

**Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement**  
**Hawaii-California Training and Testing**  
**EISX-007-17-USN-1724283453**

**Lead Agency:** United States Department of the Navy  
**Joint Lead Agencies:** United States Coast Guard, United States Army, United States Air Force  
**Cooperating Agency:** National Marine Fisheries Service  
**Title of the Proposed Action:** Hawaii-California Training and Testing  
**Designation:** Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

**Abstract**

The United States Department of the Navy (Navy) (including both the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Marine Corps) jointly with the U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Army, and U.S. Air Force (collectively referred to as the Action Proponents), prepared this Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act and Executive Order 12114. This EIS/OEIS evaluates the potential environmental impacts of conducting training activities, testing activities, and range sustainment and modernization activities (referred to as military readiness activities) after December 2025 in the Hawaii-California Training and Testing Study Area (Study Area). The Study Area is made up of air and sea space off California, around the Hawaiian Islands, and a transit corridor connecting them. Three alternatives were analyzed in this EIS/OEIS:

- Under the No Action Alternative, the Action Proponents would not conduct the military readiness activities associated with the Proposed Action within the Study Area.
- Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative) reflects a representative level of training and testing to account for the natural fluctuation of training and testing cycles and deployment schedules that would not have the maximum level of activities occurring year after year in any seven-year period. Using a representative level of activities rather than maximum level reduces the amount of ship hull-mounted, mid-frequency active sonar estimated to meet requirements. Under Alternative 1, the Action Proponents assume that some unit-level training and testing would be conducted using synthetic means (e.g., simulators) and some unit-level active sonar training would be completed through other training exercises. Alternative 1 also includes modernization and sustainment of ranges and would allow the Action Proponents to meet their statutory requirements and would maintain military readiness needed to deter aggression and conduct operations to defeat enemies.
- Under Alternative 2, the Action Proponents would be enabled to meet the highest levels of military readiness in order to deter aggression and conduct operations to defeat enemies. Alternative 2 reflects the maximum number of training and testing activities that could occur within a given year and assumes that the maximum level of activity would occur every year over a seven-year period. This allows for the greatest flexibility for the Action Proponents to maintain readiness when considering potential changes in the national security environment, fluctuations in schedules, and anticipated in-theater demands. Alternative 2 also includes modernization and sustainment of ranges.

The resources evaluated include air quality, sediments and water quality, vegetation, invertebrates, habitats, fishes, marine mammals, reptiles, birds, cultural resources, socioeconomics, and public health and safety.

**Prepared by:** United States Department of the Navy  
**Point of Contact:** HCTT EIS/OEIS Project Manager  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific/EV21  
258 Makalapa Dr., Suite 100  
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134