
Appendix J
Comments Received on the Draft
Environmental Assessment During the 30-Day
Comment Period

**SBX Radar Vessel Maintenance and Repair Draft Environmental Assessment
Public Comment Period: 14 February - 16 March 2011
Comment Receipt Matrix***

Commenter	Comment#	Method of Receipt	Comment	Response
Skotdal, Andrew	#DEA0001	E-mail (website)	<p>The satellite receivers for KRKO-AM 1380 operate in the C-band, and our studios are approximately one mile from Naval Station Everett with a line-of-sight view. If the SBX platform tests in the C-band while in port at Everett, we want to point out that operation in the C-band band is likely to interrupt our satellite delivered network feeds. We are aware that certain radar systems (possibly launch and recovery radar) caused several land-based radio stations along the Strait of Juan de Fuca to lose their network satellite feeds on C-band when an aircraft carrier was performing flight operations in the Strait. If C-band testing is necessary while the SBX is in port, we respectfully request an opportunity to know in advance of the testing. Thank you.</p> <p>KRKO-HD1, KRKO-AM 2707 Colby Avenue, Suite 1380 Everett, Washington 98201</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and interest in the Sea-Based X-Band Radar (SBX) Vessel Maintenance and Repair Draft Environmental Assessment. Currently, MDA plans to complete the necessary work on the SBX Vessel at Todd Pacific Shipyards in Seattle, WA. However, should unseen circumstances prevent this, and as a reasonable and prudent planning measure, MDA has prepared the Draft EA to analyze performing the work at one of two contingency locations: Naval Station, Everett, WA or Naval Air Station, North Island, Coronado, CA.</p> <p>You expressed concern over possible interference in the C Band spectrum, possibly from an on-board radar system. The SBX vessel does not have or operate any C-Band radar systems, nor does it operate radar for launch and recovery operations. Also, as stated in the Draft EA, MDA will NOT operate or test the X-Band radar while in port. No radar tracking, testing, or calibration would occur during maintenance activities.</p> <p>The SBX Radar Vessel utilizes commercial satellite communications service operating in the C Band. However, the antennas are directional and are not expected to interfere with other communication systems or signals.</p> <p>The following statements were added to Section 2.2.1, page 2-3 of the Final EA, "The SBX vessel does not have or operate any C-Band radar systems, nor does it operate radar for launch and recovery operations. The SBX Radar Vessel utilizes commercial satellite communications service operating in the C Band. However, the antennas are directional and are not expected to interfere with other communication systems or signals.</p>

Appendix J Comments Received During the Comment Period of the Draft Environmental Assessment

Commenter	Comment#	Method of Receipt	Comment	Response
Vissman, Sandy (FWS- Staff Wildlife Biologist- covers the Naval Base Coronado area)	#DEA0002	E-mail (directly to Mike Terrill)	<p>Dear Mr. Terrill,</p> <p>Thank you for your coordination regarding the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Sea-Based X-Band (SBX) Radar Vessel Maintenance and Repair Project. I am, however, not the Field Supervisor of our office, so wanted to provide that correction. Our Field Supervisor is Jim Bartel. I am, however the staff person who covers the Naval Base Coronado area, so will be happy to look at the EA, and am checking my availability to attend the upcoming community meeting in Coronado. We will be interested in the potential for the project to affect water quality in SD Bay, and in potential impacts to sensitive wildlife in the surrounding area. Naval Base Coronado is home to several federally listed Endangered and Threatened avian species, and also hosts nesting and roosting substrate for a substantial number of migratory birds. If you have not already done so, I suggest that you contact the Naval Base Coronado Biologist, Ms. Tiffany Shepherd, to assure adequate coordination regarding the biological resources on Naval Base Coronado.</p> <p>Thanks again, and I look forward to reviewing your project!</p> <p>Sandy Vissman USFWS</p>	<p>Thank you for responding to the notification about the availability of the Missile Defense Agency's Sea-Based X-band (SBX) Radar Vessel Maintenance and Repair Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).</p> <p>Currently, MDA is planning on doing the shipyard work at Todd Pacific Shipyards in Seattle, WA. However, should unseen circumstances prevent MDA from conducting the work at Todd, and as a reasonable and prudent planning measure, MDA has developed a Draft EA for conducting the work at two contingency locations, Naval Station, Everett (NSE) in Everett, WA and Naval Air Station, North Island (NASNI), Coronado, CA.</p> <p>Throughout the development of the EA, MDA worked with the resource staffs at NASNI and NSE to identify (1) the potential resources which could be affected and (2) the effects and the extent of those effects. The Commander Navy Region, Southwest, in San Diego and the NASNI staff in Coronado have been very helpful in this endeavor. For the Coronado area, working with the NASNI staff, no potential effects to wildlife or protected species were identified.</p> <p>MDA completed a Coastal Consistency Determination, presented it to the California Coastal Commission (CCC) and received their concurrence with the MDA's finding that the activities are compatible to the maximum extent practicable with CA coastal enforceable policies. As part of completing the consistency determination, a question similar to yours on water quality came up. MDA demonstrated to the CCC (and in an aside issue to the Regional Water Quality Control Board - San Diego) that because of the best management practices required by NASNI and MDA, and under the Uniform National Discharge Standards, there would be no issues with water quality.</p>
Opel, Beth	#DEA0003	E-mail (website)	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I noticed you have a Draft EA for Sea-Based X-Band Radar Vessel Maintenance and Repair available for viewing at the Everett, WA main library between Feb. 14 – Mar. 16, 2011. I represent a local newspaper in the Everett, WA area and wonder if you'd like to advertise that this document is available for public viewing and comment? Would you be so kind as to forward this email to the correct person if you are not the one in charge of the advertising?</p> <p>We direct mail our bimonthly community newspaper to over 24,000 area homes with each edition.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Thank you for your comments.</p>

Appendix J Comments Received During the Comment Period of the Draft Environmental Assessment

Commenter	Comment#	Method of Receipt	Comment	Response
			<p>We have many active and retired navy families in our area as well as general citizens that might be interested in this information. My next issue will be published Thursday, Feb. 24th and the deadline for that issue is this Friday.</p> <p>If you have any questions or would like to run an ad regarding this matter in our paper please let me know.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	
Selden, Walter	#DEA0004	E-mail (website; received postcard)	<p>Sir,</p> <p>Regarding your "Proposed Action" postcard received in the mail yesterday seeking comment.</p> <p>We have stated here and elsewhere that the prospect of the SBX coming into Port Gardner for any reason is unacceptable. Your continued interest in Everett floors us because it was so resoundingly put off years ago and sentiments have not changed since.</p> <p>If it is strategic, then leave it to the west where it is supposedly effective. Seattle has already agreed to take it for whatever reason and it also has the deep (50 feet) water. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_deep-water_ports. Note that there are plenty of choices other than Everett. Take a look.</p> <p>Please, service it in an area where it can be of most use... which is NOT in Puget Sound. Now one begs the question of whether this is where you would like to mothball it. A tremendous amount of work, time, material and promotion has been, in our minds, wasted on the SBX and we have had it with the nearly surreptitious approach to getting it back in our own radar.</p> <p>Thank you for listening, W. Selden Everett</p>	<p>There are only three locations on the West Coast with sufficient water depth (50 feet or more) at dockside and which have sufficient pier space available at the time of the planned shipyards, These are Todd Pacific Shipyards, WA, Naval Station Everett, WA and Naval Air Station, North Island, CA.</p>
Campbell, Lowell	#DEA0005	E-mail (website)	<p>Mr. David Hasley,</p> <p>I live on the side of Mukilteo facing the Port of Everett. I hope that the SBX comes to visit; my family and I like to go to Harborview Park to see the Navy ships, especially the Abe Lincoln. I would guess you are being overwhelmed by people wanting to see the SBX in person. If it happened to be here during the 4th of July, I would love to take a tour of the unclassified part of the vessel.</p> <p>Thanks, Lowell, Deirdre, Jason & Laura Campbell</p>	<p>Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>

Appendix J Comments Received During the Comment Period of the Draft Environmental Assessment

Commenter	Comment#	Method of Receipt	Comment	Response
Lee, Donna (and Gregory vonFalkenberg-Ridley)	#DEA0006	E-mail (website)	<p>Please, we have been through this before. Please read the comments made in the past about this issue. The South Whidbey Record can help you. Whidbey Island does not want the SBX in our area for any reason. This is just an effort to get the camel's nose into the tent. Let Seattle deal with it, keep the work in Seattle.</p> <p>Thank you. Donna Lee & Gregory vonFalkenberg-Ridle</p>	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
Laden, John	#DEA0007	E-mail (website)	<p>Gentlemen</p> <p>Please find attached my comments on your environmental assessment. I was chief engineer on SBX for Boeing while it was built. While I am retired now I am still very interested in its performance.</p> <p>I hope my comments help.</p> <p>John Laden</p> <hr/> <p>Reference: SBX Draft Environmental Assessment</p> <p>Mr. David Hasley</p> <p>My name is John Laden. I was the chief SBX engineer at Boeing from the beginning Aug 2002 to May 2005 when it went to sea. I have since retired but still maintain in interest in SBX and attended your public hearing in Everett last year. Some of your folks even remembered me. I currently live in Arlington, WA which is about 20 miles from Everett.</p> <p>I read your preliminary environmental impact assessment with much interest and realize a lot of work has been done to generate this document. My comments are not saying that the work you have done is not good but may have some areas you might want to think about.</p> <p>You mentioned that you dropped all areas on the east coast, from consideration, due to the constraints of the Panama Canal. No mention was made that SBX was originally carried from the Gulf of Mexico to Hawaii by ship and could be done again. I would think it would be better to say that the time for SBX to get to the East Coast and back was the reason it was dropped. I do not think you can afford that much lost time in the program.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The following changes were made to the Final EA based on your comments:</p> <p>A statement has been added to the Final EA in Section 2.3, page 2-21, stating ..."Additionally, due to cost it is not feasible to carry the SBX Radar Vessel to an east coast location by ship."</p>
			<p>No mention was made of doing the thruster maintenance while anchored in deep sheltered water off the coast of Hawaii. That would seem to offer the least impact to the movement of SBX and the non-thruster maintenance could be done at Pearl Harbor as you have done in the past.</p>	<p>Please see Section 2.3, page 2-21 which states that Pearl Harbor is too shallow.</p>

Appendix J Comments Received During the Comment Period of the Draft Environmental Assessment

Commenter	Comment#	Method of Receipt	Comment	Response
			No mention is made about RF environment impact other than to say you would not operate the Weather radar or the SBX radar. SBX has a complex suite of communication systems, some of which may have to be operated while in port. I would be particularly concerned with the large Satellite communication links that are normally operating. Operating those in the San Diego Harbor or Everett Base could have significant impact on similar commercial systems in the area. There is no evidence in the report that the FCC has approved or reviewed your intended operations in these areas. I know in the past that was always a major concern.	Please see Section 2.2.1; Page 2-3 which was revised to state that ..."Additionally, the XBR and the weather radar would not be operated while at pier-side. The SBX vessel does not have or operate any C-Band radar systems, nor does it operate radar for launch and recovery operations. The SBX Radar Vessel utilizes commercial satellite communications service operating in the C Band. However, the antennas are directional and are not expected to interfere with other communication systems or signals. No radar tracking, testing, or calibration would occur during maintenance activities."
			No mention is made of impacts to commercial and private use of the waterways adjacent to where the SBX is moored. I would expect that for security reasons you will have to restrict use of the waterway in proximity to the SBX Vessel. I think that the location in Everett will have little or no impact on use of the waterways. I am concerned that San Diego location is more of a problem since that area of the harbor gets heavy use by private and commercial ships. Because of the relatively easy access to the SBX from the water compared to a carrier you may have to have larger no boat zone and hence impact the use of the waterway. Thank you for the opportunity to review this document and I hope my comments will help avoid any future problems. I think a few words and a reference to their basis would clear up these issues in your document. If I can help in any way in the future please let me know. Yours Truly John Laden	A statement has been added to the Final EA on page 3-40 & 3-92 ..."Although a temporary security barrier (See Figure...) would be in place during the short-term mooring period (approximately 3 months) of the SBX Radar Vessel, no impacts are anticipated on commercial and private use of the waterways adjacent to Pier.
McCaul, Ann (Senior Planner- City of Coronado)	#DEA0008	E-mail (directly to Mike Terrill)	Good afternoon Leo, the City of Coronado is reviewing the EA for the above project and will providing comments shortly. Many of the comments will be the same that we raised when the California Coastal Commission considered the project, and which MDA committed to incorporate as part of the project, which the CCC approved. A question has come up, and I hope you can provide clarification. The City's understanding of this maintenance repair project was that it would be a one-time (once every 5 years) 3-month maintenance required to keep the vessel certified. One of our council members who attended the public workshop last week indicated that he spoke with someone at the meeting who indicated there will be more than one maintenance every 5 years. That the EA would allow the SBX Radar vessel to have routine maintenance work completed as necessary. In other words, that the SBX radar could have maintenance	Every five years is the major American Bureau of Shipping survey and USCG certification renewal. This five-year maintenance period includes the thruster work where we need water over 50 feet deep at the pier. The Draft Environmental Assessment out for public review at this time looks at performing this five-year interval work and other routine vessel maintenance work in the spring of 2011. Since the vessel is currently transitioning to the US Navy, Navy will be making the decision for the next five-year maintenance period, but it could be expected that NAS North Island, NAVSTA Everett and the Todd Pacific Shipyards facility to be candidate locations. As with any ocean going vessel, there is annual in-port maintenance and USCG inspection work that must be accomplished. The annual work is a week or two and does not

Appendix J Comments Received During the Comment Period of the Draft Environmental Assessment

Commenter	Comment#	Method of Receipt	Comment	Response
			<p>work occurring on an annual basis. This is not what we understood was the project scope, and I don't believe, what the Coastal Commission authorized with their permit approval.</p> <p>Can you please provide some clarification so that the City addresses this issue appropriately in our comment letter.</p> <p>Thanks in advance for your reply.</p>	<p>require any shipyard assistance. At the midpoint of the five years there is a special survey which requires shipyard or industrial support for scaffolding and divers, and SBX can conduct upgrades or heavy maintenance at the same time. In the past, MDA has done that work in Pearl Harbor, HI.</p> <p>During normal operations of the vessel, which is usually at sea up to 300 days a year, should unforeseen circumstances develop that require immediate vessel maintenance, the vessel would likely go the nearest port which could accomplish the necessary maintenance. That location could be the San Diego area. Much of the analysis in the Draft EA could serve as a basis for a future analysis, should it be required to accomplish the needed unplanned vessel maintenance. That was the intent of the comment made to Councilman Woiwode to which you refer.</p>
Suquamish Tribe	#DEA0009	Telephone conversation	<p>Questions from the Suquamish Tribe regarding the SBX project. In particular, are there more details about how and when the work would be conducted at Todd Pacific Shipyards? Following are specific items:</p> <p>1) What is the depth of the waterway at Todd Pacific Shipyards? Request confirmation that the hull of the SBX vessel, the thruster well extension units, and repair activities would not impact the substrate or stir up potentially contaminated sediments.</p> <p>2) The Suquamish conduct tribal fishing activities both at Everett and in Elliot Bay near the Duwamish River. The Draft EA states that the repair/maintenance work would occur in the spring of this year which is coming up soon. What is the current timeline? The Suquamish is requesting advanced notice of the arrival of the vessel in order to better schedule tribal fishing events.</p> <p>3) The Suquamish is assuming a security barrier will be in place during repair/maintenance activities whether at Todd Pacific Shipyard or Everett. If this is the case, what are the dimensions of the barrier (specifically at Todd Shipyards)? The Suquamish would like to understand how this would potentially impact treaty fisheries.</p>	<p>The scope of work at Naval Station Everett would not change existing conditions at the base. As discussed during the Government-to-Government consultation meeting on August 18, 2010, the Sea Based X-Band (SBX) radar vessel would be moored on the inner harbor within the existing security barriers. The footprint of the SBX vessel is just slightly wider than the carrier. Security would not be expanded. There would be no additional barriers causing impediments to shipping or other vessel traffic in the East Waterway.</p> <p>With regard to Todd Pacific Shipyards, the following response is being sent on behalf of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA):</p> <p>Thank you for your continuing interest in the Sea Based X-Band Radar Vessel Maintenance and Repair Environmental Assessment (SBX EA). However, since the SBX EA looks at conducting the maintenance at two contingency locations, Naval Station Everett, WA and Naval Air Station, North Island, CA, questions about Todd Pacific Shipyards are outside the scope of the SBX EA. MDA will be providing information to the Suquamish as it is developed for the work at Todd Pacific Shipyards.</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any further questions.</p>
City of Coronado	#DEA0010	Letter	<p>Dear Mr. Hasley:</p> <p>The City of Coronado has received notice of the Availability of the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Sea-based X-band (SBX) Radar Vessel. While it appears that Todd Pacific Shipyards in Seattle is the preferred alternative for the maintenance project, it is noted that NASNI has</p>	<p>The EA addresses the five-year maintenance period required for the American Bureau of Shipping survey and United States Coast Guard certification renewal. This includes the thruster work, which must be done in water that is a minimum of 50 feet deep at the pier. The Draft Environmental Assessment recently out for</p>

Appendix J Comments Received During the Comment Period of the Draft Environmental Assessment

Commenter	Comment#	Method of Receipt	Comment	Response
			<p>been analyzed as a potential contingency location for the maintenance work.</p> <p>The City has reviewed the Environmental Assessment and has the following comments:</p> <p>I. The project description contained within the Environmental Assessment is not consistent with the Coastal Consistency Determination issued for the project by the State Coastal Commission. The Consistency Determination was processed based upon a one-time, 3-month maintenance event. The Executive summary also speaks to a single maintenance and repair event in Spring 2011. However, correspondence received from Project Manager Mr. Leo Terrill indicates there would not only be a 3-month event, but annual maintenance lasting up to potentially 2 months, and a special maintenance event half-way through the 5-year certification period. The Environmental Assessment should be revised to accurately reflect the extent of the maintenance activities associated with the SBX Radar vessel.</p>	<p>public review (14 Feb – 16 March 2011) looks at contingency locations (NASNI & NSE) for performing this five-year thruster work and other routine vessel maintenance in 2011 only. Upon transition to the US Navy, the Navy will determine where future maintenance will occur and any necessary environmental planning.</p>
			<p>2. The City recognizes maintenance and repairs to the SBX Radar vessel are similar to the types of activities that occur for the aircraft carriers homeported at NASNI. However, the SBX Vessel is significantly wider and taller than a normal aircraft carrier. The dome of the radar would extend 36' higher than the top of a ship and would be 22' wider at mast. To minimize visual and noise impacts associated with this structure to adjoining residential areas, the Environmental Assessment should be revised to incorporate as a mitigation measure the commitment to moor the vessel at Pier N. The current Environmental Assessment notes the project would not significantly alter the noise environment in Coronado <u>if moored in either orientation at Pier N</u>. The document goes on to state there would be effects to the noise environment from the shipboard generators if moored in Orientation 2 at Pier P. To address this impact, the alignment of the generators' exhaust away from residences is suggested to mitigate this impact. It is not clear how effective this mitigation measure would be; therefore, Coronado recommends the Environmental Assessment be revised so that the vessel is moored at Pier N.</p>	<p>The berthing location is the responsibility of NASNI Port Operations, which factors in, among other things, port operation requirements, safety, and logistics at the pier at the time of berthing. Since the vessel could be berthed at Pier N or P, the EA looks at the effects at both locations. According to Page 3-83 of the Environmental Assessment, "Mooring at Pier N rather than at Pier P would reduce the level of noise in the nearby residential neighborhood. However, NASNI determines berthing locations based on carrier in- port schedules and logistical needs of the Port Operations." Additionally, pages ES-11, 3-85 of the Final Environmental Assessment state that, "As a means of reducing the noise from the two diesel generators, the use of the existing noise baffles and the alignment of the generators' exhaust away from residences (i.e., towards NASNI) would provide a greater buffering of the noise-sensitive areas."</p> <p>All of this as well as additional requirements and considerations would be used by NASNI Port Operations to make a location decision for berthing the SBX vessel, should it come to NASNI.</p>
			<p>3. To further address potential noise impacts, the Environmental Assessment should be revised to clarify that construction activity in the early morning hours (5:30 a.m. to 7:00 a.m.) would be limited to those internal to the SBX, similar to what is committed to within the environmental assessment for the evening hours (7:00 to 10:00 p.m.) This is also consistent with the commitments made by the MDA at the Coastal Commission hearing for the project.</p>	<p>The EA has been revised to better reflect the time restrictions that were concurred with by the California Coastal Commission on 15 October 2010. Those time restrictions pertained to noise-producing activities.</p> <p>The Final Environmental Assessment now states on Page 3-84, paragraph two that,</p> <p>..."Additionally, noise-producing maintenance activities between</p>

Appendix J Comments Received During the Comment Period of the Draft Environmental Assessment

Commenter	Comment#	Method of Receipt	Comment	Response
				the early morning hours (5:30 a.m. to 7:00 a.m.) and evening hours between (7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.) would be limited to those internal to the vessel "
			4. An additional mitigation measure to address noise impacts, (and consistent with the Coastal Commission approval), is that radar warning tests would be limited to one day, several hours (at most), and only intermittently. Additionally, radar warning tests would not be conducted at night and MDA would provide the community with advance warning through local media efforts prior to conducting any such tests to minimize confusion by community members.	<p>The Final EA has been revised to better reflect what was concurred with by the California Coastal Commission on 15 October 2010. On page 3-84, paragraph three of the Final EA the Loudspeaker Noise paragraph has been rewritten as follows:</p> <p>Radiate Warning System (Siren System/Loud Speaker)</p> <p>One of the maintenance activities to the SBX Radar Vessel while in port will be to add additional speakers to the Radiate Warning System. The system has to be audible in topside areas where high levels of noise occur when the vessel is underway. MDA conducted a survey to determine how loud the upgrade to the warning system had to be. The maximum noise level on the topside area was 97.2 dBA while the SBX Radar Vessel was at sea with all systems running (Noise Control Engineering, 2010). The system would be tested at 97.2 dBA at peak level. Data from the survey was extrapolated in Table 3.2.5-1 to show that at a distance of 0.5 mile, the sound level would be 59 dBA, an insignificant impact on surrounding residential areas. Prior to conducting tests of the Radiate Warning System's (Siren System/Loud Speaker) additional speakers, MDA, working with the local installation would provide notification to the local community of the system testing prior to conducting the test. The testing of the speakers will be limited to one day, several hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., and only intermittently. The additional speakers will not be tested at night.</p>
			5. The Environmental Assessment should be revised to address potential lighting and/or visual impacts to nearby residences by incorporating mitigation committing to using low-watt night lighting and using shielding to minimize night-lighting as required with the Coastal Consistency Determination for the project.	MDA believes that this issue was adequately addressed in the Environmental Assessment. The information in the Draft EA is consistent with what was given during the California Coastal Commission hearing. However based on the comment received during the Draft EA public Comment period, the word "low-wattage" was added to the Final EA on page 2-13 paragraph two, to identify which lights are applicable. The Final Environmental Assessment states on Page 2-13 now reads as follows: "Lights are in accordance with navigational rules, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations. There are four incandescent floodlights around the inside perimeter of the radar dome, and red safety-lights on the top of the radar dome. Additionally, low-wattage compact fluorescent lamps for safe

Appendix J Comments Received During the Comment Period of the Draft Environmental Assessment

Commenter	Comment#	Method of Receipt	Comment	Response
				<p>passage, trainable 500-watt (W) incandescent floodlights at lifeboat and raft launching stations, 300-W incandescent floodlights at each of the four mooring stations, and a number of conventional low-wattage 60-W fluorescent lamps located along inside and outside walkways. Lights are shielded to the maximum degree possible or pointed downward to minimize the attraction to birds and impacts on area residents. However, the trainable 500-W incandescent floodlights at each of the four mooring stations, and a number of conventional 60-W fluorescent lamps are not operated while in-port...."</p> <p>The Final EA was also revised to better reflect commitments made to the California Coastal Commission revising the "Lighting System" section on Page 3-100 to states that, "The SBX Radar Vessel operates its lighting systems 24/7. The vessel would use its external lights on the platform, the perimeter of the dome, and on top of the dome in the evening or nighttime hours. The lights on the dome are considered "incandescent floodlights" and the trainable 500-W and 300-W incandescent floodlights are not operated while in-port (see Figure 2-1). Lights are shielded to the maximum degree possible or pointed downward to minimize the impacts to area residents. Therefore, the light and glare produced from the external lights are anticipated to have a negligible effect on the visual and aesthetic resources of the area."</p>
			<p>6. The Environmental Assessment should be revised to address the additional number of employees that may be associated with the additional maintenance activities that may occur on a yearly or every 2.5 year maintenance period so that the cumulative impact of the entire maintenance of the SBX Radar vessel can be evaluated. Previous information provided an estimated 307 additional personnel; however, this number may not be accurate with the additional potential maintenance activities.</p>	<p>The estimated number of 307 personnel used in the Environmental Assessment refers to the number required for the planned SBX Radar Vessel 3-month maintenance and repair activities scheduled for Spring/Summer 2011. This Environmental Assessment does not analyze any other maintenance other than the proposed Spring/Summer 2011 event.</p>

#DEA0001—COMMENT

From: KRKO
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2011 4:19 PM
To: sbxea@govsupport.us
Subject: SBX Comment

The satellite receivers for KRKO-AM 1380 operate in the C-band, and our studios are approximately one mile from Naval Station Everett with a line-of-sight view. If the SBX platform tests in the C-band while in port at Everett, we want to point out that operation in the C-band is likely to interrupt our satellite delivered network feeds. We are aware that certain radar systems (possibly launch and recovery radar) caused several land-based radio stations along the Strait of Juan de Fuca to lose their network satellite feeds on C-band when an aircraft carrier was performing flight operations in the Strait. If C-band testing is necessary while the SBX is in port, we respectfully request an opportunity to know in advance of the testing. Thank you.

KRKO-HD1, KRKO-AM
2707 Colby Avenue, Suite 1380
Everett, Washington 98201

#DEA0002—COMMENT

From: Sandy Vissman, USFWS Sent: Monday, February 14, 2011 2:38 PM
To: MDA/PA
Cc: Subject: Re: Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Sea-Based X-Band (SBX) Radar Vessel Maintenance and Repair Project

Dear Mr. Terril,

Thank you for your coordination regarding the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Sea-Based X-Band (SBX) Radar Vessel Maintenance and Repair Project. I am, however, not the Field Supervisor of our office, so wanted to provide that correction. Our Field Supervisor is Jim Bartel. I am, however the staff person who covers the Naval Base Coronado area, so will be happy to look at the EA, and am checking my availability to attend the upcoming community meeting in Coronado. We will be interested in the potential for the project to affect water quality in SD Bay, and in potential impacts to sensitive wildlife in the surrounding area. Naval Base Coronado is home to several federally listed Endangered and Threatened avian species, and also hosts nesting and roosting substrate for a substantial number of migratory birds. If you have not already done so, I suggest that you contact the Naval Base Coronado Biologist, Ms. Tiffany Shepherd, to assure adequate coordination regarding the biological resources on Naval Base Coronado.

Thanks again, and I look forward to reviewing your project!
Sandy Vissman
USFWS

#DEA0003—COMMENT

From: Beth Opel
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2011 4:56 PM
To: sbxea@govsupport.us
Subject: Everett, WA Sea-Based X-Band Draft EA
Attachments: 2011Rates.pdf; 2011_calendar.pdf

Hi,

I noticed you have a Draft EA for Sea-Based X-Band Radar Vessel Maintenance and Repair available for viewing at the Everett, WA main library between Feb. 14 – Mar. 16, 2011. I represent a local newspaper in the Everett, WA area and wonder if you'd like to advertise that this document is available for public viewing and comment? Would you be so kind as to forward this email to the correct person if you are not the one in charge of the advertising?

We direct mail our bimonthly community newspaper to over 24,000 area homes with each edition.

We have many active and retired navy families in our area as well as general citizens that might be interested in this information.

My next issue will be published Thursday, Feb. 24th and the deadline for that issue is this Friday.

If you have any questions or would like to run an ad regarding this matter in our paper please let me know.

Sincerely,

#DEA0004—COMMENT

From: Walter Selden

Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2011 10:53 AM

To: sbxea@govsupport.us; maria_cantwell@cantwell.senate.gov;
Patty_Murray@Murray.Senate.gov; Rick.Larsen@mail.house.gov; Nick.Harper@leg.wa.gov;
John.McCoy@leg.wa.gov; sells.mike@leg.wa.gov; RStephanson@ci.everett.wa.us

Subject: No to SBX in Everett

Sir,

Regarding your "Proposed Action" postcard received in the mail yesterday seeking comment.

We have stated here and elsewhere that the prospect of the SBX coming into Port Gardner for any reason is unacceptable. Your continued interest in Everett floors us because it was so resoundingly put off years ago and sentiments have not changed since.

If it is strategic, then leave it to the west where it is supposedly effective. Seattle has already agreed to take it for whatever reason and it also has the deep (50 feet) water.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_deep-water_ports. Note that there are plenty of choices other than Everett. Take a look.

Please, service it in an area where it can be of most use... which is NOT in Puget Sound. Now one begs the question of whether this is where you would like to mothball it. A tremendous amount of work, time, material and promotion has been, in our minds, wasted on the SBX and we have had it with the nearly surreptitious approach to getting it back in our own radar.

Thank you for listening,

W. Selden
Everett

#DEA0005—COMMENT

From on behalf of lowell
Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2011 10:03 PM
To: sbxea@govsupport.us
Cc:
Subject: SBX Radar Vessel

Mr. David Hasley,

I live on the side of Mukilteo facing the Port of Everett. I hope that the SBX comes to visit; my family and I like to go to Harborview Park to see the Navy ships, especially the Abe Lincoln. I would guess you are being overwhelmed by people wanting to see the SBX in person. If it happened to be here during the 4th of July, I would love to take a tour of the unclassified part of the vessel.

Thanks,
Lowell, Deirdre, Jason & Laura Campbell

#DEA0006—COMMENT

From: Donna Lee
Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2011 11:28 AM
To: sbxea@govsupport.us
Subject: SBX Everett contingency site

Please, we have been through this before. Please read the comments made in the past about this issue. The South Whidbey Record can help you. Whidbey Island does not want the SBX in our area for any reason. This is just an effort to get the camel's nose into the tent. Let Seattle deal with it, keep the work in Seattle.

Thank you.
Donna Lee & Gregory vonFalkenberg-Ridle

#DEA0007—COMMENT

From: John Laden
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2011 3:43 PM
To: SBXEA@govsupport.us
Subject: SBX Environmental Assessment Comments
Attachments: SBX Comments.odt

Gentlemen

Please find attached my comments on your environmental assessment. I was chief engineer on SBX for Boeing while it was built. While I am retired now I am still very interested in its performance.

I hope my comments help.
John Laden

Reference: SBX Draft Environmental Assessment

Mr. David Hasley

My name is John Laden. I was the chief SBX engineer at Boeing from the beginning Aug 2002 to May 2005 when it went to sea. I have since retired but still maintain in interest in SBX and attended your public hearing in Everett last year. Some of your folks even remembered me. I currently live in Arlington, WA which is about 20 miles from Everett.

I read your preliminary environmental impact assessment with much interest and realize a lot of work has been done to generate this document. My comments are not saying that the work you have done is not good but may have some areas you might want to think about.

You mentioned that you dropped all areas on the east coast, from consideration, due to the constraints of the Panama Canal. No mention was made that SBX was originally carried from the Gulf of Mexico to Hawaii by ship and could be done again. I would think it would be better to say that the time for SBX to get to the East Coast and back was the reason it was dropped. I do not think you can afford that much lost time in the program.

No mention was made of doing the thruster maintenance while anchored in deep sheltered water off the coast of Hawaii. That would seem to offer the least impact to the movement of SBX and the non-thruster maintenance could be done at Pearl Harbor as you have done in the past.

No mention is made about RF environment impact other than to say you would not operate the Weather radar or the SBX radar. SBX has a complex suite of communication systems, some of which may have to be operated while in port. I would be particularly concerned with the large Satellite communication links that are normally operating. Operating those in the San Diego Harbor or Everett Base could have significant impact on similar commercial systems in the area. There is no evidence in the report that the FCC has approved or reviewed your intended operations in these areas. I know in the past that was always a major concern.

No mention is made of impacts to commercial and private use of the waterways adjacent to where the SBX is moored. I would expect that for security reasons you will have to restrict use of the waterway in proximity to the SBX Vessel. I think that the location in Everett will have little or no impact on use of the waterways. I am concerned that San Diego location is more of a problem since that area of the harbor gets heavy use by private and commercial ships. Because of the relatively easy access to the SBX from the water compared to a carrier you may have to a have larger no boat zone and hence impact the use of the waterway.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this document and I hope my comments will help avoid any future problems. I think a few words and a reference to their basis would clear up these issues in your document.

If I can help in any way in the future please let me know.

Yours Truly
John Laden

#DEA0008—COMMENT

E-mail

From: McCaull, Ann Senior Planner, City of Coronado

Sent: Monday, March 07, 2011 6:16 PM

To: Leo Terrill, MDA Public Affairs

Good afternoon Leo, the City of Coronado is reviewing the EA for the above project and will providing comments shortly. Many of the comments will be the same that we raised when the California Coastal Commission considered the project, and which MDA committed to incorporate as part of the project, which the CCC approved.

A question has come up, and I hope you can provide clarification. The City's understanding of this maintenance repair project was that it would be a one-time (once every 5 years) 3-month maintenance required to keep the vessel certified. One of our council members who attended the public workshop last week indicated that he spoke with someone at the meeting who indicated there will be more than one maintenance every 5 years. That the EA would allow the SBX Radar vessel to have routine maintenance work completed as necessary. In other words, that the SBX radar could have maintenance work occurring on an annual basis. This is not what we understood was the project scope, and I don't believe, what the Coastal Commission authorized with their permit approval.

Can you please provide some clarification so that the City addresses this issue appropriately in our comment letter.

Thanks in advance for your reply.

#DEA0009—COMMENT

Questions from the Suquamish Tribe regarding the SBX project. In particular, are there more details about how and when the work would be conducted at Todd Pacific Shipyards? Following are specific items:

1) What is the depth of the waterway at Todd Pacific Shipyards? Request confirmation that the hull of the SBX vessel, the thruster well extension units, and repair activities would not impact the substrate or stir up potentially contaminated sediments.

2) The Suquamish conduct tribal fishing activities both at Everett and in Elliot Bay near the Duwamish River. The Draft EA states that the repair/maintenance work would occur in the spring of this year which is coming up soon. What is the current timeline? The Suquamish is requesting advanced notice of the arrival of the vessel in order to better schedule tribal fishing events.

3) The Suquamish is assuming a security barrier will be in place during repair/maintenance activities whether at Todd Pacific Shipyard or Everett. If this is the case, what are the dimensions of the barrier (specifically at Todd Shipyards)? The Suquamish would like to understand how this would potentially impact treaty fisheries.

Thanks for your assistance!

#DEA0010-COMMENT



CITY OF CORONADO

1825 STRAND WAY
CORONADO, CA 92118

OFFICE OF CITY MANAGER
(619) 522-7335
FAX (619) 522-7846

March 14, 2011

Deputy Chief of Staff, Engineer
U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command
Attention: SMDC-ENN (Mr. David Hasley)
P.O. Box 1500
Huntsville AL 35807

Re: Environmental Assessment for Maintenance and Repair of Sea-based X-Band (SBX) Radar Vessel in Coronado, San Diego County

Dear Mr. Hasley:

The City of Coronado has received notice of the Availability of the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Sea-based X-band (SBX) Radar Vessel. While it appears that Todd Pacific Shipyards in Seattle is the preferred alternative for the maintenance project, it is noted that NASNI has been analyzed as a potential contingency location for the maintenance work.

The City has reviewed the Environmental Assessment and has the following comments:

1. The project description contained within the Environmental Assessment is not consistent with the Coastal Consistency Determination issued for the project by the State Coastal Commission. The Consistency Determination was processed based upon a one-time, 3-month maintenance event. The Executive summary also speaks to a single maintenance and repair event in Spring 2011. However, correspondence received from Project Manager Mr. Leo Terrill indicates there would not only be a 3-month event, but annual maintenance lasting up to potentially 2 months, and a special maintenance event half-way through the 5-year certification period. The Environmental Assessment should be revised to accurately reflect the extent of the maintenance activities associated with the SBX Radar vessel.
2. The City recognizes maintenance and repairs to the SBX Radar vessel are similar to the types of activities that occur for the aircraft carriers homeported at NASNI. However, the SBX Vessel is significantly wider and taller than a normal aircraft carrier. The dome of the radar would extend 36' higher than the top of a ship and would be 22' wider at mast. To minimize visual and noise impacts associated with this structure to adjoining residential areas, the Environmental Assessment should be revised to incorporate as a mitigation measure the commitment to moor the vessel at Pier N. The current Environmental Assessment notes the project would not significantly alter the noise environment in Coronado if moored in either orientation at Pier N. The document goes on to state there would be effects to the noise environment from the shipboard generators if moored in Orientation 2 at Pier P. To address this impact, the alignment of the generators'



Mr. Hasley
Page 2
March 14, 2011

exhaust away from residences is suggested to mitigate this impact. It is not clear how effective this mitigation measure would be; therefore, Coronado recommends the Environmental Assessment be revised so that the vessel is moored at Pier N.

3. To further address potential noise impacts, the Environmental Assessment should be revised to clarify that construction activities in the early morning hours (5:30 a.m. to 7:00 a.m.) would be limited to those internal to the SBX, similar to what is committed to within the environmental assessment for the evening hours (7:00 to 10:00 p.m.) This is also consistent with the commitments made by the MDA at the Coastal Commission hearing for the project.
4. An additional mitigation measure to address noise impacts, (and consistent with the Coastal Commission approval), is that radar warning tests would be limited to one day, several hours (at most), and only intermittently. Additionally, radar warning tests would not be conducted at night and DMA would provide the community with advance warning through local media efforts prior to conducting any such tests to minimize confusion by community members.
5. The Environmental Assessment should be revised to address potential lighting and/or visual impacts to nearby residences by incorporating mitigation committing to using low-watt night lighting and using shielding to minimize night-lighting as required with the Coastal Consistency Determination for the project.
6. The Environmental Assessment should be revised to address the additional number of employees that may be associated with the additional maintenance activities that may occur on a yearly or every 2.5 year maintenance period so that the cumulative impact of the entire maintenance of the SBX Radar vessel can be evaluated. Previous information provided an estimated 307 additional personnel; however, this number may not be accurate with the additional potential maintenance activities.

Thank you in advance for your attention to issues raised within this letter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Blair King".

Blair King
City Manager

BK/mlc

cc: Capt. Yancy B. Lindsey, Commanding Officer, Naval Base Coronado
Mayor and City Councilmembers

OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER
CITY OF CORONADO
1825 STRAND WAY
CORONADO, CALIFORNIA 92118-3005



Deputy Chief of Staff, Engineer
U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command
Attention: SMDC-ENN (Mr. David Hasley)
P.O. Box 1500
Huntsville AL 35807

3580733601 B050 