

1

2 4.8 CONFLICTS WITH FEDERAL, STATE, AND 3 LOCAL LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND 4 CONTROLS FOR THE AREA CONCERNED

5 Based on an evaluation of consistency with statutory obligations, the Navy's proposed training
6 and RDT&E operations for the HRC do not conflict with the objectives or requirements of
7 Federal, State, regional, or local plans, policies, or legal requirements. The proposed training
8 and RDT&E operations would not alter the use of the sites that currently support missile and
9 rocket testing. Enhancement of the HRC would be in accordance with applicable Federal,
10 State, and local planning plans and policies. The DoD maintains Federal jurisdiction for on-
11 installation land use. Table 4.8-1 provides a summary of environmental compliance
12 requirements that may apply to the proposed training and RDT&E operations.

Table 4.8-1. Summary of Environmental Compliance Requirements

Plans, Policies, and Statutory Requirements	Responsible Agency	Compliance Status
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. § 4321, et seq.) Department of the Navy Procedures for Implementing NEPA (OPNAVINST 5090.1B, February 1998)	U.S. Navy	This Environmental Impact Statement and Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) has been prepared in accordance with Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] § 1500-1508) and Navy NEPA procedures. Public participation and review is being conducted in compliance with the NEPA statute.
Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. § 1531) Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 CFR § 1431 et seq.)	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)	Effects on listed species are the subject of consultations with USFWS and NMFS.
Clean Water Act Section 401/402 (§§ 4101-402, 33 U.S.C. § 1251 et seq.) Section 404 (§ 404, 33 U.S.C. § 1251 et seq.)	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	The proposed training and RDT&E operations would not discharge dredged or fill material. Discharges into the water will not result in contaminant concentrations above regulatory standards.
Rivers and Harbors Act (33 U.S.C. § 401 et seq.)	USACE	A Section 10 permit in accordance with the Rivers and Harbors Act is not required.
Clean Air Act (CAA) (42 U.S.C. § 7401 et seq.)	USEPA	The proposed training and RDT&E operations would not compromise the air quality in Hawaii.

Table 4.8-1. Summary of Environmental Compliance Requirements (Continued)

Plans, Policies, and Statutory Requirements	Responsible Agency	Compliance Status
National Marine Sanctuaries Act	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	
National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.)	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, California State Historic Preservation Office	The proposed training and RDT&E operations would not have a significant impact on cultural resources.
Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) (16 CFR § 1451, et seq.)	Hawaii Coastal Zone Management Program	The Navy is preparing a Coastal Consistency Determination in accordance with the CZMA.
Executive Order (EO) 12114 Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions	U.S. Navy	EO 12114 requires environmental consideration for actions that may affect the environment outside of U.S. Territorial Waters. This EIS/OEIS satisfies the requirement of EO 12114.
EO 13112 Invasive Species	U.S. Navy	EO 13112 requires Agencies to identify actions that may affect the status of invasive species and take measures to avoid introduction and spread of these species. This EIS/OEIS satisfies the requirement of EO 13112 with regard to the proposed training and RDT&E operations.
EO 11990 Protection of Wetlands	U.S. Navy	The proposed training and RDT&E operations would not have a significant impact on wetlands.
EO 12962 Recreational Fisheries	U.S. Navy	EO 12962 requires Agencies to fulfill certain duties with regard to promoting the health and access of the public to recreational fishing areas. The proposed training and RDT&E operations do not have a significant impact on Navy actions in support of this EO.
EO 12898, Federal Action to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations	U.S. Navy	The proposed training and RDT&E operations would not disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations.
EO 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health and Safety Risks	U.S. Navy	The proposed training and RDT&E operations would not disproportionately affect children.

1

2 4.9 ENERGY REQUIREMENTS AND 3 CONSERVATION POTENTIAL

4 The proposed training and RDT&E operations include increased training and testing operations
5 in the HRC. In order to implement the proposed training and RDT&E operations, increased
6 amounts of fossil fuels would be required to power the increased use by ships and aircraft.
7 These fuels are currently in adequate supply from either Navy owned sources or from
8 commercial distributors. The required electricity demands would be met by the existing
9 electrical generation infrastructure on the Hawaiian Islands.

10 Anticipated energy requirements of the continued use and enhancement of the HRC would be
11 well within the energy supply capacity of all facilities. Energy requirements would be subject to
12 any established energy conservation practices at each facility. No additional power generation

1 capacity other than the potential use of generators would be required for any of the training and
 2 RDT&E operations. The use of energy sources has been minimized wherever possible without
 3 compromising safety, training, or testing operations. No additional conservation measures
 4 related to direct energy consumption by the proposed training and RDT&E operations are
 5 identified.

6 **4.10 IRREVERSIBLE OR IRRETRIEVABLE** 7 **COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES**

8 Resources that are irreversibly or irretrievably committed to a project are those that are used on
 9 a long-term or permanent basis. This includes the use of nonrenewable resources such as
 10 fuels. Human labor is also considered a nonrenewable resource. Use of these resources is
 11 considered irreversible or irretrievable since they would be committed to the proposed training
 12 and RDT&E operations and would not be available for other purposes. Furthermore,
 13 unavoidable destruction of natural resources as a result of the proposed training and RDT&E
 14 operations is considered an irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources if the potential
 15 uses of these resources become limited.

16 The proposed training and RDT&E operations would have an irreversible or irretrievable effect
 17 due to the use of nonrenewable energy sources: fuels for aircraft, vessels, and vehicles.
 18 Implementation of the proposed training and RDT&E operations would not result in the
 19 destruction of environmental resources so as to cause the potential uses of the environment of
 20 the HRC to be limited. The proposed training and RDT&E operations would not adversely affect
 21 the biodiversity or cultural integrity within the HRC including the marine, terrestrial, or human
 22 environment.

23 **4.11 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM** 24 **USE OF THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT AND** 25 **THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT** 26 **OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY**

27 The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires an analysis of the relationship between
 28 a project's short-term impacts on the environment and the effects that these impacts may have
 29 on the maintenance and enhancement of the long-term productivity of the affected environment.
 30 Impacts that narrow the range of beneficial uses of the environment are of particular concern.
 31 This means that choosing one option may reduce future flexibility in pursuing other options, or
 32 that committing a resource to a certain use may often eliminate the possibility for other uses of
 33 that resource.

34 The proposed training and RDT&E operations would result in both short- and long-term
 35 environmental effects. The Navy is committed to sustainable range management, including co-
 36 use of the HRC with the general public and commercial interests. This commitment to co-use
 37 will enhance the long-term productivity of the range areas and surrounding areas.

4.12 FEDERAL ACTIONS TO ADDRESS ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE IN MINORITY POPULATIONS AND LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS (EXECUTIVE ORDER 12898)

An Environmental Justice analysis is included in this document to comply with the intent of Executive Order (EO) 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*, Navy, and Department of Defense guidance. The EO states that “each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.” In addition, the EO requires that minority and low-income populations be given access to information and opportunities to provide input to decision making on Federal actions.

As described in Chapter 1.0, scoping is an early and open process for developing the “scope” of issues to be addressed in the EIS and for identifying significant issues related to a proposed action. During scoping, the public helps define and prioritize issues and convey these issues to the agency through both oral and written comments. Four scoping meetings were held on the islands of Maui, Oahu, Hawaii, and Kauai, respectively. The scoping meetings were held in an open house format, presenting informational posters and written information, and making Navy staff and project experts available to answer participants’ questions. The public also has an additional opportunity to review the proposed actions during their review of the Draft EIS/OEIS.

The Navy has evaluated training and RDT&E operations and proposed enhancements in the HRC, specifically related to the islands that could potentially be affected by HRC training and RDT&E operations, due to the nature of the activities proposed on and around the islands. Training and RDT&E operations occur in the open ocean, offshore, and within existing Navy, Army, or Marine Corps installations boundaries generally away from population centers. No expansion of the area encompassed within the HRC is planned. In addition, there would be no displacement of persons associated with training and RDT&E operations and proposed HRC enhancements.

The percentage of minority or low-income population in the census area exceeds 50 percent (see Table 4.12-1); and thus the proposed training and RDT&E operations need to comply with EO 12898. Demographics of the population of Kauai and Oahu in 2000 were previously presented Table 3.3.2.1.10-1 and Table 3.4.2.1.3-1, respectively.

Table 4.12-1. Population and Ethnicity for the State of Hawaii

Geographic Area	Total Population	Race								
		Total	White	Black or African American	American Indian	Asian	Native Hawaiian	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic or Latino (of Any Race)
Hawaii	1,211,537	952,194	294,102	22,003	3,535	503,868	113,539	15,147	59,343	87,699
County										
Hawaii	148,677	106,389	46,904	698	666	39,702	16,724	1,695	42,288	14,111
Honolulu	876,156	710,532	186,484	20,619	2,178	403,371	77,680	11,200	74,624	58,729
Kalawao	147	138	38	0	0	25	71	4	9	6
Kauai	58,463	44,525	17,255	177	212	21,042	5,334	505	13,938	4,803
Maui	128,094	99,610	43,421	509	479	39,728	13,730	1,743	28,484	10,050

1 Source: 2000 Census

2 According to Council on Environmental Quality environmental justice guidance under NEPA,
 3 agencies should consider three factors when determining whether human health effects are
 4 disproportionately high and adverse:

- 5 • Whether the health effects (bodily impairment, infirmity, illness, or death) are significant,
 6 according to NEPA, or above generally accepted norms
- 7 • Whether the risk or rate of exposure to an environmental hazard by a minority or low-
 8 income population is significant under NEPA and appreciably exceeds or is likely to
 9 appreciably exceed that of the general population or appropriate comparison group
- 10 • Whether health effects occur in a minority or low-income population affected by
 11 cumulative or multiple adverse exposures from environmental hazards

12 The following factors should be considered when determining whether environmental effects are
 13 disproportionately high and adverse:

- 14 • Whether there is or will be an impact on the natural or physical environment (ecological,
 15 cultural, human health, economic, or social) that significantly, under NEPA, and
 16 adversely affects a minority or low-income population that appreciably exceeds or is
 17 likely to appreciably exceed that of the general population or appropriate comparison
 18 group
- 19 • Whether environmental effects are significant, under NEPA, and are or may be having
 20 an adverse impact on minority or low-income populations that
- 21 • Whether environmental effects occur or would occur in a minority or low-income
 22 population affected by cumulative or multiple adverse exposures from environmental
 23 hazards

24 The following discussion provides an analysis of environmental justice concerns grouped into
 25 the following resource categories: air quality, airspace, biological resources, cultural resources,
 26 geology and soils, hazardous materials and waste, health and safety, land use, noise,
 27 socioeconomics, transportation, utilities, and water resources. In accordance with the
 28 requirements of EO 12898, the Navy has determined that proposed training and RDT&E
 29 operations and HRC enhancements would not result in disproportionately high and adverse

1 environmental or health impacts on minority or low-income populations. There would be no
2 direct or indirect environmental, cultural, health, or economic impacts specific to any groups
3 from minority or low-income populations nor have any such effects been identified in this
4 EIS/OEIS. Therefore, there would be no impacts related to Environmental Justice under the
5 No-action Alternative, Alternative 1, or Alternative 2 as described below.

6 **4.12.1 AIR QUALITY**

7 Environmental justice concerns associated with air quality would occur if the current air quality
8 attainment status would change as a result of the No-action Alternative, Alternative 1, or
9 Alternative 2 or if air emissions exceed a health-based standard in a minority or low-income
10 area. Results of analysis conducted for HRC activities determined that there would be no
11 change to the current attainment status and no health-based air quality standards would be
12 exceeded in minority or low-income neighborhoods.

13 **4.12.2 AIRSPACE**

14 Environmental justice concerns associated with airspace would occur if modifications or a need
15 for additional airspace is required as a result of the No-action Alternative, Alternative 1, or
16 Alternative 2 or significant (under NEPA) impacts to commercial airspace use were determined
17 in a minority or low-income area. Results of analysis conducted for HRC activities determined
18 that there would be no modifications or need for additional airspace and no significant impacts
19 to commercial airspace use in minority or low-income neighborhoods.

20 **4.12.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

21 Environmental justice concerns associated with biological resources would occur if local
22 subsistence food sources (e.g., fish) would be adversely impacted by the No-action Alternative,
23 Alternative 1, or Alternative 2. Although some fish may be injured or killed, as discussed under
24 the biological resources sections, vegetation and wildlife are not anticipated to be significantly
25 (under NEPA) impacted by current or proposed HRC activities.

26 **4.12.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

27 Environmental justice concerns associated with cultural resources would occur if traditional
28 resources or properties to which religious and cultural significance is attached are impacted as a
29 result of the No-action Alternative, Alternative 1, or Alternative 2. Although access to some
30 traditional resource areas may be denied during current or proposed HRC activities for safety
31 reasons, this would only be temporary. The Navy would consult with SHPO and the Office of
32 Hawaiian Affairs prior to any construction.

33 **4.12.5 GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

34 Environmental justice concerns associated with impacts to geology and soils would occur from
35 construction-related ground disturbance and the potential for soil contamination. No minority or
36 low-income populations are located within the areas proposed for construction. The potential
37 for minority or low-income populations to come in contact with soil (beach) that could be
38 affected by missile emissions and hazardous materials does exist. However, any spill or
39 terminated flight debris would be quickly remediated to prevent any soil contamination.

1 **4.12.6 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND WASTE**

2 Environmental justice concerns associated with hazardous materials and waste as a result of
 3 the No-action Alternative, Alternative 1, or Alternative 2 would occur if minority or low-income
 4 populations were to be exposed. All hazardous materials used and hazardous waste generated
 5 would be conducted in accordance with Federal and State regulations. There are no minority or
 6 low-income populations residing adjacent to where most of the hazardous materials and waste
 7 operations would occur. Any hazardous materials that would result from an early missile flight
 8 termination would be cleared from the ground hazard area, and any contamination would be
 9 remediated.

10 **4.12.7 HEALTH AND SAFETY**

11 Environmental justice concerns associated with health and safety would occur if the risk or rate
 12 of exposure to an environmental hazard by a minority or low-income population is significant
 13 under NEPA and appreciably exceeds or is likely to appreciably exceed that of the general
 14 population or appropriate comparison group. As addressed in the health and safety sections,
 15 there are minimal health and safety risks associated with the No-action Alternative, Alternative 1
 16 or Alternative 2. Transportation of hazardous materials would follow all applicable Federal and
 17 State regulations. Some minority and low-income populations do use the ocean adjacent to the
 18 military installations where training and RDT&E operations occur. Navy, Army, and Marine
 19 Corps personnel take every reasonable precaution during planning and execution of training
 20 and RDT&E operations to prevent injury to human life or property. Specific safety plans have
 21 been developed to ensure that each training operation is in compliance with applicable policy
 22 and regulations, and to ensure that the general public and range personnel and assets are
 23 provided an acceptable level of safety.

24 Missile launches by their very nature involve some degree of risk, and it is for this reason that
 25 DoD and the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) have specific launch and range safety
 26 policies and procedures to ensure that any potential risk to the public and government assets
 27 (launch support facilities) is minimized. Applicable State and Federal regulations and range
 28 safety plans and procedures are followed in transporting and handling potentially explosive
 29 ordnance and hazardous materials. Missile components, including any propellant, are
 30 transported in Department of Transportation and military designed and approved shipping
 31 containers. An explosive safety quantity-distance (ESQD) surrounding the missile launcher is
 32 calculated based on the equivalent explosive force of all propellant and pyrotechnic materials
 33 contained on the flight vehicle. All potentially hazardous debris resulting from an accident on
 34 the launcher will be contained entirely within the ESQD, which will already have been cleared of
 35 unprotected personnel. To protect people from injury from either nominal launches or
 36 accidents, two primary mitigation measures are in place: flight termination and clearance of
 37 specified regions. Clearance areas include the ground hazard area for land areas, Ship
 38 Exclusion Zones for ocean areas, and Restricted Airspace and Altitude Reservations for
 39 airspace.

40 Prior to each mission, the PMRF Flight Safety Office performs a comprehensive analysis of the
 41 proposed mission, including flight plans, planned impact areas, vehicle response to
 42 malfunctions, and effects of flight termination action. A probabilistic analysis is performed with
 43 sufficient conservative assumptions incorporated to ensure that the risks from the mission are
 44 acceptable. These acceptable risk criteria are designed to ensure that the risk to the public

1 from range operations is lower than the average background risk for other third-party activities
2 (for example, the risk of a person on the ground being injured from an airplane crash).

3 Range safety would be responsible for ensuring the safe usage of the proposed laser systems
4 on the PMRF range. Range safety would require the proposed high-energy laser program to
5 provide specific information about the proposed usage so that a safety analysis of all types of
6 hazards could be completed and appropriate remedial procedures would be taken before
7 initiation of potentially hazardous laser activities.

8 **4.12.8 LAND USE**

9 The potential impacts to land use from the No-action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2
10 would occur from the addition of new facilities, potential incompatible land uses, and restriction
11 of access to popular beach, fishing, and hunting areas. All of the activities within the HRC occur
12 adjacent to compatible land uses. There are no residential land use areas that would be
13 affected by current or proposed activities. However, minority and low-income populations do
14 use the ocean adjacent to the islands for subsistence fishing, and hunt near some of the support
15 sites. Residents place a high value on traditional fishing and gathering activities and on
16 Hawaiian customs and practices. The availability of an alternate source of food gives residents
17 a sense of self-sufficiency and freedom and reduces dependence on a cash economy.
18 Subsistence activities, therefore, are important in supplementing relatively low family incomes,
19 as well as maintaining the preferred lifestyle of community.

20 As discussed under the land use sections, access to some of the beaches adjacent to the
21 military installations within the HRC for fishing is allowed and some of these areas would be
22 restricted during hazardous operations. Other areas within the HRC would be available for use.
23 Advance notification is provided of closure times (through a 24-hour hotline at PMRF), so
24 minimal impacts to subsistence fishing are expected. Closure of the southern portion of
25 Polihale State Park on Kauai would occur no more than 30 minutes per launch or up to 15 hours
26 total per year and would only affect the southern end of the park, which in turn would only affect
27 the ability of minority and low-income populations to subsistence fish for short periods during the
28 year.

29 **4.12.9 NOISE**

30 Environmental justice concerns associated with noise would occur if the risk or rate of exposure
31 to a noise level by a minority or low-income population that exceeds DoD or the Occupational
32 Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) safety requirements outside of areas where the public
33 is excluded. Construction related noise on PMRF would be temporary in nature and would only
34 affect a very limited area. Construction related noise would not impact any minority or low-
35 income residential areas on the island.

36 Launch related noise may be quite high under the No-action Alternative, Alternative 1, and
37 Alternative 2. However, none of the noise levels would exceed either DoD or OSHA safety
38 requirements outside of the ground hazard area where non-essential personnel and the public
39 are excluded (during launches). Personnel within the ground hazard area would wear hearing
40 protection devices. Noise levels from launches from the southern end of PMRF may startle,
41 awaken, or distract low-income and minority neighborhoods in the town of Kekaha. However,
42 the number of launches from southern PMRF would be infrequent with most occurring on the

1 northern end of the island. Other noise generating activities within the HRC would occur near
2 the source and are not expected to significantly (under NEPA) impact any minority or low-
3 income areas.

4 **4.12.10 SOCIOECONOMICS**

5 As discussed under the socioeconomic sections, the activities under the No-action Alternative,
6 Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 would provide an economic benefit to the islands affected by
7 HRC training and RDT&E operations. The opportunities and economic benefit provided help
8 support all industries on the islands and assist both minority and low-income populations. The
9 potential restriction of areas used for commercial fishing and tourist related industries does not
10 affect those industries. Potential impacts to subsistence fishing and gathering activities is
11 addressed above under land use.

12 **4.12.11 TRANSPORTATION**

13 Environmental justice concerns associated with transportation would occur if adverse impacts to
14 the transportation systems used by a minority or low-income population is significant under
15 NEPA and appreciably exceed or are likely to appreciably exceed that of the general population
16 or appropriate comparison group. As addressed in the transportation sections, during
17 operational periods, the potential for range users would vary from small teams working for 3 to 6
18 months to as many as 300 individuals visiting for 1 to 2 days to witness and participate in a
19 specific mission. The amount of traffic on the main island highways and potentially other local
20 roadways could be temporarily affected during these training and RDT&E operations. Overall,
21 the effect on roadways would be temporary and the effect on roadways from enhanced RTD&E
22 operations would also be temporary and only occur during the time the activity is being
23 conducted.

24 **4.12.12 UTILITIES**

25 The increase on utilities demand would occur during the training and RDT&E operation periods,
26 which are discrete and intermittent. These increase would be within the available capacity of
27 island utility systems with no effect to minority or low-income populations. The current power
28 supply from Kauai Island Utility Cooperative is sufficient to support the new Range Operation
29 Control Building and associated building conversions or relocations proposed for PMRF.
30 Domestic waterlines would be added on PMRF to accommodate increases in demand, and the
31 wastewater treatment system would be constructed and connected to the current system.

32 **4.12.13 WATER RESOURCES**

33 Environmental justice concerns associated with water resources would occur if adverse impacts
34 to water quality used by a minority or low-income population are significant under NEPA and
35 appreciably exceed or are likely to appreciably exceed that of the general population or
36 appropriate comparison group. Analysis of launch-related impacts is covered in the Strategic
37 Target System EIS (U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command, 1992), which evaluated the
38 potential impacts of launch emissions, spills of toxic materials, and early flight termination. The
39 analysis concluded that hydrogen chloride emissions would not significantly affect the chemical
40 composition of surface or groundwater; that there would be no significant increase in aluminum
41 oxide in surface waters due to launches; that sampling of surface waters in the vicinity of the

1 launch site showed that hydrogen chloride, potentially deposited during past launches, has not
2 affected surface water quality on PMRF or adjacent areas; and that contamination from spills of
3 toxic materials will be highly unlikely. Subsequent sampling and analysis, prior to and following
4 a 26 February 1993 Strategic Target System target launch, showed little or no evidence that the
5 launch produced any adverse impact on water, soil, or vegetation (U.S. Army Space and
6 Strategic Defense Command, 1993). As described in Chapter 3.0, sampling for perchlorate was
7 conducted at PMRF in October and November 2006 and the results indicated perchlorate levels
8 were within guidelines. Therefore, HRC RDT&E operations are not expected to affect water
9 resources used by minority or low-income populations.

10 Based on the estimated total concentrations of munitions constituents dissolved in rainwater
11 migrating from the EOD Land Range on Oahu, their contribution to concentrations of water
12 pollutants in Pearl Harbor will be negligible. These inputs would be periodic, and tidal flushing
13 would further substantially disperse and dilute them. Thus, these intermittent, short-term
14 discharges of very small amounts of munitions constituents into surface waters will have no
15 effect on water resources.

16 **4.13 FEDERAL ACTIONS TO ADDRESS** 17 **PROTECTION OF CHILDREN FROM** 18 **ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH RISKS AND** 19 **SAFETY RISKS (EXECUTIVE ORDER 13045,** 20 **AS AMENDED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER** 21 **13229)**

22 Since the majority of training and RDT&E operations as part of continued use and enhancement
23 of the HRC would be conducted on DoD property and out in the open ocean, this EIS/OEIS has
24 not identified any environmental health and safety risks that may disproportionately affect
25 children.