish sea where the southern residents are roaming. This population only contains 76 individuals anymore. They are facing extinction. Please do not worsen their suffering. Humans have done them enough harm. Besides, spare the thousands of other whales, porpoises or seals that suffer from sonar use. Do your training somewhere else please.</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Wiese-1	I believe a substantive error has occurred in your analysis. The problems facing our nation, our region, and our one-and-only world cannot be solved by more Growlers or sonar explosions. We are facing climate chaos and the critical loss of clean potable water, habitable oceans, oxygen-producing forests, and productive, arable land across every border on Earth. Please stop adding to the problems and instead refocus the vast resources and skills of the Navy toward life-affirming activities. Thank you for looking with your hearts at ways the Navy can rapidly address the true threats to the world we are creating for children of the future.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Wikler-1	There is no scenario in which testing involving sonic blasts and the setting off of explosives in our oceans is safe. Here in the Pacific Northwest, we are seismically unstable. No amount of seismological research can define a "safe" level of setting off powerful blasts, designed to destroy, that will not increase our risk of tsunamis and earthquakes. No amount of biological research can define a program for detonating explosives or setting off sonic blasts in the ocean that will fail to have a significantly adverse effect on our oceans' ecosystems and the fragile flora and fauna that are already dangerously stressed by climate change, pollution, over-fishing, and other human interference. Please abandon any plans to do this. In human medicine we are learning how to develop and teach procedures without actually having to perform them. Surely the Navy has conducted enough research to do the same. Thank you.	There is no evidence to suggest that any of the Navy's activities could trigger earthquakes. In fact, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) dismisses the likelihood of even nuclear explosions triggering earthquakes (see USGS Frequently Asked Questions - https://www.usgs.gov/science-explorer-results?es=nuclear&classification=faq).
Wiley-1	I have commented since the very beginning. I was told that I would be a "stakeholder" but received no further information from the Navy. The Navy is not being "a good neighbor", a quote I heard at a meeting once by a Navy representative. The Growler noise is impacting every species that is alive in the area over which they fly. The cumulative effects of high decibel rating noise has been shown to the Navy and they do not care. In fact, they are adding more planes into an area known for it's peacefulness and solitude. Children in schools or playing at home on a summer day are affected. The Navy does not care. They are a neighbor that will damage your hearing and test your sanity. The Growler pollutants impact all land and bodies of water. The Navy does not care. This is a land of water ways and lakes. They are a polluting neighbor.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>The firefighting foam has poisoned the wells and waterways of Whidbey Island. The Navy does not care. They only ramp up training and provide cheap bottled water that is known to contain arsenic. This is not something a good neighbor does.</p> <p>They once used the Yakima range, which still exists, now they use our beloved National Park. Climbers in the Olympics get a blast of ear deafening Growler noises up to 16 hours a day during peak climbing season, as none of the parameters included being 1200 feet above a mountain top. If they climb with ear protection, they cannot hear their team members rope commands.</p> <p>The Navy is not a good neighbor.</p> <p>Even now, with all that we know about sonar and munitions testing, the Navy feels that the loss of whales, leather back turtles and dolphins along our coastal beach nearshore, is acceptable. This is cruel and despicable. They have known for a LONG time what sonar does to these creatures, but continue to "train" and destroy. Not even a horrible neighbor would do this intentionally. They would be jailed. The Navy gets a free ride at taxpayer expense and loss, to destroy in the name of "Freedom" our beautiful lands, people and animals. How much more war does this war hungry country need?</p>	
Wiley-1	<p>We respect your mission but do not ruin the peaceful and calm feeling of a small seaside town by flying Growlers over our airspace! Do these exercises far out over the ocean. Please respect our community. Thank you!</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTTS Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Williams-1	<p>I'm 69 years old, worked three years commercial fishing. I've been watching the ocean deteriorate from observing the changes in the beaches here and the fishing catch and the behavior of marine animals.</p> <p>I believe that the Navy's testing and training has a negative impact on</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>ocean life. I hope that the Marine Mammal Protection Act, I believe it should be invoked to maximum effect and no authorization be issued by the National Fisheries Service because commercial whaling is presently occurring by the Japanese fleet in the North Pacific.</p> <p>Also, gray whales this year are malnourished as proven by autopsies of beached whales this spring, almost 30 known on the West Coast in the last month, and that's only a percentage of dead and dying whales.</p> <p>Weapons testing has a negative effect on all species including humans and those who participate in it. Our military currently spends more money than all other militaries combined.</p> <p>My father was an Annapolis Naval Academy graduate, and I fully recognize the U.S. Navy's sense of discipline, honor, and duty. However, to continue current and proposed weapons testing benefits only the makers of weapons and associated industries. Our national security would be furthered more by providing aid to those who need it; for example, the people of Mozambique.</p> <p>I hope you consider my opinion. Thank you.</p>	<p>to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Willmes-1	<p>Hello. I object to sonar testing in the Salish Sea as it can be harmful to Marine</p> <p>Whom rely on sound to communicate, locate food, avoid predators and navigate. Exposure to sound could change their behavior and can be thrown off. Limiting their ability to recognize sound frequencies can affect their survival. This includes but is not limited to the endangered southern resident orcas.</p> <p>https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/navy-plans-testing-of-futuristic-technology-sonar-harm-to-mammals-in-pacific-northwest/</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Wilmot-1	<p>AS A FORMER COMMANDING OFFICER OF VAQ-135 AND THE NAVY'S TEST PILOT FOR THE EA-6B PROWLER. I CAN TELL YOU THAT THIS PROJECT WILL PROVIDE THE ELECTRONIC WARFARE COMMUNITY WITH A MUCH NEEDED RESOURCE FOR TRAINING AIRCREWS, AT THE SAME NOT AFFECTING THE ENVIRONMENT (DESPITE THE OPPONENTS OF THIS PROJECT'S UNSUBSTANTIATED CLAIMS TO THE CONTRARY). THE LOCATION IN A SPARSELY POPULATED AREA IS IDEAL BECAUSE IT ALLOWS THE EMITTER OPERATORS TO MOVE THEIR EQUIPMENT TO DIFFERENT SITES, THUS TESTING THE EW CREWS' ABILITY TO ACQUIRE AND LOCATE THE EMITTERS WITHOUT HARMING WILDLIFE OR INTERFERING WITH THE ACTIVITIES OF HUMANS.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Wilson AI-1	To the U.S. Navy, Please stop conducting your harmful sonar practices. You are harming innocent whales and marine life. Find another place to go about the sonar technology or stop it completely. Enough is enough, when is the government going to start caring about biodiversity? The planet is in a critical state as it is and you are making matters worse for no good reason.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Wilson Au-1	Please protect the orcas from donor.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Wilson R-1	To know you are deafening marine life I think you should be drowned. How can you knowingly harm anything. There is something very wrong with idly standing by and letting this happen that is why we are speaking out.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Wilson S-1	I strongly disapprove of the US Navy proposal to fly 5000 Growler jets over the Olympic national park and the marine sanctuary areas of Puget Sound and the Pacific Ocean. People do not travel from around the world to hear earsplitting noises while enjoying this exceptional marine ecosystem, stunning temperate rainforest and spectacular undeveloped coastline. I also do not approve of “incidental takes of threatened and endangered marine animals” in Puget Sound. We must require that the United States Naval flight operations over these waters adhere to the legal agreement to protect the critically endangered Orcas, and the salmon that they depend	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy’s ocean stewardship programs, visit:

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>on for food. Please note the text of the KOMO news story about this legal reality and the Federal agencies required adherence to the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>KOMO News April 15, 2019</p> <p>“SEATTLE (AP) — The federal government says that by October it will propose expanded habitat protections off Washington, Oregon and California for Pacific Northwest orcas. The announcement comes in response to a lawsuit filed by the Arizona-based Center for Biological Diversity, which sued in 2018 to make officials move more quickly to protect the endangered orcas. The whales spend their summers in the waters between Washington state and Canada, but about two-thirds of the year they migrate and forage for salmon off the West Coast. The conservation group said the National Marine Fisheries Service had been dragging its feet in designating 'critical habitat' for the whales in those foraging and migration areas. Under the Endangered Species Act, federal agencies must ensure that activities they pay for, permit or carry out do not harm such habitat.”</p> <p>https://komonews.com/news/local/northwest-orcas-to-get-expanded-habitat-protection-feds-say?fbclid=IwAR3l1FlavdnSx7vLaOWyIC1IS28v9sEOyBdz8HekGOa4UK5DkohmiiuWIM4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy’s Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research’s Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy’s project website at: www.NWTTTEIS.com
Winder-1	<p>I have just learned of an EIS put out by the U.S. Navy on March 29, which is very disturbing to me. The only EIS alternative that is acceptable is the No Action Alternative. The other options given are unacceptable to the environment and life on the Olympic Peninsula. Alternatives 1 and 2 would cause unforgiveable and unnecessary damage to Olympic National Park and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. Alternative 2 is the most extreme. The length of the EIS, the great area it affects, and the many people it affects requires a 90-day comment period. This, so the EIS can be examined properly and thoroughly. Please ask the Navy for another 14-day extension of the comment period. The noise from multiple jet flights over the western and northern parts of the Peninsula will chase residents and visitors away. This will affect the health and economy of the Peninsula and the state of Washington. The search pattern of jet Growler flights looking for emitters would roar above the ocean beaches; the Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges; Washington State Department of Natural Resources land; Quinault, Quileute and Hoh Reservations; and thousands of acres of private land, including the towns of Forks and Amanda Park. The Navy admits to 85–100 decibels of noise per pass. That is enough to cause</p>	<p>The original 60-day comment period was extended by 15 days for a 75-day comment period.</p> <p>The Navy’s proposed activities will not result in chronic noise at sound levels that would result in the health effects described in this comment. The predicted noise levels can be found in Appendix J (Airspace Noise Analysis). The potential effects of Growler and other activities on the environment are discussed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA’s designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA’s designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	hearing loss and contribute to other health problems. People in Forks have recorded 94 decibel flights under the current operations. While noise is known to affect people and no studies have been done on the iconic Olympic elk, it is not difficult to reason they would be similarly affected, being mammals of a similar weight. The military training in the Marine Sanctuary would do damage to the ocean beaches, the marine animals of the coast, the nesting areas of many of Washington's shorebirds, migrating whales, and the birds that use the Pacific Flyway. The Navy has denied flying over Olympic National Park. This is untrue. Not only is this untrue, it is impossible not to fly these missions over the Park. This degradation of the Olympic Peninsula's environment is unacceptable. For 112 years, Congress and presidents have set aside areas of the Peninsula to protect its valuable environment. Irreparable damage would be caused if the activities are done as stated in the Navy EIS/OEIS Mar 2019 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Northwest Training and Testing. Please stop this plan by the Navy. The training has been done elsewhere. It can be done elsewhere. Wild places are not empty places just waiting for an invasion by the military. Our national security must also include environmental security.	where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Windfeldt-1	Testing sonar in the Salish Sea region will have a detrimental affect on the critically endangered Southern Resident Orcas - of which only 76 remain - and Humpback whales. In addition a large number of non-endangered marine wildlife will also be negatively impacted repeatedly. The Navy is on record for acknowledging the damage and dangers of sonar to marine wildlife. Any sonar testing in the Salish Sea or Puget sound will violate the National Marine Protection Act. Please include me on the supplemental EIS/OEIS mailing list.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. You have been added to the NWTT mailing list.
Wing G-1	Our northwest public lands, and especially our national parks, are a haven. Not only do they harbor endangered species whose habits and needs we are only beginning to understand, they also harbor people in search of ancestral quiet. And those people--tourists and people like me who live nearby--bring with us the needs and the money to provide livelihoods to a whole peninsula of fellow northwesterners. If the skies above Olympic	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	National Park turn as noisy as those above MY house on Lopez Island, the idea of "haven" will become joke. Word will spread about the noise pollution of the increased Growler presence. Tourists will head elsewhere to find their haven of quiet. And who even knows how the noise will affect the non-human species who live in the Olympics? Not us...and if the Growlers traffic increases, it may soon be too late for us to know.	minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Wing L-1	Many marine animals rely on sound to communicate, locate food, avoid predators and navigate. Intense or repeated exposure to certain frequencies of sonar could will also affect animals' ability to hear sounds in those ranges. This will only limit these species survivor. Don't forget IN 2005, 34 WHALES DIED BECAUSE OF NAVY SONAR TRAINING. Please request that all funding for the low frequency active sonar be terminated. The two major reasons for terminating this program are the severe environmental damage LFAS can inflict on marine life and the availability of passive listening devices to achieve the same national security purpose (detection of silent submarines) without causing such harm. I Request to be included on the Supplemental EIS/OEIS mailing list to receive notification of public meetings and project information.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. You have been added to the NWTT mailing list.
Winslow-1	I am against the Navy's plan to use the Northern California Coastal Waters for training and testing exercises. We do not need more sacrifice zones. This is a whale corridor and one of the last safe places for wildlife to live. Please exempt this area from your plan. Your work will cause irreversible harm to wildlife resources in this area.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Winters-1	I am concerned that the Navy's plans for the Washington Coast will adversely effect all of the animals and fish that call this area home. I am particularly concerned about our Southern Resident Orca population which is struggling and on the verge of extinction. We need to do all we can to assure that these animals thrive. I am afraid that the Navy's plans off our coast will be one more blow against the Orca; it will truly be a crime if this population goes extinct under our stewardship.	The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk. The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Winters-2	<p>I live in Port Townsend, just South of the Navy base on Whidbey Island across Admiralty Inlet. I frequently hear the Navy jets flying up and down The Straits of Juan de Fuca and directly over Port Townsend. The noise level is often high enough that it is difficult to have a outdoor conversations. The noise level is also high enough indoors that sleeping is difficult and doing any kind of focused thinking is difficult. I don't mind 10 or 20 minutes of noise during daylight hours but the jets often start flying at 5 pm and continue till well past 10 pm. This is very aggravating, ruining what should be a quiet, peaceful time of day and making it very difficult to sleep. It is my understanding that the Navy intends to increase the number of flights by a factor of 4, adding 36 new Growler jets to the existing fleet. I also understand that many of the Growlers will soon be equipped with more powerful, louder engines than the planes that are currently flying. I am extremely concerned that this will hurt our local economy, much of which is based on outdoor recreation. Who wants to vacation in a place contaminated with jet engine noise? I am concerned that property values in all the areas exposed to the jet noise will diminish. Who wants to live in a place where you are exposed to jet noise? It is my understanding that the Navy's expansion plans will also bring over 600 new personnel and their families to an area with almost no housing inventory. This will deplete our already limited workforce housing and force current residents to move. We live in one of the most pristine, peaceful and beautiful areas in the world. It is bad enough that we are already putting up with excessive jet engine noise. Multiplying our current load by a factor of 4 is completely unacceptable.</p>	<p>The Navy is not proposing to increase Growler activity by 400%. While the increase in the level of activities was reflected in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy has made revisions to clarify that the increase results in approximately 300 additional aircraft flights per year.</p> <p>When looking at the proposed increase in EA-18G Growler flights in the Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), it is important to consider this increase in the proper context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on an analysis that included weekdays and weekends, the FAA determined that over the Olympic National Park, Navy aircraft account for only 25 percent of all flights below 35,000 ft. altitude and 38 percent of all flights below 18,000 ft. altitude. 2. Most Navy flights in the Olympic MOA occur on weekdays, and during daylight hours (approximately 6 percent of flights occur at night). The military averages about 2,300 flights per year over the Olympic MOA; approximately 8.8 flights per day if averaged over weekdays only (6.3 flights per day averaged over a 365-day year). 3. The proposed increase of 300 total flights per year averages to just over one additional flight per day. 4. In the past, when the Navy had over 200 tactical aircraft assigned to NAS Whidbey Island, it conducted up to three times as many flight operations compared to today, including projections with the increase to 118 Growlers. Far more training events then involved low-level maneuvers due to the type of aircraft involved. <p>The GE F414-400 enhanced engine is currently only in a research phase for the Navy, and is not installed in any aircraft, nor are there plans to purchase or install it. If this engine were to be introduced to the fleet of F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft, the Navy would measure the noise emissions from this new engine.</p> <p>The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include relocation of personnel. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com</p>
Winters-3	<p>I live in Port Townsend and listen to jet noise very frequently. My understanding is that the Growlers currently fly about 3050 flights per year. If the Navy continues with their plans then the Growlers will fly about 12,000 flights per year. This is outrageous! We live in one of the most</p>	<p>Please see response to Winters-2.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	beautiful places on earth in a small town that is very quiet and peaceful. Jet noise on any level is simply unacceptable! Multiplying the jet noise we are currently hearing by a factor of four is crazy! Our economy is largely based on tourism. Who is going to want to vacation in a town with constant jet engine noise? This is a very serious threat to our property values and our economy!	
Wisner-1	I am only here just to offer my support for the work the Navy is doing. I've been in Merchant Marines for 47 years, still in it, and I'm a firm believer in training and practice. I understand its importance. I have had experience with sonar in some of my jobs in the past, and I don't believe it's -- it's injurious to all of the mammals. And so I'm just here to offer my support and -- and that's it, I think.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.
Wodjenski-1	I submitted the attached letter while living at our former residence. We moved out of the area largely to distance ourselves from the noxious noise levels on Morris Road, close to OLF Coupeville.	The attached is a comment letter addressing the Growler EIS. The activities proposed in the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS do not include activities described in the comment letter. Please see Chapter 2 (Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives) for a description of the location of these activities. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com
Wolfe-1	The Olympic National Park and surrounds is like no other. After studies, it was found to be the most quiet place in the continental United States. Certainly the Navy can respect this park and find alternative places to train.	The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.
Wolfson-1	Please respect the waters and stop using sonar and testing. Our marine mammals need protection. the challenges before us w/ climate change and catastrophe already [pose a major threat to many species. These measures have played a direct role in harming endangered marine life and threaten the biodiversity of the ocean's ecosystem. This is a critical and acute time to leave some environments intact.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. You have been added to the NWTT mailing list.
Wolhandler-1	As one of the poorer rural counties, I have concerns that we cannot pay our own professional team to monitor sound to protect our wildlife or oil leakage from Navy vessels. Any detonation near the coastline could cause serious overall environmental harm. Tourism is pretty much all we have left after a past that has destroyed our fishing and timber industries. A military presence here (other than the Coast Guard, which is much appreciated) would negatively impact the serenity and natural beauty that people travel great distances to experience.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/• The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org• The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr• The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology• The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Wolman-1	Hail, O Whale Watery neighbor Spouting good news We're Here! Please protect the gray whale migration route. We're losing so much life on the planet, and cetaceans are one of the higher life forms, with high intelligence. Navy sonar is well known to damage the hearing these creatures rely on to orient themselves and communicate. Your signals also confuse them. Please stay far away from the West Coast and if you must do your testing, do it in deep water.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. You have been added to the NWTT mailing list.
Wood E-1	This is wrong, and you know it. All of our actions impact the natural world, and simply receiving a rubber stamp does not exonerate you from the undoubtedly harmful repercussions. Find another way.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Wood N-1	With the recent loss of biodiversity and the increasing amount of animals being added to the endangered species list, the last thing we need is more negative human interference. The coasts need help recovering from all the damage we have none. The money going to this would be much more beneficial if it were instead used to clean our coasts and protect the animals.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Woodbridge-1	I am a long time resident of San Juan Island. I live here because of the beautiful environment and the closeness of nature. The quiet of the islands, the absence of urban noise, is a vital part of living here. During the last many months, the dreadful deep roar of Whidbey Island jets has repeatedly and very often overwhelmed and destroyed the acoustic environment. Many times the jets fly for hours and hours at a stretch, obliterating all other sounds of the environment and overwhelming even sounds indoors with windows closed. Many nights the jets fly long into the night. Noise of this sort is a pernicious form of pollution, causing a perpetual stress response, affecting everyone at their deepest level of being. A great deal of recent scientific research concerning noise in the environment indicates clearly that the effects of noise on health are similar to the effects of many other forms of pollution. Effects of noise are profound, whether they are distant or immediate. The duration, quality, and vibrational level of noise can be as important as the volume. Noise affects all of us, whether we hear it or not, whether we experience it as painful or not. Just as some sounds can be instantaneously calming, other qualities of sound can be instantaneously shattering. The effects of these experiences don't have to reach the level of awareness to be profound	Growler noise on San Juan Island and Whidbey Island are outside the scope of the NWTTEIS/OEIS. Please refer to the EA-18G Growler Airfield Operations Final EIS located at http://www.whidbeyeis.com/CurrentEISDocuments.aspx for a comprehensive look at Growler activities and impacts in your area.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>nonetheless. The effects can be insidious and cumulative. The noise from the jets on Whidbey Island is dreadful, in the literal sense of the word dread-full. The noise shatters calm, shatters all other sounds of the environment. Even in our busy modern world, we rely on sounds from the environment for vital and meaningful information, coming to us all the time from our surroundings, both near and far. It is part of our genetic heritage to be attuned to sound and to be responsive to sound. We respond, consciously or not, to sounds such as those from the jets, with dread and alarm. It is medically well established that this causes a cascade stress response within us which contributes negatively to all manner of health problems. A stress reaction to which we can respond meaningfully is entirely different from a stress response that is ongoing and outside our ability to affect or escape. This creates a situation conducive to illness, to aggravating other pre-existing medical conditions, and interrupts that which is required for health, healing, and well-being. Recent and ongoing scientific studies also indicate clearly the importance of the acoustic environment for other species.</p> <p>Studies about noise in the environment are ongoing and current. Scientific findings support and confirm individuals' experience of the very harmful effects of noise on health and well being. It is recognized globally that noise of this sort is one of the terrible impacts of war. It is wrong to allow noise of this sort to destroy the quality of life for all residents in the northern Puget Sound and Salish Sea.</p>	
Woodland-1	Anything that hurts animals is beyond despicable. This is not necessary!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Woods M-1	<p>As a resident on the shore of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary for 40% of the year, and as someone who hikes and fishes along the Queets, Bogachiel, Hoh, and Quinault Rivers toward the interior Olympic Mountains, I can verify from personal experience that the current navy training regimens are at minimum disruptive and at maximum lethal to resident wildlife.</p> <p>We can count on fighter jet noise daily in the middle of the day. When in the forest interior, the animals startle and then hide, birds shriek and rise in flocks, and there is an unnatural stillness following the assault. The decibels are much higher than normal forest sounds, and do disturb the ecosystem. This is a daily occurrence.</p> <p>While I cannot see what goes on under the surface of the sea, I can report that on a single day in August 2018, there were 3 sea lions dead or dying on the beach near Kalaloch. Many people, myself included, were reporting this event to the rangers. The two smaller sea lions were dead, with congealed blood around their heads, and the larger one had beached himself and was alternating between laying flat and raising his head to swivel it blindly in what appeared to be pain. I am not a scientist, but between the blood, agonized movements, and actual death of 3 animals in close proximity and time (I have never seen this before in 40 years of walking that coast) I could only wonder if underwater sonic experiences had ruptured these animals heads in some way. If so, I would hate to have that be caused by naval exercises, especially in a Marine Sanctuary.</p> <p>Military training exercises do not have to be conducted within a National Park and National Marine Sanctuary. They could be conducted in a more populated area that does not host wild and endangered species, in areas where noise levels are already at similar ranges, and the exercises would be merely one activity among many. If these trainings are necessary, please move them to environments where they would have minimal impact on birds, fish, marine mammals, other wildlife and communities.</p>	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Woods W-1	<p>Regarding NWT Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS, I support an immediate ending of all aerial training above National Parks, designated Wilderness Areas, National Wildlife Refuges and sovereign tribal lands. Flights taking place over the past several years have desecrated national treasures including the Olympic and North Cascades National Parks, Pasayten, Alpine Lakes and Colonel Bob Wildernesses and many National Wildlife areas, as well as been disrespectful to the sovereignty of the Quinault Indian Nation and other tribes. I have made a home on the Olympic Peninsula since 1965,</p>	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations);</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>and support our military. However, in all the years I have lived there, never has frequency of damaging noise been at this level. The scientific consequences to wildlife are numerous, including nesting and reproduction success and damage to vital organs. Humans' ability to enjoy the solitude and beauty of our sacred natural areas has been disrupted to such an extent that I sometimes avoid the outdoors. Flight training and testing in this area is absolutely inappropriate for these reasons.</p> <p>As for Naval sea and sub-surface activities, I again call upon the U.S. Navy to immediately halt all advanced low-decibel sonar activity. We live adjacent to the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and have witnessed an extremely disturbing increase in the number of dead and dying sea mammals on our beaches over the past three years. This sanctuary, already under environmental stress, must be spared the additional degradation and slaughter caused by Naval maneuvers and testing.</p>	<p>however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p> <p>To ensure compliance with the National Marine Sanctuary Program regulations and the interagency consultation requirements of National Marine Sanctuaries Act section 304(d), the Navy considered all proposed modifications to training and testing activities to determine whether they have the potential to destroy, cause the loss of, or injure sanctuary resources, or result in adverse impacts on sanctuary resources or qualities. Accordingly, the Navy and NMFS submitted a joint Sanctuary Resource Statement to the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries.</p> <p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Woodward-1	<p>Following centuries of disregard, we have reached the unfortunate juncture where we can no longer ignore the impact of our activities on the world around us. We have numerous studies carefully documenting the impact of noise above and below ground. The current proposals flaunt the findings of those studies in favor of increased military activity. While acknowledging and appreciating the work of our military, we must also know where to draw the line. Where is Whibey; now is NOW.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Woollett-1	<p>I am 100% against underwater sonar testing which has been proven to harm marine animals. It is time to act before there is too much harm done. Please stop this now before the damage is irreversible..</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<p>EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>You have been added to the NWTT mailing list.</p>
Worthington-1	Please see the document attached.	Please see the responses to Friel-2 through Friel-11.
Wright D-1	<p>I am very worried to hear of your plans to run tests of such magnitude in the marine environment. This is home to numerous species would be destructive to them to say the least.</p> <p>I object most strongly and declare it an act of violence against our planet.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy.marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Wright D-2	<p>On April 24, 2019, I was introduced to the Navy's Northwest Training and Testing Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement. The Open House Public Meeting was held in Everett WA.</p> <p>It is evident the Navy has done a lot of work to demonstrate how they have considered means to protect wildlife and environment during the operations proposed. I think important issues have been left out. The wildlife, environment and economic viability of the Northwest is as important to me as the going forward with proposed operations here in the Northwest is to the Navy.</p> <p>Asked why they have chosen to operate over some of our most precious natural resources, The reply from the Navy was "...the most efficient use of taxpayer dollars", "our personnel love the area", and "the Navy has been here for over 75 years."</p> <p>The Growler noise flying over the Olympics is very disturbing to the wildlife and people who enjoy the hiking, camping, birding, and other wonderful</p>	<p>The noise model used, MR_Nmap uses state of the art science and is the appropriate method to evaluate aircraft noise in special use airspace such as the Olympic MOA. This model is approved by the FAA for these types of analyses.</p> <p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II. The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>activities that can be enjoyed right here in our National Park. The National Park is so quiet and there are so few places where quiet can be enjoyed. My concern is that the noise testing for operations has not been done by the most current modeling software to estimate the noise levels on the ground and ask that the testing be done again by up to date equipment. When I travel to enjoy some of my favorite places on the Olympic Peninsula the disturbing noise of the Growlers will ruin my trip. I have friends who tried to camp at Deception Pass on Whidbey Island and the Growler noise was so loud they had to leave. They traveled from California to enjoy the beauty of the Northwest. They then headed for the Olympic National Park where they were convinced they would enjoy a quiet and amazing experience. I have other friends who have reported that the noise of the Growler jets is very disturbing when they were hiking on the Olympic Peninsula.</p> <p>Having been born and raised in Everett, WA, I experienced the planes from Paine Field in the 60's that flew just over my house. We also enjoyed our beach place on Whidbey Island. After I retired, I sold my home in Everett and moved to Whidbey Island. My father was a pilot in the Army Air Corps where he taught aerobatics. My stepfather was a Navy Captain. In Everett the Navy has been wonderful neighbors and we have included them in our community. Many retire in the area.</p> <p>Our national security is important to me and so is peace and tranquility at home - for which we fight to protect.</p> <p>Please consider another location for these training operations. Best use of the tax payer dollars for training operations should not include the degradation of our communities and national park areas by loud Growler training operations. There are other locations better suited for these operations. Navy personnel who love the area here can come back and enjoy our closely protected and pristine National Park and Whidbey Island.</p>	<p>and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Wright G-1	<p>I traveled from Colorado specifically to visit the quiet place of the Hoh Rainforest. What a shame that it has been ruined by this noise caused by the planes. It is such an intrusion on the citizens here and will certainly impact tourism to this area. We also were shocked at the noise caused by the planes throughout our trip in other areas of Washington. I was so looking forward to it, but will not be back. Shame, shame.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Wright H-1	<p>We are all one. You hurt one of us, you hurt us all. Please dont hurt our whales and other marine life.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	Please dont do this. Please.	<p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Wright Ja-1	Are you not going to be happy until you kill everything in the ocean!!!	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navy-marinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Wright Je-1	My name is Jeff Wright, and I have been to several of these hearings. I first want to invoke the name of Rosalind Peterson. And she passed away recently; I'm not sure of her age or what the cause of her demise was. But she used to come to these meetings extremely well prepared and brief people on the issues and have posters and alternative aspects of the research she had done versus what the Navy had done. And by reference, I want to include her in this documentation and in this record for anything	<p>Thank you for your comment. While there is no existing research on the impact sonar may have on the breakdown of plastics in the ocean, the information you provided will help the Navy determine funding for future projects.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>she's ever contributed in the past. And all previous records of all previous hearings here in Fort Bragg, in Eureka, on the dark side of the moon, wherever they may have occurred concerning this issue I want incorporated in the record concerning this. I believe that they probably already are, but I want to make sure that absolutely they are, and so I'm doing that for the record. All previous documentation and hearings and stenographers' notes be included, and anything else that may have slipped my mind as far as specific reference to any letters, any comments publically, however they may have been sent or however they were received by the Navy to be considered in this. My biggest concern, since I've made comments in the past and I've now included them by reference, is a new issue which has come up. And I do not believe that anyone really has addressed it. I asked several people, including I believe his name was Brian, either Bill or Brian over here at one of the posters. And they don't give their last names for some reason, so it makes it kind of hard to know who you spoke to. But specifically my question was about plastics and nanoplastics getting into the animals. There's something called "nerdles." I'm not sure how to spell it, I'm going to guess n-e-r-d-l-e-s. "Nerdles." And they are plastic balls or shapes that are pre-made to melt into various colors or various types of plastics. So it's like the embryo or the seed of plastics. And they then melt them to make larger plastics. I assume they're probably used in things like 3D printing. Anyway, my point with this is I'm very concerned about sonar more rapidly breaking down the plastics into smaller particles and causing further and more rapid damage to the fish, the mollusks, the sea mammals, the whales, dolphins and cetaceans and every creature in the ocean that has been adversely affected by the plastics, as we're just now finding out. And I believe the reason nobody had any information on it is apparently the Navy has done no research on it because it's cutting edge science. They're just now finding out about these nanoplastics getting into these creatures. So the bottom line on the question is does that sonar cause further and more rapid damage because it may be breaking down plastics quicker than it would break down otherwise, due to the vibrations that the sonar runs through the water. And I think it's important for that to be researched and experiments done to see if that's the case. And my preference is the no war games alternative, not to do this project. That we've done it enough. I think we know pretty much how to do it. And there's other ways now, virtual training, virtual reality, for the men. They don't really actually necessarily need to be blowing stuff up and sending sonar that's more intense than</p>	

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	regular sonar, the war level sonar that's a weapon on the sonar, into the sea unnecessarily. I also want to invoke, since it's Pete Seeger's birthday, I'm going to sing one verse. I know you can't put musical notes. (Singing) Where have all the dolphins gone? Long time passing. Where have all of the whales gone? A long time ago. Where have all the whales and dolphins gone? Gone to Navy sonar every one. When will they ever learn? Will they never learn? (End of singing.) So, bless you Pete Seeger, and bless you Rosalind Peterson. So I'm going to leave it there, because I've referred to everything else by record, and it's getting late and I've got people waiting for me. So thank you so much.	
Wrobel-1	Aircraft should not be allowed to fly over the Olympic Peninsula creating negative noise impacts on pets and wildlife, not to mention us humans.	<p>The Olympic Military Operations Area (MOA), a portion of which overlies the Olympic National Park was designated for precisely the type of training that the Navy, as well as other U.S. military forces have conducted since the MOA's designation in 1977. Prior to the MOA's designation, military aircraft have trained over and off the Olympic Peninsula since World War II.</p> <p>The Navy has considered other locations (see the NWTT Supplemental EIS/OEIS, Section 2.4.1.1, Alternative Training and Testing Locations); however, the Navy needs access to training complexes within proximity to where the aircraft are based as stated in Section 2.5.1.1 (Alternative Locations) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. The Olympic MOA is necessary for Naval training and testing activities due to its proximity to multiple testing and training range complexes, homeports of Navy Region Northwest commands, shore-based facilities and infrastructure that maximize the training realism and testing effectiveness.</p>
Wyatt-1	<p>As a Seattle citizen and sailor in the Puget's Sound, I ask that the Navy halt all sonar and explosive practice or testing in the Puget Sound. These waters have a strong history for the native tribes of the area and remain crucial to the Pacific North West economy and culture. Simulations can be just as beneficial without causing harm to the ecosystem.</p> <p>I recognize this how things have been done, but with our increasing knowledge of harmful these practices are I ask you to discontinue those tests that can be completed through simulation (and move others to safer areas, such as Lake Washington which has less bio diversity to risk.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy already uses simulation in training and testing whenever possible; please see the discussion presented in Section 5.5.1 (Active Sonar) from the Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
Wyner-1	Thank you for taking the time to review my comments and to answer my questions. See Attached PDF letter for comments and questions.	No PDF letter or other documents were attached.
Wyner-2	Dear NWTTS Supplemental EIS/OEIS Project Manager: I support the position of the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council and its member Tribes regarding the cultural and environmental protections that are needed for the Navy's proposed training and testing activities in the Northwest Training Range Complex. As a concerned member of the public, I ask that the Navy cooperate with the Tribes in meaningful ways to help ensure that military training and testing do not harm marine life and areas of cultural concern to the Tribes. Special measures should be taken to address the concerns of the Tribes, because they are Sovereign Nations and not merely members of the public. The Navy's obligation to consult with sovereign Tribal Nations under federal law provides a framework for the Tribal-Navy consultation being facilitated by the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council. I request that the Navy continue to fulfill its obligation for meaningful government-to- government Tribal consultation, and that it work toward substantively addressing Tribal concerns about the Navy's Training and Testing activities. The use of sonar in training and testing exercises is known to seriously damage the hearing and alter the behavior of marine mammals when they are in the vicinity of such activities. The impacts of sonar and other Navy training and testing activities on the marine environment should not be measured solely according to whether entire populations of marine species are harmed. Harm to smaller areas and groups should also be considered. The goal of mitigation of harm to marine plant and animal species should be to reduce the effect of training and testing to the lowest humanly possible impact. I call on the Navy to honor the reasonable request of the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council's member Tribes that testing and training activities be conducted outside of marine waters offshore from California. I strongly urge the Navy to collaborate with the member Tribes of the InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council in developing robust monitoring and mitigation measures to address impacts of the Navy's training and testing activities that are planned for the Northwest Training Range Complex. It is also hoped that the letters of concern are read by, and evaluated by, government officials, who are not just the paid vendors that present the Navy public hearing meetings. The vendors only have \$\$\$ and profit in mind, not necessarily the public concern for environmental cultural	<p>The Navy will continue to consult with the Tribes. Through Government-to-Government consultations, the Navy will consider additional tribal and traditional knowledge provided, maintaining respect for cultural sensitivity and confidentiality.</p> <p>As stated in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the term "traditional resources" is used to encompass protected tribal resources.</p> <p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	protections, in addition to national safety. Thank you for your consideration.	
Wyner-3	I have concerns about the sound from the testing affecting the marine life. Someone mentioned a study that sound can travel 12,000 miles. I'm not sure if that is correct, but any distance up to that amount or short of that amount would surpass the 12 miles that is allowed by the Native Americans off the coast. Any take could be unsafe or injurious to the marine life. I understand that there can be up to 500,000 takes. Though the definition of a take can range from a simple course of misdirection, as well as terminating the life of a marine species; there is some latitude on that. But even a whale going off course because of the sound can disrupt its life, be injurious, or fatal for that whale if it gets lost. That's the sound. In terms of military waste or debris left over from the exercise itself, I understand there will be lots of debris. Military debris. Weapon shells, explosions, and I'm not sure if they're going to have actual targets, but I understand there will be tons of it. Some of it will be cleaned up, but from asking questions, there is no plan to clean it up, to clean up what is left. And I think that's a disservice to our country, the marine life, and our ocean. There will be more military pollution that will be left there until perpetuity unless there's a plan. What is the plan to clean it up? And I don't think there is one. I think there should be one.	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>Please see Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for the analysis of impacts to water quality from the Navy's proposed activities.</p> <p>Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.</p>
Wyner-4	Commenting about the meeting, the meeting was very disappointing, because the speakers could not be heard. I don't know if that was intentional, or just a consequence of the people here trying to find out more information about the weapons testing that will be off our coast. The audience could not hear the questions, the audience could not hear the answers. The format did not really engage or expect engagement from the audience. The way it was set up was almost intentionally not to answer public comments, except for our wonderful court reporter to take our information. I'm concerned that our court reporter is the only person that's really listening. So thank you for being here and thank you for taking notes. I'm wondering if there will be a way to have the information, the questions and the information that the court reporter is reporting on, be made public and available to the people who attended today, and what are those venues. I have another concern about the meeting. Some of the information was confusing. Some of the presenters had no idea that we're near an earthquake zone. The San Andreas fault is three miles off our coast, and some of the presenters were unaware of that. And it seems like that could be a factor if the military is setting off explosions near there, near the	The Navy went to a great amount of effort to coordinate and organize the public meetings to meet the needs of all of the public. The format allowed for ample opportunity for valuable exchange of information between the public and Navy subject matter experts. The subject matter experts were available and answered questions throughout the entire meeting. The meetings also provided opportunity for individuals to comment in writing or orally privately to a stenographer. The Navy has received feedback from meeting attendees that the open-house format is more conducive to promoting public understanding and constructive dialogue. Open house meetings allow a greater number of individuals to directly engage and interact with Navy team members and ask questions about the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, as well as provide comments on the document.

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>fault zone. It seems like that would not be a good idea. There were also comments that our area is similar to the South Korean or North Korean coast, that's one reason it has been selected here, and some of the vendors had different opinions or different information than the other vendors, even when asked the same question. There did not seem to be continuity in the answers to some of the questions. That would have been helpful, if there was continuity or some collaboration between the presenters at the different booths. This format of the separate booths did not seem to address the issues that people wanted to have answered. It would have been nice if there was a meeting where audience can ask questions, we could get direct answers, and have them verified at the time, and graciously recorded by our court reporter. Thank you.</p>	
X		
Xelette-1	Stop it	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>
Xuan-1	<p>To the Navy,</p> <p>We thank you with all our hearts for protecting the people but it's time you protect those without a voice. These beautiful animals do not deserve to suffer because of our actions. We may believe sonar testing is beneficial to us but the orcas, whales, dolphins, turtles are suffering. Please stop sonar testing and start protecting the wildlife which needs our protection the most.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>
Y		
Yanish-1	<p>I hear and some times see our jets flying over Forks almost every day. I am proud to see our pilots getting the training they need to be the best in the world. If this causes a little discomfort for a few people - so be it. They would be a lot more uncomfortable speaking Russian or Chinese.</p> <p>You are doing a great job.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p>
Yearsley-1	<p>We need to not hurt these southern orcas more then the dangers they already face every day. Please do not test in their home</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Yellowwolf-1	Please sustain from sonar testing. It has been scientifically proven that this harms sea life. Our orcas are already under threat of extinction from starvation, they cannot and should not have to battle this too. Intense and repeated exposure to certain frequencies of the sonar will affect animals' ability to hear in those ranges and this is so dangerous to those that hunt by sonar. It is our responsibility to protect our animals. We owe them that. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ying-1	Please stop the harmful sonar emitted from navy ships! This is detrimental to ocean wildlife, leading to an inhospitable environment and hear loss. We need orcas and other marine life to thrive in order to sustain our ecosystem.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Yoneda-1	I am writing today to voice my concerns regarding the naval testing off the coast of Northern California, specifically my home town of Mendocino. There are many reasons that your proposed plan create cause for concern and I have several questions about how you plan to address these concerns. I will focus on my two main concerns in this comment. First, our local economy relies on the beauty and health of our oceans. In a letter addressed to you on April 23, 2019 our county Board of Supervisors stated: "The Mendocino County Board of Supervisors believes that sonar and	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species. The potential impacts to the economy are discussed in Section 3.12 (Socioeconomic Resources). The impacts of the training and testing activities

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>explosive testing off the Mendocino Coast is detrimental to the fauna of the oceanic ecosystem on which we rely. This fragile ecosystem supports migrating whales and a wide variety of sea life and is a key economic source for our county and must not be damaged in any way.</p> <p>How do you plan to address the economic impact your testing will have on our community? Will there be baseline testing of the strength of our current economy and how it might be affected by both noise and physical pollution? Will you be able to ensure that we will not be economically impacted by your testing? If so, how? If not, why?</p> <p>Second, NOAA has recently declared a Wildlife Emergency in response to the alarming number of Gray Whales that have washed up along the west coast this migratory season. There have been at least seventy Gray Whales have washed ashore this season with the actual estimate of deaths closer to 700. Are you aware of these numbers and this declared emergency? How will you respond? Will you conduct further research on your environmental impact taking into consideration this recent surge in marine deaths? If so, how and when? If not, why?</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of my concerns,</p>	<p>in NWTT on tourism are discussed in Section 3.12.2.3 (Tourism and Recreation). No negative effects to tourism activities in the Study Area are expected from proposed training and testing activities. Therefore, loss of revenue or employment associated with tourism is not expected to occur. The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p>
Yopp-1	Save our oceans and those that live in it.	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/ • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Young-1	I understand that we need these tests for National Security. After reading the reasons they need to be done in the Pacific North West though i'm a bit ashamed of us as a whole that we don't know by now to do better by the environment and ALL the inhabitants. It is more cost effective for fuel and	<p>All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	all the reasons you stated, but there are animals that live there. Smart, sentient animals that have a right to live as much as we do. Please find another way besides sonar to find things. There is a group of killer whales that live where you want to test. I love these whales as do many people. They are becoming extinct right before our eyes because we've ruined their environment, and without any thought as to how humans will live once the ecosystems don't work any longer. We allow commercial fishing that takes their food, and because of this, they are starving to death. I would never have thought this could happen in my country, but here we are. On top of that Canada has approved the pipeline expansion, that is more noise, tanker traffic and pollution to their home. Now ;you want to add military testing to the mix. The mix that they didn't make, and have no control over, yet it's killing them. Please, find another way, and if you can not, please do the testing somewhere else for a while so IF they can survive, at least their population will be healthier. It is the equivalent of having gone through a hurricane, and before you can regroup there is no food at the stores any longer, and the air is no longer breathable. That isn't exaggeration. This is what they are trying their hardest to survive through. Please don't make it any harder than it already is. This isn't even mentioning the population of gray whales washing ashore from starvation. Thank you.	to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Youngberg-1	Hello, I am an avid hiker of the Olympic National Park and Olympic National Forest complex. I frequently hear the noise pollution from Growler planes while hiking, backpacking and trail running in the greater Olympic park complex. I also have seen planes flying lower than regulation allows and it has caused my dogs to spoke and run away. I would like the Navy to cease flying of growler planes in the area. I would also am worried what the noise and visual impact does to the local fauna in the area. There are many sensitive species in the area and I am sure they must be impacted.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.
Youngstrom-1	Thank you for your time, Sadie Youngstrom PO Box 2913 Friday Harbor, WA 98250 Marine Biologist/Observer/Captain	Please see responses below.
Youngstrom-2	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your revised supplemental draft. The document is quite extensive and I am pleased to see so much relevant literature cited. I'd like to include some of the research I found regarding the effects of sonar in particular and underwater noise to marine mammals. Nature journal filed a Freedom of Information Acts (FOIA) request for a	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids,

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>Navy report on the impacts of Sonar on whales. "Sonar does affect whales, military report confirms. Animals stopped vocalizing and foraging for food during marine exercises." by Daniel Cressey.</p> <p>Military-sponsored tests now suggest that low levels of sonar, which to not cause direct damage to whales, could still harm by triggering behavioral changes. Changes include decreased or completely ceases vocalizing and foraging for food in the area around active sonar transmissions. The report notes, "Since these animals feed at depth, this could have the effect of preventing a whale (beaked whale specifically) from feeding over the course of the trial and could lead to second or third order effects on the animal and population as a whole." The report also references a second military document from 2005, which explains that these second-and third-order effects could include starvation and then death, depending on the severity of the sonar's initial effect on the whales.(Nature, 2008 http://ocr.org/ocr/wp-content/uploads/nature_Navy_confirms_neg_effects_of_sonar.pdf)</p> <p>In another study, Ian Boyd, an expert on marine mammals at St Andrews University, UK, worked with Tyack on the response study. He says that it is possible to mitigate the effects of sonar by using forms that sound less like predators, for example, or simply by moving military exercises away from whales.</p> <p>"We need to start doing some of these sorts of things," he says. "But we need to do it within the context of an experimental set-up where we can genuinely test the extent to which there is disturbance to these animals, and potentially test new types of sonar signals, because they may only be sensitive to certain types of signal." (https://www.serdp-estcp.org/News-and-Events/Blog/Impacts-of-Sonar-on-Marine-Mammals).</p> <p>Dr. Andrew Read from Duke University Marine Lab (RC-2154, Odontocete Cetaceans: Quantifying Behavioral Ecology and Response to Predators Using a Multi-Species Approach) used playback experiments to facilitate identification of some of the key contextual factors of the behavioral responses to a threatening sound in two species of odontocetes. The biphonic calls share several characteristics with mid-frequency active sonars (MFAS). The results from the study infer that odontocetes perceive the sounds of MFAS and the sounds of predators in a similar manner, or even if they merely respond to the two sounds types the same way, we can infer much about the nature and likely magnitude of the potential risks of MFAS by understanding the anti-predator response of each species. An important conclusion resulting from this study is that there is considerable</p>	<p>minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>merit from pursuing this line of reasoning: that is, constructing a formal conceptual model of the response of odontocetes to potential threats and using interacting factors such as habitat, social structure, and body size as predictors of response. A matrix of these predictive factors can be used to predict the behavioral response of odontocetes to any threat, including MFAS, at least in a coarse manner.</p> <p>Another study, "Behavioral Ecology of Cetaceans: The Relationship of Body Condition with Behavior and Reproductive Status (RC-2337) finds Long-term consequences of disturbance are particularly difficult to quantify. Noise may reduce foraging rates and thereby body condition, which is a good predictor of offspring survival and reproductive success. Body condition influences how animals trade-off foraging and anti-predator behaviors, and it modulates responses to human disturbance. Thus, behavioral ecology studies of how body condition relates to the risk and consequences of acoustic disturbance in cetaceans should be a high priority.</p>	
Youngstrom-3	<p>"Autonomous Real-Time Passive Acoustic Monitoring of Baleen Whales for Mitigating Interactions with Naval Activities Dr. Cara Hotchkin NAVFAC Atlantic RC-201446</p> <p>The Navy regularly conducts studies of marine mammal distribution and occurrence in association with training exercises to better monitor potential interactions between marine mammals and naval activities. Methods used for these studies include visual surveys and acoustic monitoring via passive acoustic recorders; however, these methods have significant drawbacks. Visual surveys from ships and airplanes are expensive, and they cannot be conducted during nighttime or periods of high winds, rough seas, or poor visibility. Although passive acoustic recorders have large detection ranges and can be used to persistently detect vocalizing marine mammals regardless of weather conditions, recordings can be accessed only after recovery of the recording instrument. In addition, acoustic analysis by a trained person is time consuming and expensive.</p> <p>Recent advances in low-power digital signal processors, detection algorithms, and satellite communications have made near real-time (within hours of sound detection) audio processing, sound detection, classification, and reporting from autonomous platforms feasible. This project will demonstrate a passive acoustic detection and classification hardware/software system that is capable of detecting the calls of four</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record.</p> <p>The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	species of endangered baleen whales—fin (<i>Balaenoptera physalus</i>), humpback (<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>), sei (<i>Balaenoptera borealis</i>), and right (<i>Eubalaena glacialis</i>)—from three different autonomous platforms (Slocum gliders, wave gliders, moored buoys). In particular, the project seeks to: (1) demonstrate year-round, large-scale near real-time acoustic surveillance from these autonomous platforms; (2) validate near real-time acoustic detections using audio recorded in situ and airplane-, ship-, and land-based visual observations; and (3) develop best practices for integrating near real-time acoustic detections from autonomous platforms into persistent visual monitoring programs such as the current National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and Navy marine mammal aerial survey programs off the U.S. east coast.	
Youngstrom-4	<p>According to Falcone et al. 2017 behavioral changes (foraging disruption and displacement from foraging habitats) have potential long-term consequences if repeated exposures result in a reduction in individual energy stores [17,18]. Responses that increased with proximity were evident up to 100 km away in this large dataset that included sizeable samples of behavior from 16 whales during periods both with and without MFAS use, despite the relative coarseness of both the behavioral and MFAS data used in this analysis.</p> <p>In at least some specific cases where the IDDI was instead reduced during MFAS use, there is evidence that the whale did not actually resume foraging on its next deep dive, and thus the foraging disruption effect may be even stronger than these results suggest.</p> <p>This last study brings up the topic of range. In the supplemental draft, mitigation area was determined on the potentially effected animal. I was unable to find any mitigation that specified "shutdown" of operations when marine mammals were visible from observers on the ship or other vessels, reports from aircraft, buoys (hydrophones) or based on migration patterns.</p> <p>1) Research is finding a change of behavior is whales at short and long ranges, how is one to accurately account for an incidental take?</p> <p>2) How is mitigation area taken into consideration when multiple animals of same or different species are present?</p> <p>3) Short term studies are finding real time behavioral changes, very little is know on cumulative effects. In order to protect endangered/species-at-risk and threatened species, should military testing/exercises be halted in critical habitats until evidence is found that supports absolutely no change in behavior?</p> <p>In the recent publication by Castellote et al., 2019, anthropogenic noise has</p>	<p>The article cited in the comment (Falcone, 2017) was not available at the time the behavioral response functions were developed. The Navy will incorporate these findings into the Navy's future behavioral response functions as appropriate. However, the Navy's current beaked whale BRF covers the responses observed in the new article since the beaked whale risk function is more sensitive than the other risk functions at lower received levels. Thus far, no new information has been published or otherwise conveyed that would fundamentally change the assessment of impacts or conclusions of this Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Navy included mitigation for active sonar, including dipping sonar, in the Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS. Within 12 NM from shore in the Marine Species Coastal Mitigation Area, the Navy will not conduct Anti-Submarine Warfare Tracking Exercise – Helicopter, Maritime Patrol Aircraft, Ship, or Submarine training activities. These activities involve the use of MF4 and MF5.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	<p>been identified as a major threat for the recovery of the endangered Cook Inlet beluga, <i>Delphinapterus leucas</i>.</p> <p>Mitigation is mainly focused on close-range injury effects defined as the onset of permanent threshold shift (PTS) and temporary threshold shifts (TTS) in marine mammal hearing, following the recently updated NOAA technical guidance report (NMFS, 2018). Although behavioral harassment is also considered as part of the mitigation, a small number of takes is often allowed because of the difficulties in monitoring the extensive areas encompassed to level B harassment threshold (120 dB re 1 μPa for non-impulsive and 160 dB for impulsive sources, NOAA, 1995). Five previous acoustic studies collected noise data and suggested that the background noise in upper Cook Inlet may often exceed 120 dB re 1 μPa (Heenehan, 2009; Blackwell and Greene3; URS4; Širovic; and Kendall5, HDR6). These results led the NMFS to define an exception for upper Cook Inlet of 125 dBrms for behavioral harassment (level B take) by non-impulsive noise instead of the standard 120 dBrms limit (NMFS7).</p> <p>The acoustic characteristics of most of the detected noise events in this study have the potential to mask beluga hearing at certain frequencies and also their communication, and some exceed the current NOAA behavioral harassment thresholds on a daily basis.</p> <p>The background noise level to be considered for behavioral responses of belugas in Cook Inlet should correspond to the quiet undisturbed natural conditions, rather than conditions when other anthropogenic activities are altering the background noise levels (even if these are common).</p> <p>4) This brings into focus, the overall levels in the study area and if military testing would exceed marine mammals PTS and TTS and allowable behavioral harassment thresholds?</p>	
Youngstrom-5	<p>5) Does the draft provide contact information and educational outreach to the public to report marine mammal sightings when know military exercises are underway?</p> <p>6) What kind of public outreach is provided in advance to scheduled military exercises?</p>	Due to national security concerns, the Navy does not typically provide advance notice of training or testing activities.
Youngstrom-6	7) What are the consequences or accountability the Navy will be responsible for if known harm or exceeding allowable takes to marine mammals or documented during training exercises?	The Navy is subject to the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and coordinates with the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service if the Navy anticipates it would exceed allowable takes.
Youngstrom-7	<p>8) Lastly the Southern Resident killer whale population is 76 currently but is reported as 77.</p> <p>Please reach out with any questions/clarification, updates you may have.</p>	There are several sources of abundance numbers for marine mammal species. For consistency, the Navy uses abundance numbers of Southern Resident killer whales (as well as other marine mammal species) provided by NMFS in

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		the most recent Stock Assessment Report. The Navy tracks this species closely and will continue to use the most recent available data.
Youngstrom-8	<p>Using studies conducted as far back as 1984 as source material for your EIS/OEIS draft is wholly unacceptable. So far this year, 70 gray whales washed ashore on the west coast, five times the average rate. NOAA has declared a wildlife emergency. The SEIS at 3.4.282 states that "military expended materials will sink to the ocean floor". At 3.4.302 the SEIS states that "for the most part," this material will be ingested by bottom feeders, Gray whales are bottom feeders. The SEIS needs to take into account the already stressed gray whale population. Scientific studies have shown that explosives and SONAR are detrimental to marine animals. For whales and dolphins, listening is the way they see and communicate and is integral to their survival. Under these circumstances, will the Navy provide updated studies in the OEIS reflecting the current crisis? Until NOAA's study on the die-off on the Gray Whales is complete, shouldn't any disruption of the ocean by sonar and explosive activity be halted?</p> <p>https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/gray-whales-stranded-west-coast-1.5119056</p> <p>https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2533</p> <p>The economic considerations are well-stated in the letter of opposition to sonar testing off the coast of Mendocino County by the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors in their letter to you dated April 21, 2019. To paraphrase: sonar and explosive testing off the Mendocino coast is detrimental to the fragile oceanic ecosystem on which we rely. The wide variety of sea life is a key economic source for our county and must not be damaged in any way.</p> <p>Will you please slow down this process to allow enough time for current scientific data to be added to your SEIS?</p> <p>Thank you for your serious consideration.</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p> <p>The Navy uses the most current marine mammal population data available from the National Marine Fisheries Service. The 2008 and 2010 references cited in the comment were not used by the Navy to determine current populations.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the recent gray whale deaths. In the 2019 NOAA Report which officially declared the Gray Whale Unusual Mortality Event, full or partial necropsy examinations were conducted on a subset of the whales. Preliminary findings in several of the whales have shown evidence of emaciation. These findings are not consistent across all of the whales examined, so more research is needed. With this in mind, there are no indications that any of the deaths are caused/related to naval activities.</p>
Yount-1	<p>Navy sonar testing is an awful idea. This is critical habitat for the critically endangered Southern Resident killer whales. L112 Sooke was killed by Navy sonar, it was so impactful that her ears and her brain hemorrhaged. So, no! This should NOT happen!!</p>	<p>The Navy is aware that the Southern Resident killer whale population is at risk.</p> <p>The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Yseth-1	Please do not release any environmental “stressors,” including heavy metals and explosives, into the coastal waters of the U.S. Pacific Northwest. With the local wildlife populations struggling, including the local orca pods, I believe this will negatively affect them. These metals will undoubtedly have a negative impact on the marine ecosystem, and therefore also the fishing industry.	<p>Please see Section 3.1 (Sediments and Water Quality) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS for the analysis of impacts to water quality from the Navy's proposed activities.</p> <p>Best management practices include measures that regulate operations to ensure compliance with pollution emission requirements and general resource conservation goals. Navy policies and procedures identified in Navy instructions such as the Environmental Readiness Program Manual, include directives regarding waste management, pollution prevention, and recycling, all of which benefit sediments and water quality in the ocean. Any procedures or practices that benefit ocean sediments and water quality in turn benefit all marine life in the ocean, from plants and invertebrates, to fish and marine mammals.</p>
Yuen-1	7) What are the consequences or accountability the Navy will be responsible for if known harm or exceeding allowable takes to marine mammals or documented during training exercises?	The Navy is subject to the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and coordinates with the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service if the Navy anticipates it would exceed allowable takes.
Z		
Zablocki-1	Please take into consideration that the sonar testing is greatly harming the orcas (and other marine life as well). Orcas are already a species that are suffering greatly and it would mean a lot to conservation efforts if the sonar testing ended or was conducted in a better manner. Thank you.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Zachariadou-1	Please end the sonar testing, the marine animals of our beautiful area will not be able to handle it. Plenty of other places to do this stuff! The environment and wildlife should be top priority.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Zadorozny-1	<p>I am extremely concerned upon reading how again humans believe they have the right to destroy the world below the surface of the seas. 50 to 80% of all life on earth is below the surface of the oceans. Only 10% of that has been explored by humans and holds many secrets to our existence and further conservation is needed to preserve the deep, dark sea, and all the life it contains.</p> <p>I have read reports from marine biologist Alexandra Morton about the Southern Resident Killer Whales and Transient Killer Whales. Their feeding grounds in the Broughton Archipelago were abandoned when Fish Farms in the area started using sonar to repel them and all other marine life including dolphins.</p> <p>She studied whales for 25 years, Living an intimate co-existence with them. Reading her studies were mind altering for me. Maybe you are able to widen your perspective as well with more research before doing something that will change the lives of an endangered species (SRKW) plus countless numbers of sentient beings in our Salish Sea.</p> <p>Echolocation and communication between whales is interrupted when sonar is in their waters, to cause devastating effects.</p> <p>A very enlightening excerpt from Alexandra Morton's book, Listening to Whales: " When they fish they split up one taking each shoreline as they call back and forth. Each call might show fish, transients and islands in a radarlike sweep. The oil filled antennae that are their lower jaws, carry acoustic vibrations deep into direct contact with their inner ears. There, translated into electrical pulses, the vibrations flash up to the auditory site of the brain on a rich weave of nerves. From there the signal is boosted on a superhighway to the neocortex-the centre for higher thought. That's where the holes in each sound could be read like braille to reveal a school of Salmon.</p> <p>Because cetaceans are one of only three types of mammals that can mimic a sound (bats and humans are the other two), a whale might broadcast a travel-worn signal with enough fidelity to show a third whale where the mother load of fish can be found. The possibilities multiply exponentially when you consider projection of three dimensional images between whales."</p> <p>We are stewards of this planet, we are here not to destroy but to live in</p>	<p>The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.</p>

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	co-existence with the many life forms in the intricate web of life. When we destroy keystone species like Salmon, Whales and our forests then disintegrate. We are all connected and dependant on each other. Please use your Please, please, please, use the neocortex portion of your brain and rethink what you will later regret doing. Think about the big picture. We cannot survive without whales, forests, air and our precious, finite water supply on this planet. The planet can and will survive without us. We want to make changes now to save what is left for future generations.	
Zahrobky-1	Please do your training exercises out of the migratory pathways of the gray whales. They should be protected from possible harm. Respectfully submitted.	The Navy has conducted training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Zamora-1	It is vital that we protect whales and dolphins from sonic distress and injury through Navy testing. They are under too many pressures and sonic testing does very little to aid our defense. Please stop immediately.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Zarconi-1	I feel this is so wrong to be doing and so harmful to the animals.	Thank you for your participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process. Your comment is part of the official project record. The Navy takes its environmental stewardship responsibilities seriously while preparing for its mission. As a steward of the environment, the Navy avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential effects on the environment from its activities. To learn more about marine species, sonar, and sound in the water, and the Navy's ocean stewardship programs, visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Navy's Marine Species Monitoring webpage at: www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Discovery of Sound in the Sea website at: www.dosits.org • The Living Marine Resources Program at: https://www.navfac.navy.mil/lmr • The Office of Naval Research's Science and Technology programs at: https://www.onr.navy.mil/Science-Technology/Departments/Code-32/all-programs/marine-mammals-biology • The Navy's project website at: www.NWTTEIS.com
Zeiner-1	Please stop the sonar blasts! These creatures are already struggling to survive. Do the right thing, please!	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Zerke-1	I am completely AGAINST underwater sonar testing. Many marine mammals use sound extensively to navigate and to find food sources, and by engaging in underwater sonar testing, the navy is threatening the survival not just of one species, but of an entire ECOSYSTEM. This is absolutely outrageous. The Pacific Northwest ecosystem is what thousands of people depend on to make their living and by threatening this ecosystem, the navy is also threatening the livelihood of countless people. If humans can figure out how to put people on the moon and perform heart transplants, I'm pretty sure the navy can figure out how to do what it needs to do without destroying an entire ecosystem and an entire sea-based economy. People and animals should not be threatened because the navy does not want to be inconvenienced. The Navy's job is to protect from harm, not to be the cause of harm.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Ziemer-1	We all need to be concerned about supporting our marine and wildlife environment. I am asking the DOD to put that need as the priority in choosing which areas to fly training missions st. There are many less sensitive areas in our country to do this training where there is less negative impact on people and the environment.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Zillioux-1	Whales are dying quickly, not just the southern residents. We need them for the health of the planet. They serve a huge role in pulling carbon out of the atmosphere among other things. And nobody wants to nor is able to	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study

Table H-6: Responses to Comments from Individual Members of the Public (continued)

<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Navy Response</i>
	live on a dead planet. The sonar situation is simply unacceptable. We have greater needs than whatever the sonar is supposed to accomplish. It's an inferior priority. Thank you.	Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Živanović-1	I don't really know what to say about this besides that it's obviously bad harming animals like this especially when you know that you're doing it. I really think that these testings should stop as soon as possible.	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Zucker-1	We wish that this could be more "substantive", but I am not among naval personnel, scientists, or engineers. I am a private citizen writing on behalf of my family, including 7 voting, tax-paying adults, all of whom have grave concerns about the priorities of naval research. To wit: We oppose, and hope that you will respect, the other vulnerable creatures with whom we share territory. We are dismayed and worried for the health of cetaceans who must co-exist with us and our defense systems' needs. We read too often of dwindling Orca populations in our part of the world, plus numerous beachings of whales and dolphins; plus whales gored by ships as they go about their "business" (some of it commercial). Yes, we believe that your tests and exercises bear much responsibility for devastation at sea. We hope that national security and cetacean survival can both be considered when your decisions are made, now and in future. Thank you	All of the potential effects from Navy training and testing activities were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.
Zure-1	Our West Coast Marine Life is in severe decline. Sonar testing is clearly destructive beyond measure and has no place in our oceans at all, much less in the Pacific Northwest. It is incumbent upon us to do everything we can to SUPPORT the recovery of our dying marine life, particularly whales and dolphins, no add to their demise. Extinction is not an option and the people don't want this.	The Navy has conducted active sonar training and testing activities in the Study Area for decades, and there is no evidence that routine Navy training and testing has negatively impacted marine mammal populations in the Study Area. Based on the best available science summarized in the Supplemental EIS/OEIS Section 3.4.3.4 (Summary of Monitoring and Observations During Navy Activities Since 2015), long-term consequences for marine mammal populations are unlikely to result from Navy training and testing activities in the Study Area. As discussed in Chapter 5 (Mitigation) of the Supplemental EIS/OEIS, the Navy will implement mitigation to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the Proposed Action on marine species.