
12.0 Public Scoping Summary

12.0 PUBLIC SCOPING SUMMARY

2 General Summary of the Scoping Period

3 The scoping period for the Hawaii Range Complex Environmental Impact Statement
4 (EIS)/Overseas EIS (OEIS) began with publication of a Notice of Intent on August 29, 2006.
5 The scoping period lasted 46 days, concluding on October 13, 2006. Four scoping meetings
6 were held on September 13, 14, 16, and 18 on the islands of Maui, Oahu, Hawaii, and Kauai,
7 respectively. The scoping meetings were held in an open house format, presenting
8 informational posters and written information and making Navy staff and project experts
9 available to answer participants' questions. Additionally, a court reporter was available to
10 record participants' oral comments. The interaction during the information sessions was
11 productive and helpful to the Navy.

12 Scoping participants could submit comments in six ways:

- 13 • Oral statements at the public meetings (as recorded in transcripts by the court
14 reporter);
- 15 • Written comments at the public meetings;
- 16 • Faxed letters;
- 17 • Written letters;
- 18 • Electronic mail; and
- 19 • Voice mails left on the project information line.

20
21 In total, the Navy received 353 comments. This summary gives an overview of comments
22 received through these means during the scoping period. Comments are organized by issue
23 area.

24 Air Quality

25 Comments in this category expressed concern about the effects of military activities on air
26 quality, such as effects from emissions from ships and other off-shore engines, and suggested
27 procedures the Navy could implement to decrease emissions. Other air quality comments
28 requested that the Navy analyze more global impacts of its activities, such as impacts to
29 weather patterns, polar ice caps, and the atmosphere.

30 Airspace

31 Commenters asked how and where the Navy is proposing to increase its use of airspace and
32 what risks could accompany increased use, such as the potential to interfere with commercial
33 air traffic. Commenters also provided suggestions on how the Navy could decrease its impact
34 on airspace use.

1 **Alternatives**

2 Most comments regarding alternatives suggested that the Navy consider other sites to conduct
3 its activities. Several comments included suggestions of alternative technologies to sonar and
4 alternative methods of conducting research on the effects of sonar on marine mammals.

5 **Biological Resources—Open Ocean and Offshore**

6 A significant number of comments received expressed concerns about impacts to marine life.
7 Many of these comments specifically related to concerns about the effect of Navy sonar on
8 marine life, such as marine mammals, fish, sea turtles, and sea invertebrates. Participants
9 frequently requested that the EIS/OEIS consider alternative technologies to mid-frequency
10 active sonar. Other commenters requested that the Navy conduct further research and consider
11 other studies conducted by agencies outside the Navy in order to identify sonar levels that can
12 be used without potentially affecting marine life. Commenters also suggested that the Navy
13 explore other parameters pertaining to sonar use to prevent injury to marine mammals. Another
14 group of comments addressed protective and mitigation measures for marine mammals when
15 sonar is used. For example, it was requested that the Navy employ better protective measures
16 in future Rim of the Pacific (RIMPAC) exercises, such as conducting more monitoring and
17 enforcing larger safety zones around ships.

18 Other comments expressed concern about effects on marine resources not related to using
19 sonar. These comments requested that the Navy analyze the potential for ships to introduce
20 invasive species to Hawaii and suggested procedures to decrease that risk. Other commenters
21 were concerned about impacts to the sea floor, coral reefs, and coastal zones from military
22 equipment or technologies, such as unexploded ordnance and chemicals. Several comments
23 expressed general concern about impacts to marine life, while others identified specific policies
24 that must be considered in the Navy's analysis, such as the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

25 **Biological Resources—Onshore**

26 Participants commenting in this category expressed concern about Kauai's ability to sustain
27 additional military activity. Others requested that the Navy learn more about the *aina* of the
28 island of Hawaii before continuing military activities. Some commenters were more specifically
29 concerned about potential impacts to endangered plants at the Pacific Missile Range Facility on
30 Kauai, erosion, invasive species, and increased fires. A few participants asked about the
31 potential impacts of using Navy technologies, such as lasers.

32 **Cultural Resources**

33 Participants commenting on cultural resources were concerned that the military's presence and
34 activities on the Hawaiian islands causes harm to native Hawaiian culture and religious beliefs.
35 Other commenters expressed concern about impacts to recreational and subsistence fishing, an
36 important activity for Hawaiians. A few comments requested that the Navy consider potential
37 impacts to specific culturally significant sites, such as Nohili on Kauai, Haleakala on Maui,
38 Pohakuloa on the island of Hawaii, and Waimomi on Oahu.

39 **Cumulative Impacts**

40 Comments in this category expressed concern about the overall impact of past and present
41 military activity in Hawaii and requested that the Navy initiate cleanup operations. Additional
42 comments requested that the Navy study the impacts of other actions, such as initiation of

1 Stryker Brigade activities, stationing of C-17s in Hawaii, expanded missile defense programs,
2 the proposed Navy University Affiliated Research Center at the University of Hawaii, the
3 expansion of a Navy communications center in Wahiawa, and the expansion of Fort Shafter.

4 **Environmental Justice**

5 Commenters requested that the EIS/OEIS identify any disproportionate impacts to
6 disempowered groups of people. Participants also requested that the Navy analyze the potential
7 impact of sonar on sea life, which is particularly important to the diets of Hawaiian people.

8 **Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste**

9 Comments regarding hazardous materials and waste in general included requests for the Navy
10 to identify and clean up former and current contaminated sites. Other comments expressed
11 concern about the potential effects of Navy technologies, such as nuclear energy and
12 chemicals. Finally, comments made suggestions on how the Navy can manage waste on ships
13 and maximize recycling and reuse.

14 **Health and Safety**

15 Several comments asked the Navy to analyze the potential health and safety impacts of a
16 specific activity or technology, such as missile launches, lasers, electromagnetism, and gamma
17 rays. Other comments asked about the potential social impacts of having more permanent and
18 visiting military staff on the islands for Navy activities. One commenter asked that a procedure
19 be developed to verify Navy compliance with health and safety regulations and to make this
20 information easy for the public to access. Another commenter requested that the Navy notify
21 people working near torpedo exercises when activities will be taking place in their area. A few
22 commenters expressed concern that Hawaii may be at greater risk of being a target for attacks
23 as a result of proposed activities.

24 **Land Use**

25 Comments regarding land use, for the most part, expressed concern about public access and
26 other impacts to the beaches at the Pacific Missile Range Facility. Other comments identified
27 specific policies and plans that the Navy must consider in its analysis, such as Coastal Zone
28 Management laws and general plans in Hawaii.

29 **Noise**

30 Comments regarding concerns about noise were general in nature and inquired into the level of
31 sound considered safe to the environment and how that assessment is made.

32 **Miscellaneous**

33 General comments related to respecting the earth and all its life. Several comments noted
34 opposition to the United States' involvement in Iraq, wondered why returning soldiers are not
35 provided adequate medical assistance, and expressed concerns about reinstating the draft. A
36 few comments specifically requested that the Navy not become affiliated with the University of
37 Hawaii. Others were concerned about the potential for increased military presence in Hawaii to
38 increase tensions between the military and civilian communities.

1 **Mitigation Measures**

2 Most comments regarding mitigation measures focused on marine mammals. For example, it
3 was requested that the Navy employ better protective measures in future RIMPAC exercises,
4 such as conducting more monitoring and enforcing larger safety zones around ships. A few
5 comments addressed mitigation for activities not related to marine mammals, such as mitigation
6 for increased numbers of heavy military vehicles on Kauai's roads and bridges.

7 **Policy/National Environmental Policy Act Process**

8 Comments on the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process were split between those
9 which praised and criticized the format and content of the scoping meetings. Some comments
10 praised the informative displays, the ability to build a rapport with the Navy, and the Navy's
11 effort to notify Kauai residents before the RIMPAC. Criticisms of the scoping meeting format
12 included participants not being able to speak in a public hearing format and not being able to
13 interact directly with the decision makers for this NEPA process. Some comments suggested
14 additional methods of notifying the public of future meetings or requested additional information.

15 Another group of comments expressed concerns with future steps in this NEPA process. These
16 comments included requests that the Navy provide more information to the public, analyze
17 current exercises along with proposed actions, revise its statement of purpose and need,
18 consult with appropriate groups, hold additional community meetings, and ensure that the
19 Proposed Action is consistent with existing laws and policies.

20 **Program**

21 Comments regarding the Navy's programs consisted of many questions about whether the Navy
22 is planning to start specific programs or use certain materials and technologies, such as mood-
23 altering techniques, missile defense, and certain laser technologies. Other commenters asked if
24 the Navy uses certain areas for operations, such as Pohakuloa, and if the Navy is planning to
25 expand the boundaries of any of the areas it currently uses. Several of these comments
26 referred to residents' concern about initiating activities for the Stryker program on the islands.
27 Other comments asked whether the Navy was involved in the development of the Superferry.

28 **Purpose and Need for Proposed Action**

29 Many of the comments regarding the purpose and need for the Proposed Action questioned the
30 need for a greater military presence in Hawaii and suggested that the Navy consider alternate
31 sites for its activities. Others suggested that military funds be redirected to other activities, such
32 as education, alternative energy, and environmental restoration. Several were of a general
33 nature and requested that the Navy rethink its programs and purpose. Some communicated
34 support of the Navy's proposal to increase activities and upgrade facilities. One scoping meeting
35 participant acknowledged her understanding of the Navy's need to conduct sonar training and
36 testing but said the Navy needed to balance that with preventing harm to marine mammals.

37 **Socioeconomics**

38 Several comments regarding socioeconomic concerns included general questions about the
39 long-term cost of military activity. Some of these comments requested that the EIS/OEIS
40 analyze potential impacts to the tourism and fishing industries. Others more specifically
41 requested that the EIS/OEIS analyze whether and to what extent increased military activity and
42 increased numbers of military individuals will impact rent rates, local schools, and homelessness.

1 **Transportation**

2 Comments regarding transportation included concerns about the impacts of increased traffic
3 congestion from additional military personnel and increased training activities. A few comments
4 asked for the Navy to conduct a traffic analysis of a specific area, such as from Nawiliwili to Mana.

5 **Utilities**

6 Comments regarding utilities included general concern about the impacts of the Proposed
7 Action on local utility usage, wastewater disposal, grading and drainage plans, solid waste
8 disposal, and police, fire, and emergency services.

9 **Water Resources**

10 Comments regarding water resources included general concerns about the potential for water
11 quality to be affected by military activities.

12 Table 12-1 provides a breakdown of comments received during scoping.

Table 12-1. Breakdown of Scoping Comments by Resource Area

Resource Area	Count	Percent of Total
Biological Resources—Open Ocean and Offshore	82	23.23%
Program	79	22.38%
Policy/National Environmental Policy Act Process	47	13.31%
Purpose and Need	35	9.91%
Health and Safety	28	7.93%
Socioeconomics	14	3.97%
Cultural Resources	11	3.12%
Land Use	10	2.83%
Airspace	7	1.98%
Miscellaneous	7	1.98%
Alternatives	6	1.70%
Cumulative Impacts	5	1.42%
Air Quality	4	1.13%
Biological Resources—Onshore	4	1.13%
Mitigation Measures	3	0.85%
Transportation	3	0.85%
Environmental Justice	2	0.57%
Hazardous Materials and Waste	2	0.57%
Utilities	2	0.57%
Noise	1	0.28%
Water Resources	1	0.28%
TOTAL	353	

1

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK