



# **PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY REPORT**

## **Hawaii-California Training and Testing Draft Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement**

**May 2025**

**ID# EISX-007-17-USN-1724283453**

---

**Hawaii-California Training and Testing  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement  
Public Involvement Summary Report**

This report includes a summary of public involvement and stakeholder outreach activities conducted by the Department of the Navy (Navy) (including both the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Marine Corps), as the lead agency, jointly with the U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Army, and U.S. Air Force, during the public review and comment period for the *Hawaii-California Training and Testing (HCTT) Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS)*. This report also summarizes public comments received during the Draft EIS/OEIS public review and comment period, which was open from Dec. 13, 2024, to Feb. 11, 2025. The National Marine Fisheries Service is a cooperating agency on this EIS/OEIS.

The military services recognize the importance of engagement with the public, stakeholders, federally recognized tribes (tribes), and Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs) and made significant efforts to encourage their participation and submission of comments. The purpose of public involvement during the Draft EIS/OEIS public review and comment period was to:

1. Notify the public, stakeholders, tribes, and NHOs of the availability of the Draft EIS/OEIS for review and comment and public involvement opportunities.
2. Disseminate information about the Proposed Action, the environmental analysis, and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 processes; and
3. Provide an opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS/OEIS and a means to submit information or comments regarding historic properties.

Involvement and outreach efforts were conducted in accordance with NEPA and military service guidance. Additional outreach efforts beyond those required by NEPA were taken to more broadly notify and inform the public. Examples of additional outreach efforts include:

- A 60-day comment period, 15 days more than the required 45-day period
- Focused stakeholder briefings
- Multiple newspaper advertisements throughout the Study Area
- Notification letters and other direct mailings
- News releases and social media posts
- A virtual open house presentation (including narration and transcript) on the project website
- Project video on the importance of training and testing and environmental stewardship efforts
- In-person public meetings, including an open house information session and Navy presentation followed by a public oral comment session (similar to a traditional public hearing)
- A live virtual public meeting, consisting of a presentation and question-and-answer session
- Provision of the recorded virtual public meeting presentation available on the project website for those unable to attend live meetings

---

## **Summary of Public Involvement and Outreach Activities**

### **A. PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

The military services prepared materials to notify the public of the availability of the Draft EIS/OEIS and the public review and comment period. All public notices included information about the Proposed Action and why it is needed, public meetings (in-person and virtual), public commenting opportunities, and the project website address. The military services disseminated notices beginning Dec. 12, 2024. The following is a summary of those notices.

#### ***Federal Register Notices***

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency published a Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS/OEIS in the *Federal Register* on Dec. 13, 2024. The Navy published a [Notice of Public Meetings](#) on Dec. 13, 2024. The National Marine Fisheries Service published a Notice of Receipt of application for regulations and letters of authorization on Dec. 13, 2024.

#### ***Newspaper Advertisements***

Newspaper display advertisements were published in 10 local and regional newspapers in Hawaii and California. The advertisements were published once, beginning Dec. 13, 2024, to coincide with publication of the Notice of Availability in the *Federal Register*. The advertisements were published again in early January 2025, closer to the public meeting dates, for three consecutive days, including a Sunday (if publication schedule allowed).

Table 1 lists the newspapers and corresponding publication dates for each advertisement.

**Table 1: Newspaper Publications for the Notice of Availability**

<b>Newspaper</b>	<b>Newspaper Coverage</b>	<b>Publication Frequency</b>	<b>Publication Dates</b>
<i>Honolulu Star-Advertiser</i>	Oahu	Daily; except Saturday	Friday, Dec. 13, 2024 Friday, Jan. 10, 2025 Sunday, Jan. 12, 2025 Monday, Jan. 13, 2025
<i>The Garden Island</i>	Kauai	Daily; except Sunday	Friday, Dec. 13, 2024 Friday, Jan. 10, 2025 Saturday, Jan. 11, 2025 Monday, Jan. 13, 2025
<i>Hawaii Tribune-Herald</i>	Big Island of Hawaii	Daily; except Saturday	Friday, Dec. 13, 2024 Friday, Jan. 10, 2025 Sunday, Jan. 12, 2025 Monday, Jan. 13, 2025
<i>The Maui News</i>	Maui	Thursday only	Thursday, Dec. 19, 2024 Thursday, Jan. 9, 2025 Thursday, Jan 16, 2025
<i>Ka Wai Ola News</i>	Hawaiian Islands	Monthly	Wednesday, Jan. 1, 2025
<i>The San Diego Union-Tribune</i>	San Diego County	Daily	Friday, Dec. 13, 2024 Friday, Jan. 10, 2025 Saturday, Jan. 11, 2025 Sunday, Jan. 12, 2025
<i>Los Angeles Times</i>	Los Angeles County	Daily	Friday, Dec. 13, 2024 Friday, Jan. 10, 2025

Newspaper	Newspaper Coverage	Publication Frequency	Publication Dates
			Saturday, Jan. 11, 2025 Sunday, Jan. 12, 2025
<i>Ventura County Star</i>	Ventura County	Daily; except Saturday	Friday, Dec. 13, 2024 Friday, Jan. 10, 2025 Sunday, Jan. 12, 2025 Monday, Jan. 13, 2025
<i>The Monterey Herald</i>	Monterey Peninsula	Daily	Friday, Dec. 13, 2024 Friday, Jan. 10, 2025 Saturday, Jan. 11, 2025 Sunday, Jan. 12, 2025
<i>The Tribune</i>	San Luis Obispo County	Wednesday and Sunday only	Sunday, Dec. 15, 2024 Wednesday, Jan. 8, 2025 Sunday, Jan. 12, 2025

### ***Tribal and Stakeholder Notification Letters***

The military services mailed personalized tribal letters Dec. 12, 2024, via certified mail to 82 tribal chairpersons, presidents, historic preservation officers, and other cultural resource staff of tribes in California. The military services mailed personalized stakeholder letters first-class Dec. 12, 2024, to 98 federal and Kauai elected officials, and mailed 1,312 generic letters to state and local elected officials; federal, state, and local agencies; non-federally recognized tribes and tribal groups; and NHOs. All letters offered a briefing upon request and provided a point of contact for questions.

### ***Stakeholder and Tribal Database/Mailing List***

The military services developed a stakeholder and tribal database/ mailing list including tribes and stakeholders from the 2018 Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing EIS/OEIS and the 2022 Point Mugu Sea Range EIS/OEIS, those who commented during the 2023/2024 HCTT scoping period, and those who requested to be added to the list prior to the release of the Draft EIS/OEIS. The military services added newly formed NHOs in Hawaii and tribes and stakeholders in Central and Northern California due to the expanded offshore area. The list was updated and validated to manage and document the distribution of project notices.

### ***Postcard Mailer***

The military services mailed postcards on Dec. 12, 2024, to 579 nongovernmental organizations, research institutes, universities, and aviation, business, community, fishing, and recreation groups.

### ***News Releases and Media Distribution***

Public Affairs Officers (PAOs) for Navy Region Hawaii, Navy Region Southwest, and Pacific Missile Range Facility distributed [news releases](#) on Dec. 13, 2024, to local, regional, and national print and broadcast (radio and television) media. The news releases provided contact information for media questions. The PAOs redistributed the news releases on Jan. 7 or Jan. 8, 2025.

### ***Social Media Posts***

PAOs from Navy Region Hawaii, Navy Region Southwest, and Pacific Missile Range Facility posted information on their respective existing social media platforms, including the [Navy Region Hawaii Facebook page](#), [Navy Region Southwest Facebook page](#), [Pacific Missile Range Facility Facebook page](#),

---

and the [Stewards of the Sea Facebook page](#), on Dec. 13, 2024, Jan. 8, 2025, Jan. 15, 2025, and/or Jan. 16, 2025.

### ***Website Subscribers and Email Notifications***

The military services emailed notifications Dec. 13, 2024, to 511 website subscribers, and Jan. 10, 2025, to 499 website subscribers. Website subscribers include those from the 2018 Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing EIS/OEIS, the 2022 Point Mugu Sea Range EIS/OEIS, and new subscribers who completed the form on the HCTT website prior to the release of the Draft EIS/OEIS.

There were 503 website subscribers as of April 1, 2025.

## **B. PUBLIC INFORMATION**

The military services developed and disseminated informational materials to provide the public with comprehensive, accurate, and timely information. These materials are described below.

### ***Project Website***

The military services established a project website to make information readily available to the public in one convenient location. During the Draft EIS/OEIS period, information available on the website included:

- Draft EIS/OEIS and technical documents
- Public notices
- Project fact sheet
- Project video
- Maps of the Study Areas
- NEPA schedule
- Virtual open house presentation
- In-person and virtual public meeting details
- NEPA and NHPA Section 106 processes, including a Section 106 consulting party informational request form
- Links to completed projects and additional Navy resources

The public was able to submit comments via the website using the online comment form and subscribe to receive future notifications via email. The website was initially made available to the public on Dec. 14, 2023, and project updates were implemented Dec. 12, 2024. All materials posted were compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. The website address ([www.nepa.navy.mil/hctteis/](http://www.nepa.navy.mil/hctteis/)) was included in all public notices and informational materials.

On Jan. 21, 2025, the presentation for the virtual public meeting was posted on the website for the public to access prior to the meeting. On Jan. 29, 2025, the recording (audio and visual) and written transcript of the Navy's presentation was posted on the website.

### ***Virtual Open House Presentation***

The military services hosted a [virtual open house presentation](#) on the project website with information organized by topic. The public could view the presentation anytime during the Draft EIS/OEIS public

---

review and comment period. Audio narration and written transcripts were also available for each topic. The presentation will remain accessible on the Project Materials webpage.

### ***Stakeholder Briefings***

Navy personnel briefed key stakeholders upon request during the public review and comment period. Briefing topics were tailored for each stakeholder group based on their area of interest, expertise, or jurisdiction. Table 2 includes a summary of stakeholder briefings conducted.

**Table 2: Stakeholder Briefings**

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>Conducted By</b>	<b>Format of Outreach</b>	<b>Date</b>
California Coastal Commission	U.S. Pacific Fleet	Virtual	Dec. 10, 2024
Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council	Naval Air Systems Command	Regularly Scheduled Meeting	Jan. 24, 2025
Kauai Port Allen Fishing Club	U.S. Pacific Fleet	In Person	Feb. 5, 2025
Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources	U.S. Pacific Fleet	Virtual	Feb. 7, 2025
State of Hawaii Office of Planning and Sustainable Development	U.S. Pacific Fleet	Virtual	March 25, 2025
California Coastal Commission	U.S. Pacific Fleet	In Person	April 11, 2025

### ***Information Repositories***

The military services established 14 information repositories in December 2024 to make printed versions of project documents available to the public. The Draft EIS/OEIS was mailed on Dec. 11, 2024, to:

- Billie Jean King Main Library
- City of San Diego Central Library
- Coast Community Branch of Mendocino County Library
- Coronado Public Library
- E.P. Foster Library
- Los Angeles Central Library
- Monterey Public Library
- San Luis Obispo Library
- Hawaii State Library
- Hilo Public Library
- Wailuku Public Library
- Kailua-Kona Public Library
- Lihue Public Library
- Molokai Public Library

### ***Fact Sheet Booklet***

The military services developed a 12-page [fact sheet booklet](#) which included the following topics:

- Importance of at-sea training and testing
- HCTT Study Area, including changes since the 2018 Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing EIS/OEIS
- Proposed Action, including purpose and need
- Alternatives analyzed
  - No Action Alternative
  - Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)
  - Alternative 2
- Military readiness activities, including training and testing with sonar and explosives
- Summary of the environmental analysis

- 
- Marine resource and environmental protections at sea
  - NEPA process
  - NHPA Section 106 process
  - Public involvement opportunities, including in-person and virtual public meetings
  - Virtual open house information
  - Commenting information

Downloadable copies of the fact sheet booklet were posted on the project website and printed copies were available at the in-person public meetings.

### ***In-Person Public Meetings***

The military services held three public meetings from Jan. 13, 2025, through Jan. 16, 2025, at the locations listed in Table 3. The purpose of the public meetings was to inform the public and stakeholders about the Proposed Action and the findings of the environmental analysis, answer questions, and solicit comments on the Draft EIS/OEIS and the project's potential to affect historic properties. Each meeting included an open house information session staffed by military service representatives, a brief presentation by the Navy, and a public oral comment session. Members of the public could arrive at any time during the event. Each meeting was three hours in duration.

Staff at the welcome station greeted attendees and encouraged them to sign in and be added to the project mailing list. A fact sheet, comment form, and speaker request card were provided, along with verbal direction on the general flow of the poster stations and commenting methods.

Stations were set up around the room offering visual poster displays, fact sheet booklets, comment forms, speaker request cards, and other handouts. Subject matter experts staffed each poster station to answer questions and provide project information. Printed copies of the Draft EIS/OEIS were available for reference. Other previously approved public materials were also made available for viewing, such as information about Navy's marine species monitoring programs in Hawaii and California.

A comment station with tables, chairs, pens, and comment forms was provided to facilitate public commenting during the meeting. A certified court reporter was available to record oral comments either one-on-one or during the public oral comment session. Individuals could submit completed comment forms at the meetings, by mail, or via the project website.

To provide a safe environment conducive to a constructive exchange of information between the project team and the public, and to minimize potential disruption and contention, security guards were visibly present at each public meeting. The security guards greeted meeting attendees and monitored the venue space.

### ***Posters***

The military services developed 17 posters for use at the in-person public meetings which included the following topics:

- Aloha (at the welcome table)
- Proposed Action and Alternatives
- Importance of Military Readiness Activities
- Lead and Joint Agencies
- California Study Area

- 
- Southern California Range Complex
  - Hawaii Study Area
  - Hawaii Range Complex
  - Environmental Analysis – In-Water
  - Environmental Analysis – Marine Mammals
  - Environmental Analysis – Other Resources
  - Mitigation Measures around Hawaii
  - Mitigation Measures around California
  - Resource Protection and Environmental Stewardship around California
  - Resource Protection and Environmental Stewardship around Hawaii
  - National Environmental Policy Act and Other Regulatory Processes
  - National Historic Preservation Act Section 106

#### *Presentation and Oral Comment Session*

About one hour after the start of the public meetings, an approximately 30-minute presentation was given by Navy Senior Leadership and the program manager for U.S. Pacific Fleet. Following the presentation was an oral comment session, in which members of the public had up to three minutes each to publicly provide verbal testimony. A moderator opened and closed the comment session, reminding attendees of the commenting methods and inviting attendees to resume the open house if they had further questions. For the Honolulu public meeting, the three-minute time limit was unofficially waived. The meeting concluded after the oral comment session, approximately one hour after the published meeting end time due to the number of commenters. The court reporter transcribed the presentation and oral comment session at each meeting.

#### *Handouts*

The military services distributed a comment form and speaker request card to public meeting attendees. The comment form allowed attendees to submit written comments at the meeting or by mail. The speaker request card was available for meeting attendees who wished to provide a verbal comment during the public oral comment session. A sign-in sheet was available at the welcome table for meeting attendees to sign-in and request to be added to the project mailing list.

#### *Media Kits*

The military services prepared media kits to provide the media with project information in one convenient packet. Kits included the fact sheet, *Federal Register* Notice of Public Meetings, news release, copy of a stakeholder letter, and comment form. Persons identifying themselves as media at the public meetings received a media kit.

#### *Meeting Summary*

Table 3 includes a summary of the public meetings held Jan. 13-16, 2025, in San Diego, Calif., Honolulu on the island of Oahu, and Lihue on the island of Kauai. In total, 96 people attended the three in-person public meetings. The public meetings were well-attended, with productive discussions occurring at the poster stations. Members of the public asked questions of subject matter experts and some submitted written or verbal comments for the public record and consideration in the Final EIS/OEIS.



**Table 3: Summary of Public Meetings**

Site/Date	Attendance	Oral Comments	Written Comments
<i>Portuguese Hall</i> 2818 Avenida de Portugal San Diego, CA Monday, Jan. 13, 2025	30	1	4
<b>Media Attendance:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>			
<b>Organizations in Attendance:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City Council District 8 staff</li> <li>Port of San Diego</li> </ul>			

Site	Attendance	Oral Comments	Written Comments
<i>Ke'ehi Lagoon Memorial Weinberg Hall</i> 2685 N. Nimitz Highway Honolulu, HI Wednesday, Jan. 15, 2025	42	23	7
<b>Media Attendance:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Honolulu Star-Advertiser</li> </ul>			
<b>Organizations in Attendance:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Earthjustice</li> <li>Hawaii Committee for Human Rights in the Philippines</li> <li>Hui Aloha Aina</li> <li>Hui Ku Like Kakou</li> <li>Ka Lahui Hawaii</li> <li>Kululoia Ohana-I Ke Kai o Kululoia</li> <li>Na Kiai Paa</li> <li>Protect Kahoolawe Ohana</li> </ul>			

Site	Attendance	Oral Comments	Written Comments
<i>Kauai Veterans Center</i> 3215 Kauai Veterans Memorial Highway Lihue, HI Thursday, Jan. 16, 2025	24	8	0
<b>Media Attendance:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>			
<b>Organizations in Attendance:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>County of Kauai, Councilmembers</li> <li>E Ola Kakou Hawaii</li> <li>Kauai Historical Society</li> <li>Kauai Ocean Awareness</li> </ul>			

Site	Attendance	Oral Comments	Written Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ko Hawaii Pae Aina</li> <li>Hawaii Peace and Justice</li> <li>Ili o Ki Hapiilani Restoration Project</li> <li>Na Kuleana O Kanaka OIwi</li> <li>State of Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Aquatic Resources</li> </ul>			

### ***Virtual Public Meeting***

The Navy held a [virtual public meeting](#) to expand the opportunity for the larger public to participate. The Study Area is geographically broad, with population centers spread across Hawaii and California. The virtual public meeting format allowed for a dedicated opportunity for exchange of information between the public and project team members. The Navy's goals in hosting the virtual public meeting were to inform the public about the Proposed Action and the environmental analysis, answer questions, and encourage submission of public comments through established channels.

The Navy held one virtual public meeting on Jan. 22, 2025. Interested individuals could attend the virtual public meeting by computer, tablet, mobile device, or telephone. The meeting consisted of a live [Navy presentation](#) and public question-and-answer session to discuss the Proposed Action and the environmental analysis. Each meeting was scheduled for one hour; however, the meeting was extended 30 minutes to continue to answer questions from the public. The Navy posted meeting materials on the project website, including the virtual public meeting presentation.

The public was encouraged to ask questions about the Proposed Action or the environmental analysis during the virtual public meeting. A website question form, found on the Public Meeting page of the project website, was available to receive questions from the public in advance. Although a question submission deadline of Jan. 15, 2025, was initially advertised, the Navy accepted questions through the date of the virtual public meeting on Jan. 22, 2025. During the meeting, attendees using a computer or mobile device could type their question using the "Q&A" function. A moderator read the questions and team members responded verbally during the live meeting. All questions submitted and discussed during the question-and-answer portion were not considered official public comments nor part of the official public record. An official public comment could be submitted by mail or website through Feb. 11, 2025. The moderator promoted the proper commenting channels during the meeting.

### ***Meeting Summary***

Table 4 includes a summary of the virtual public meeting held Jan. 22, 2025. In total, 69 members of the public, government agencies, nongovernmental organizations, contractors, and military service employees attended the meeting. The "text submitted" portion of the table provides the verbatim text submitted via the website question form or during the live meeting.

**Table 4: Summary of Virtual Public Meeting**

Date/Time	Attendance
Tuesday, Jan. 22, 2025 3 to 4 p.m. Hawaii Standard Time; 5 to 6 p.m. Pacific Standard Time; 8 to 9 p.m. Eastern Standard Time Meeting Duration: 90 minutes	<b>Total Attendance: 69</b>
<b>Media Attendance:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>	

**Text Submitted (written via the website question form or typed into the Zoom application):**

- How is the lack of fuel from the Kapūkakī (Red Hill) facility affecting the plans in this EIS? If effects are not great, why did the Navy claim for years that they could not do without Kapūkakī?
- How many more flight events will take place at MCBH as compared to 2024?
- How many more helicopter insertions/extractions will take place in Kaneohe Bay as compared to 2024?
- Does the Navy have a clear strategy in assessing Cumulative impacts on marine life?
- Will explosives of any kind be used in Kailua or Kaneohe Bay?
- Are any new constructions proposed for MCBH? If so, where would they be located on the base and would be their magnitude?
- Can live fire exercises near whale breeding and migration paths be avoided, could the Navy use its passive sonar to detect groups of whales and take measures to either wait for them to move on or change the target area to avoid harming them.
- Are P-8s to be based at MCBH, if so how many and how many flight events per year are expected?
- Is there a reason this happen to expand into residential areas? Please keep the training exercises limited to Pearl Harbor and Barber's Point. There is already more than enough disruption of wildlife in the ocean as it is.
- Will this recording be available for view later?
- Will explosives be used to neuntralized the test vehicles and objects?
- Why is the chat disabled?
- Unable to hear audio
- It's working now. Mahalo
- "NO BOOTS ON THE GROUND, NO BOMBS IN THE AIR! U.S. OUT OF EVERYWHERE! A ZINE BY HAWAI'I COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE PHILIPPINES  
No To U.S. Military Use of Hawaiian Lands!  
Seiji Yamada, Arcelita Imasa, Richard Rothschiller  
[https://www.canva.com/design/DAGQPVelfXo/NH7eUISGgmqP86rglslGDg/view?utm\\_content=DAGQPVelfXo&utm\\_campaign=designshare&utm\\_medium=link&utm\\_source=editor#2](https://www.canva.com/design/DAGQPVelfXo/NH7eUISGgmqP86rglslGDg/view?utm_content=DAGQPVelfXo&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link&utm_source=editor#2)"
- Why should the people of Hawai'i allow you to destroy and desacrate the `Aina yet again, when you haven't even cleaned up Red Hill, Pohakuloa, Makua, Kaho`olawe, Ka`ula, Pu`uloa, etc, etc, etc?
- A'ole RIMPAC..no to contamination of our waters and desecration of our lands
- Just wondering if those on Zoom will be able to testify after the presentation?
- Aloha...When could we speak up on this? Please let me know. Mahalo
- Is there an increase in training activity within Kaneohe Bay, Oahu. If so, what are those increased training activities.
- With all due respect, the U.S. military has no business in Hawai'i. Please remember that the Hawaiian Kingdom still exists, we're illegally occupied, and the rights of Kānaka and 'āina trampled on. The military should clean their mess and work towards and peaceful resolution, where NONE of these harmful "exercises" should take place
- Kānaka Maoli OPPOSE any and all trainings. Boundaries are outside of U.S. jurisdiction
- With Humpback whales migrating to and from Hawaii waters, what considerations are undertaken to lessen interactions or incursions with those patterns?
- Will questions be answered at the end?
- My first question is: Are there options to change negative impacts made through military training, by creating new pathways that include Kānaka and our feedback?
- Will these training areas be closed to vessel and aircraf traffiic? If so, how and how often?
- By AFFECTING them, causes injury to both Kānaka and 'āina as well

- My second question is: Does the military understand that the water quality and marine life affect human beings?
- per Humpback question: Answered.
- What are the cultural representation provided by the spotters who will be operating in Hawaiian waters? Are they of native Hawaiian ancestry and would be able to validate proper cultural processes in order to protect our aumakua from unforeseen impacts of the military testing?
- The speaker said no changes to Hawai'i portion are being suggested, but he also says there is a proposal to deploy more mines..?
- Will questions be answered at the end?
- Just to be clear, we want to hear about impacts, not your good deeds.
- Does the Navy actively seek out and work with Kanaka Maoli/ Indigenous American-led environmental groups and organizations?
- Is there a full list of individuals or organizations that participated in the original scoping period? Demographics of participants?
- How can the navy claim environmental protection, when Kapukaki is still recovering and the navy is not attending meetings with community representatives and other stakeholders, Waiau is still being investigated, the ships in Pu'uuloa are rotting in waters just off shore etc.
- Many have read...when will questions be answered? Comments have been submitted
- Please don't just read what is on the screen, especially when it is available elsewhere!
- How come there's a Q&A option, as directed by the Monitor, if questions will not be addressed?
- The MMPA prohibits activities that harass, hunt, capture, or kill marine mammals. The Navy's use of active sonar and explosives poses significant risks to marine life, including whales and dolphins. share examples of proposed mitigation measures sufficient to prevent unlawful harm to these protected species? as well as for ESA, etc. we don't want to read your false words, you need to come with specific details.
- The U.S. Navy has killed one of our islands Kaho'olawe and made it uninhabitable with no life, as they broke the water table by bombing it for "testing" and poisoned our water on O'ahu due to the Kapūkākī (Red Hill) oil & contaminants spill, amongst many other things...What makes the U.S. Navy think it's okay to continue to desecrate and destroy our home of Hawai'i, the Moana(ocean) and further continue killing us? It's not okay!
- If both have been done, how and when will be informed of its submittal?
- Can you please allow oral questions
- Does the no action alternative assume that no training and testing activities would occur at all, or that no permits would be issued but some activities would still occur that wouldn't require a permit?
- How does it feel to be a tool of the illegal US occupation of Hawai'i?
- Yes ma'am I understand. I have already done so
- Do you know that the Navy has failed to fulfill its public trust duties? and has not demonstrated ability to mitigate the extensive environmental damage it has already caused?
- I will state my questions again in a more orderly fashion, for your consideration and convenience
- How will the US Military realistically ensure there are minimal impacts to marine wildlife?
- How is this lawful? Didn't the U.S. breach its treaty of friendship, commerce and travel with the Hawaiian Islands, H. I.? Aren't US military service members violating their oaths with these actions?
- Does Appendix E analyze annual impacts under Alternative 1, or just Alternative 2?
- Did you know that this is a blatant violation of Hawai'i State Constitution, the Hawaiian Kingdom Public Trust Doctrine, and international law incl. UNDRIP, the Law of Sea Convention, and the Hague Convention?
- Do you realize that we are saying NO. Option 1 NO ACTION?

- Is the U.S. military allowed to go in territories of other countries and 'train'?
  - Could we get a third party EIS done? Not the military or government and could it be done by a non-profit of some sort, like Sierra Club or others that have the best interest for Hawai'i as well as the rest of the world.
  - Do you know that you need to clean up before expansion/increased training? and that this deepens the crisis of environmental harm with your presence?
  - As a former naval officer, and current Kauai resident, I am familiar with PMRF as both a user (while an active duty surface warfare officer), and a resident/neighbor of PMRF. I understand how impacts to marine mammals are limited through limited use of active sonar (which is not a very good way to find submarines since it gives away your location). I have more recently witnessed PMRF's stewardship in protecting the marine and shoreline environment and commend their leadership on that.
  - "True security is achieved not through militarization but through peaceful coexistence and respect for all forms of life. Is this project aligning us with the values of peace and respect that we aspire to uphold? With the pressing global climate crisis, should we not prioritize protecting our natural environments over activities that contribute to their degradation?"
  - Our military has a very difficult and important job - to protect our country and its citizens, and there is no easy way to train for this. I support the ongoing viability of PMRF.
  - Do you recognize that we are NOT giving you consent and that this again violates our rights?
  - Do you know that your use of sonars and explosives have already been proven to harm marine mammals, destroy fisheries, and DESECRATE CULTURAL PRACTICES?
  - Perhaps more appropriately, I support ongoing conduct of at-sea training and testing activities, and modernization and sustainment of ranges (collectively referred to as "military readiness activities") within the HCTT Study Area
  - Do you recognize that NO CONSENT violates UNDRIP?
  - I asked a question prior to the Q&A being turned on and it has disappeared. I'll try and respond.
  - Do Navy service members experience moral injury related to their destruction of Hawai'i's 'Aina?
  - The original question was relating to increased activities within Kaneohe Bay and if so, what are those activities?
  - You DO know that you are able to allow us to orally testify? and thus are stopping our right to testify? You are violating so many rights and laws.
  - Do Navy contractors promoting the Navy activities promoted in this EIS experience related moral injury?
  - \*\* Not a question \*\* You may want to make an announcement at future calls - that questions in the Q&A only populate after the Q&A session is opened.
  - May we please have the link where this recording will be published?
  - Relating to the use of platforms, at what depth are they normally located?
  - why are your questions showing up in the queue after you answered? and other questions there are not being asked.
- "As a former servicemember (US Army), our routine training entailed the devastating environment destruction that comes from routine military operations in the field, that was enabled until EPA would halt training, which would just move us to another public lands area to destroy while the former lay fallow and poisoned. My question as a veteran is: how will individual soldiers, many still adolescents, be held accountable for environment damage inevitable from practicing warfare? We never were"
- Disabling the chat is anti-democratic by definition
  - I was just going to ask about testifying
  - You did not really answer my question about explosives neutralizing objects like mines? Exactly where would that be done and how powerful are those explosives? That is, could people in and around Kaneohe Bay hear them?

- Yes ma'am, we have gone through proper channels. Testimonies, live, by phone, ZOOMS. The concern is it's not Q and A. Our questions have not been addressed nor answered. Please answer my questions below. Thank you
- please ask my questions...there are two in one comment thread previously sent.
- Since damage has been done to life, is there a plan to revitalize life? Energy is powerful
- Yes Sir. We have submitted our testimonies. THOUSANDS of us. When will OUR questions be answered?
- What's the process in stopping this from happening and demilitarizing Hawai'i?
- "what kānaka 'ōiwi communities/people/kūpuna of hawai'i, NOT state/federal entities have you spoken to to learn about OUR relationship and responsibility to the ocean? each of you said you have NOT at the last meeting, WHY do you feel you have the authority to teach us about our own waters?"
- Yes Sir, I have read the ENTIRE EIS
- these are questions
- do you NOT see the question mark?
- Certainly!! I have provided several pages worth of comments. If chats weren't disabled (which was by the Navy's design) we would type comments there. Thank you for your time and attention
- Will lessons of long term harm be learnt and policies and procedures changed from Red Hill & Buxton Military Base contamination issue's that are coming to the surface decades later?
- In your slide on impacts to marine life it states that there could be permanent damage to hearing of reptiles from sound producing activities. Is there any way that this can be avoided?
- is this project aligning us with the values of peace and respect that we aspire to uphold?
- Can you please list of what organizations have approved ANY of this? We are members of several, as many Kānaka are, and it appears our questions, comments and concerns are being ignored. Please provide answers to my questions. Mahalo
- where is that list?
- But how do you feel about it as a human being?
- My third question is: When thousands of Kānaka have expressed concern about the Navy's presence and practices, when will the accountability portion take place where WE the people come first?
- what will constitute the NO ACTION to be the final answer so this DOES NOT move forward?
- How will the monitoring of the maritime environment for range safety be performed?
- what is the Navy's exact definition of minimal impacts, bc it has been known for years that the marine life is affected by sonar etc. We have now also learned that the Navy's claim of minimal impact regarding Red Hill & affected individuals don't match the data of those affected.
- where's the treaty?
- Are any of you aware that the United States government and ALL employees are guilty of war crimes and will be held responsible?
- do you have a treaty of annexation? this is a question
- Are you aware that under United States Law, International Law AND Hawaiian Kingdom Law are in full effect? Please review Apology Law by your government, Public Law 103-150 <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-107/pdf/STATUTE-107-Pg1510.pdf> MAHALO
- thank you for asking the question and for the members emotybwds
- <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-107/pdf/STATUTE-107-Pg1510.pdf>

---

**Organizations in Attendance:**

- Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
- California Coastal Commission
- California Energy Commission
- Earthjustice
- Environmental Protection Agency
- Kauai Chamber of Commerce
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
- Office of Hawaiian Affairs
- Sacred Places Institute for Indigenous Peoples

**C. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS**

***This section is intended to illustrate the main public concerns presented during the Draft EIS/OEIS public review and comment period; it is not meant to capture all aspects of the comments or to serve as a legal record. Additionally, not all issues presented here are within the scope of the EIS/OEIS. Substantive comments received during the Draft EIS/OEIS public review and comment period will be responded to in the Final EIS/OEIS.***

The Draft EIS/OEIS public review and comment period was open from Dec. 13, 2024, to Feb. 11, 2025. The military services received 1,888 comments during the public review and comment period. Public comments were received in-person at the public meetings (written: 11, verbal: 32), via the website comment form (1,526), via email (312), and by postal mail (7). Many comments appear to be created using a standardized letter. Please note that if a comment was submitted by the same person or group more than once via different methods, e.g., the same comment was submitted by mail and the website by the same person, it was only counted once. Additionally, one comment submission may include comments on multiple resource areas or topics.

The EIS/OEIS team reviewed, compiled, logged, and discussed the impact, significance, and relevance of the comments, as well as the substantive issues and concerns of communities, during the preparation of the Final EIS/OEIS. All comments submitted through the appropriate channels during the Draft EIS/OEIS public review and comment period are part of the public record.

Table 5 includes a summary of public comments to provide a brief overview of the general issues or concerns expressed during the Draft EIS/OEIS public review and comment period. The military services appreciate public, stakeholder, and tribal participation in this important process.

**Table 5: Summary of Public Comments**

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
Proposed Action and Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Concerns about military readiness activities in fragile environments around the Hawaiian Islands.</li><li>• Requests for military training and testing to be conducted away from the Hawaiian Islands, which are considered sacred lands.</li><li>• Concerns about expanding training in the Hawaii Study Area on the Windward side (Kaneohe Bay, Bellows Beach, and Marine Corps Base Hawaii [Kailua]).</li></ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about expanding the training and testing areas within the California Study Area and whether the effects of those expanded areas were adequately assessed.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Proposed Action would have negative effects on coral reefs and other ocean wildlife, such as whales and dolphins.</li> <li>• Concerns about the perceived lack of cleanup of unexploded ordnance and other debris from military readiness activities.</li> <li>• Concerns about Rim of the Pacific – or RIMPAC – and international militaries training with the U.S. military. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that the military services exclude harm potentially inflicted on marine mammals by foreign navies participating in military readiness activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Opposition to the Proposed Action, training and testing in Hawaii, and expanding the Hawaii Study Area.</li> <li>• Support for the No Action Alternative to stop military activities or support for the Proposed Action to allow for the continuation of military readiness activities to protect the United States of America.</li> <li>• Concerns that the overall environmental benefits, such as endangered species recovery, of proceeding with the No Action Alternative are not adequately analyzed in the Draft EIS/OEIS. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Disagreements that proceeding with the No Action Alternative would leave the status of effected marine mammal populations/stocks “unchanged” or, at best, “slightly improved from baseline conditions.”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns about the military services increasing activities already conducted in the Study Area, especially for mine warfare activities.</li> <li>• Concerns about using nearshore areas more frequently for new training and testing activities, such as mine warfare training.</li> <li>• Concerns that the use of active sonar, underwater explosives, and live-fire exercises would have devastating effects on marine life, including marine mammals, endangered birds, and coral reefs communities.</li> <li>• Questions about whether range modernization and sustainment activities would run across state submerged lands within the Hawaii Study Area.</li> <li>• Questions about how the Wave Energy Test Site was authorized and designated since it is on State-owned submerged lands in the Resource subzone of the Conservation District.</li> <li>• Questions about whether land-based activities are truly outside the scope of the EIS/OEIS, such as how onshore facilities receiving marine fiber optic cables are addressed.</li> <li>• Questions about amphibious landings and other nearshore activities and the general effect these activities would have on terrestrial, environmental, community, and cultural resources.</li> <li>• Questions about how the homebasing of P8A’s and the V-22 Osprey are addressed in the Draft EIS/OEIS.</li> </ul>



Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests to clarify the locations and types of military readiness activities that would increase, such as number of aircraft flights, amphibious maneuvers, etc.</li> <li>• Concerns about how “dummy mines” would be neutralized using non-explosive practice munitions and explosive munitions and the potential effects from these activities.</li> <li>• Requests for greater clarity on what modernization and sustainment of ranges would include.</li> <li>• Questions about whether historical shipwrecks would be used as targets.</li> <li>• Requests for clarity on where sinking exercises would take place and how often these exercises would occur.</li> <li>• Concerns that increased or expanded activities are not clearly explained in the Draft EIS/OEIS. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests for adequate descriptions of activity changes vice a general statement on what “percent more hours” an activity would increase.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS does not address increased use of unmanned systems across air, surface, and subsurface environments in Hawaii, and therefore, does not properly assess the potential effects on marine life, including sensitive habitats.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS does not fully address the installation of new cable and sensor infrastructure east of Kaneohe, and that the EIS/OEIS lacks descriptions of the scale, methods, and long-term monitoring plans associated with this installation.</li> <li>• Concerns about how the Draft EIS/OEIS addresses the Air Force’s air-to-air gunnery training and the use of new vessels during amphibious landings.</li> <li>• Concerns about increasing the use of sonar in the waters around Hawaii and the potential effects on marine species.</li> <li>• Confusion about the discrepancies between the military services Preferred Alternative and the MMPA Letter of Authorization request, and ultimately, the extent of effects on marine species.</li> <li>• Concerns that the military services do not take seriously proceeding with an alternative that has fewer environmental effects compared to the Preferred Alternative. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests to reevaluate NEPA’s command to evaluate “choices or alternatives that might be pursued with less environmental harm.”</li> <li>○ Requests for the military services to consider alternatives that include temporal shifts in training and testing activities to reduce harm to marine mammals from vessel strikes since whales are present only seasonally, increasing the risk of vessel strikes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Air Quality and Climate Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns that the military services rely on emission estimates rather than using pollution concentrations and comparing them to National Ambient Air Quality Standards.</li> <li>• Concerns that the air quality assessment does not consider all relevant pollutants and does not adequately address effects across the entire affected area.</li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that the military services do not use the most current air quality modeling techniques or data sources recommended by regulatory agencies.</li> <li>Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS analysis does not examine the effects on air quality in already overburdened communities and those most vulnerable to pollution, such as communities in Long Beach, Calif.</li> <li>Clarification that Ventura County, Calif., is in attainment for ozone.</li> </ul>
Sediments and Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that Draft EIS/OEIS does not adequately assess the effect military readiness activities have on ocean pollution, particularly the effect on endangered species, and instead, places the blame for this pollution on municipalities and industry.</li> <li>Requests to reassess effects on water quality, especially from wastewater and oil spills, and how endangered species, such as sea turtles, could be affected.</li> <li>Concerns about whether a known DDT (a chemical used as an insecticide) dump site within the California Study Area would be disturbed by military readiness activities.</li> <li>Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS does not include an in-depth evaluation of marine debris and the environmental threats that results from this hazard.</li> <li>Concerns that missile and artillery firing from the Pacific Missile Range Facility would introduce risks related to unexploded ordnance, marine debris, and potential chemical contamination.</li> <li>Concerns about nitrogen pollution from wastewater contributing to the proliferation of invasive algae.</li> </ul>
Birds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about the effects of military readiness activities on endangered birds, such as band-rumped storm petrel, Hawaiian petrel, and Newell's shearwater.</li> <li>Concerns about military readiness activities startling birds and forcing birds to abandon eggs.</li> <li>Requests for a more comprehensive analysis of the effects of military readiness activities on birds and their habitats.</li> </ul>
Fishes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about the effects the Proposed Action may have on subsistence fishing and fishing communities, even if closures are only temporary.</li> <li>Concerns that it is inaccurate to claim that fishes would move away from sound, laser targets, and explosives.</li> <li>Requests for clarity on whether takes of ESA-listed fishes would be requested.</li> <li>Concerns that the military services do not use the best available science regarding the effects of sonar and other military readiness activities on sharks, especially the Oceanic whitetip sharks, and rays, especially giant manta rays.</li> <li>Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS analysis inadequately explains the effects of electronic warfare systems, and that electromagnetic fields can have notable effects on sharks and rays, including oceanic whitetip, scalloped hammerhead, and tope sharks.</li> </ul>
Marine Mammals/Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about the effects of the Proposed Action on marine species at the individual-level, even if effects at the population-level are not anticipated.</li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns that activities may kill, injure, disorient, or have long lasting effects on marine species and marine habitat.</li> <li>• Concerns about the increase in incidental takes (of marine species) requested by the military services for military readiness activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that the reasoning for an increase in takes, and any filed complaint related to incidental takes, has not been adequately discussed in the Draft EIS/OEIS.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Requests for the National Marine Fisheries Service to not issue permits to the military services for any “takes.”</li> <li>• Concerns that the military services do not treat marine species with respect, nor do they consider the marine species as relatives/closely connected to the Native Hawaiian community.</li> <li>• Concerns about the military services assessment in the Draft EIS/OEIS that effects on marine species would not be significant. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests to reevaluate significance determinations to more accurately reflect the potential effects on marine species, particularly endangered species.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns about the military services analyses (specifically for abundance/densities, seasonal distribution densities, seasonal in-water percentages, and regional distribution), and the references used for Guadalupe fur seals, Hawaiian monk seals, northern elephant fur seals, harbor seals and bottlenose dolphins, California sea lions and other pinnipeds, and cetaceans. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that if densities are not accurate, the Navy Acoustic Effects Model (NAEMO), would not yield accurate modeling results.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns about the current weighting function and associated thresholds for non-impulsive sources for very high-frequency cetaceans, including mysticetes.</li> <li>• Concerns about the current usage of behavior thresholds for acoustic sources, including the Navy-developed Bayesian biphasic dose-response functions.</li> <li>• Concerns about NAEMO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns about inefficiencies with NAEMO when criteria and thresholds for auditory and behavioral effects data is constantly changing.</li> <li>○ Requests for NAEMO to consider using varying avoidance swim speeds depending on the species.</li> <li>○ Concerns about using relative proportions or percentages of a stock to estimate effects on individuals from repeated exposures and population-level consequences, leading to negligible effects determinations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns about the analysis implementing cut-off distances beyond which it considered the potential for significant behavioral responses to be unlikely.</li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about behavior thresholds used for explosives, and maintaining in the analysis that marine mammals do not exhibit behavioral responses to single detonations.</li> <li>• Concerns about the models used to estimate sound propagation associated with underwater detonations.</li> <li>• Concerns about marine species exposure to pile-driving and inaccurate data used, and requests to revise the accumulation time, range to effects, and numbers of takes for marine species in the Final EIS/OEIS.</li> <li>• Requests to use alternative forms of probability analysis that are more reflective of vessels being used in the area for 7-year vessel strike probabilities.</li> <li>• Concerns about the possible effects of electromagnetic discharges or stray electricity (including without limitation, microwave communication electrical energy) that may result from military readiness activities on marine species and coral reefs.</li> <li>• Questions about what procedures are in place to assist marine species or sharks that may be entangled in military equipment, such as parachutes.</li> <li>• Questions about federal or state agency oversight tracking incidental takes of marine species.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS does not identify marine species effects by stocks and rather lumps together all the effects on an entire species from direct strikes (vessels, high-energy lasers, military expended materials) in the Hawaii Study Area and California Study Area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that the military services do not quantify the number of predicted vessel strikes on each marine species stock under either of the analyzed alternatives.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Request for the military services to use the most recent scientific research when analyzing effects and behavioral responses on all marine mammals, marine species, fishes, sea turtles, invertebrates, and seabirds.</li> <li>• Requests to ensure migratory species and patterns are properly analyzed.</li> <li>• Concerns about the short- and long-term effects of sonar on all marine mammals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that the military services do not quantify and adequately consider the effects of multi-day sonar exposures on marine species.</li> <li>○ Requests to quantify the effects of consecutive day sonar exposures on feeding, reproduction, and displacement of marine mammals.</li> <li>○ Requests for the military services to consider new information on the sensitivity of marine species to sonar.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns that the military services do not consider non-lethal (behavioral) takes significant, which generally minimizes the extent of the effects on marine species. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns with the claims that long-term harm to marine species populations are not anticipated.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that the military services did not conduct the required analysis to determine if Level A and B takes would cause significant harm to affected marine mammal populations or stocks, such as the Eastern North Pacific stock of blue whales, the Central America/Southern Mexico-California-Oregon-Washington stock of humpback whales, and the Hawaiian monk seal.</li> <li>• Requests that the military services consider changes in species distribution resulting from marine heatwaves and other ecosystem changes that have become more frequent in the past decade to accurately evaluate potential effects on marine species and implement appropriate mitigation measures.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS analysis underestimates the potential harm to beaked whales off California because beaked whales are extremely sensitive to sonar and have experienced numerous mass strandings caused by military sonar.</li> <li>• Concerns that the military services did not analyze the effects of military readiness activities on critically endangered North Pacific right whales (recent observations demonstrate that North Pacific right whales overlap with the HCTT Study Area), and the military services must consider effects from vessel strikes, sonar, and explosives.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS analysis inadequately examines the effects of the Proposed Action on ESA-listed sea otters, especially since the expanded California Study Area includes northern areas, which are likely to have sea otter effects.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS analysis inadequately examines the effects of military activities on humpback whales, specifically the endangered Central America/Southern Mexico-California-Oregon-Washington stock of humpback whales and their critical habitat.</li> <li>• Concerns about the effects of sonar and other military readiness activities on blue whales, Southern resident killer whales, minke whales, and main Hawaiian Islands insular false killer whales. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns about strandings of pygmy killer whales and dwarf sperm whales.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Reptiles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns that the military services do not adequately assess the effects of sea turtles in the Draft EIS/OEIS.</li> <li>• Concerns about the effects of sea turtles that may be foraging around or on seafloor devices.</li> <li>• Concerns that the military services do not quantify or analyze the extent of risk to sea turtles from vessel strikes.</li> <li>• Concerns about the decline of sea turtle populations and extinction risks.</li> </ul>
Marine Sanctuaries/Marine Protected Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about the effects of marine species in ecologically critical areas, such as the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument and offshore at Kaula Island.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument was not evaluated as a traditional cultural property during the NHPA Section 106 process.</li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests for the Navy to evaluate marine sanctuaries within the Study Area as traditional cultural properties.</li> <li>• Concerns that greater details were not provided to explain when the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument could be susceptible to sonic booms or utilized for emergency situations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that possible effects on cultural voyaging or wayfinding would only be temporary.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Requests for verification on whether all types of unmanned aerial systems are allowable within the Hawaiian Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary.</li> <li>• Requests for clarification on the definition "limited activities" to be conducted in Marine Protected Areas and to clearly correlate those activities with appropriate regulatory controls to ensure the protection of natural and cultural resources within Marine Protected Areas.</li> </ul>
Habitats/Coral Reefs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about coral reefs from the effects of active sonar, explosives, or other sources of underwater sound during military readiness activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that these stressors would further harm critical coral reef ecosystems, which are essential for biodiversity, coastal protection, and cultural practices.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns that military readiness activities, combined with the stresses of climate change, do not provide coral reefs the opportunity to recover, which effects overall ocean health.</li> <li>• Concerns that placing and moving targets for mine warfare training activities, such as exploding ordnance, laying and relaying cable, and other activities would disturb coral reef ecosystems that are already heavily disrupted by ongoing military use and other stressors.</li> <li>• Concerns about the effects of military expended materials on the seafloor, and how an accumulation of non-recovered expended materials from past and current military use of the Study Area could affect marine life and environments.</li> <li>• Concerns about further impacting Puuloa, off Oahu, because seafloor and habitat disturbance caused by military readiness activities.</li> <li>• Concerns about how range modernization and sustainment activities (installation of seafloor cables and platforms) would affect coral reefs and other seafloor habitats, and questions about how these effects would be mitigated.</li> <li>• Concerns about the potential for unexploded ordnance to affect coral reefs and other seafloor habitats.</li> <li>• Questions about the proposal of critical habitat for green sea turtles around the Hawaiian Islands.</li> <li>• Concerns about the perceived lack of site-specific data on wildlife (marine species) and their preferred habitats within the newly expanded California Study Area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS relies heavily on outdated or generalized data, which may not accurately reflect the current</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<p>distribution and density of sensitive species or environmental conditions and prey availability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that the installation of new cable and sensor infrastructure east of Kaneohe could disrupt benthic (bottom) habitats and contribute to increased sedimentation, which can harm coral reefs and marine species.</li> <li>Concerns about the installation and maintenance of mine training shapes in the Maui Basin, and that the Draft EIS/OEIS does not adequately analyze the ecological consequences of placing and retrieving these objects in this sensitive marine environment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that the potential for seabed disturbance, habitat degradation, and interference with local fisheries is insufficiently addressed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Public Health and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about hazardous and chemical waste and effects spreading beyond a localized region.</li> <li>Concerns that increasing or continuing to conduct military readiness activities around Hawaii would make it a target for future attacks.</li> <li>Concerns about whether increases in military readiness activities would result in closing Kaneohe Bay and the Waimanalo coast from public recreation use.</li> <li>Concerns about the possible effects of electromagnetic discharges or stray electricity that may result from military readiness activities on marine recreationists (e.g., SCUBA divers).</li> <li>Concerns about the information available in the Draft EIS/OEIS about mines and underwater mine countermeasures, and how activities would affect recreationists.</li> <li>Questions about the notices ocean users would receive when access to recreation areas within the Study Area would be temporarily closed.</li> <li>Concerns about potential detonations in Kaneohe Bay and the public's safety.</li> </ul>
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about noise effects, specifically from explosives, on people and local communities.</li> <li>Concerns that the underwater noise analysis is inadequate, and therefore, effects on marine species, such as cetaceans and fish, may be underrepresented. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that the effects of noise on adjacent communities are inadequately addressed.</li> <li>Questions about the analysis categorizing noise levels based on day-night average sound levels.</li> <li>Requesting more information on what level of increased activities would occur in the evening.</li> <li>Concerns that already disproportionately burdened communities would be affected by increased noise the most.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Concerns that inadequate consideration is given to the adoption or development of alternative, quieter technologies for training and testing activities that could reduce overall noise pollution.</li> <li>Concerns about noise pollution due to increased use of unmanned systems.</li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about noise effects on marine mammals, fishes, and seabirds in the Study Area, including the expanded airspace.</li> <li>• Concerns about noise effects on submerged marine species, such as marine mammals and fishes, and that it is possible for noise that exceeds thresholds to trigger behavioral responses in marine mammals, fish, and sea birds. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that the analysis of sonic booms under the sea surface is inadequate because studies show the sea surface does not serve as an acoustic barrier to military aircraft noise.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns that the military services did not adequately analyze the effects of aircraft noise and requests to include a more in-depth analysis in the Final EIS/OEIS.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS analysis underestimates the effects of pile driving noise off Port Hueneme, and that it is inaccurate to claim marine species and fishes move away from pile driving.</li> </ul>
Cultural Resources/ National Historic Preservation Section (NHPA) 106 Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about the military services abilities to avoid cultural resources.</li> <li>• Concerns that military readiness activities intrude on cultural practices, such as fishing and traditional ceremonies, and lead to spiritual and community effects.</li> <li>• Concerns that the analysis in the Draft EIS/OEIS does not account for tribal sacred sites or for potential adverse effects on lower-income communities and communities with environmental equity concerns.</li> <li>• Concerns that the military services disrespect sacred spaces and the relationship the Native Hawaiian community has with the ocean environment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that the military services do not understand the significance of marine life to Native Hawaiian culture and values.</li> <li>○ Concerns that military readiness activities disrupt traditional practices, such as fishing, navigation, and ceremonies, and violate the rights of Native Hawaiians to care for and protect their ancestral waters.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS and in-person public meeting presentation demonstrated a lack of consultations with the Native Hawaiian community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests for the military services to engage in meaningful consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and incorporate this knowledge and values into the decision-making process.</li> <li>○ Requests to ensure military readiness activities do not infringe on Native Hawaiian rights.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns that the NHPA Section 106 process and Draft EIS/OEIS sections that discuss effects on cultural resources are inadequate and incomplete: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that a consultation timeline for Native Hawaiians was not presented in the Draft EIS/OEIS.</li> <li>○ Concerns that a NEPA public participation plan, as an optional tool pursuant to 32 Code of Federal Regulations 775.11, or inclusion of an "Indigenous Knowledge Plan" were not implemented as part of the NHPA Section 106 and NEPA processes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that the Office of Hawaiian Affairs was not consulted for assistance with engagement with Native Hawaiian Organizations.</li> <li>• Suggestions to include the Council on Environmental Quality’s guidance on Indigenous Knowledge.</li> <li>• Requests for the Navy to consult with Native Hawaiians and homestead communities to better understand traditional and customary practices that take place at sea and how best to mitigate potential effects on the constitutionally protected rights of Native Hawaiians.</li> <li>• Concerns with the assessment that the action alternatives would cause “less than significant effects” on cultural resources and harm to cultural practitioners that they inflict.</li> </ul>
Socioeconomics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about the effects of the Proposed Action on lower-income communities and communities with environmental equity concerns, and concerns about the military services analyzing those effects.</li> <li>• Questions about the number of new service personnel and families that would be homeported at either Pearl Harbor or Marine Corps Base Hawaii as a result of the Proposed Action and the housing units needed for new personnel. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns about housing shortages on Oahu and how the military affects Oahu’s housing supply, housing availability, and housing affordability.</li> <li>○ Requests for the military to build more on-base housing to alleviate housing shortages.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Mitigation Measures and Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about the effectiveness of the military services mitigation measures and standard operating procedures to minimize effects on marine species.</li> <li>• Concerns about inaccuracies with the biologically important areas used to create geographic mitigations, such as seasonal migration inaccuracies for gray whales and omissions of geographic mitigation areas for blue whales.</li> <li>• Concerns about the ineffectiveness of Navy Lookouts to inform visual observations.</li> <li>• Requests to increase the use of passive acoustic monitoring via range instrumentation and sonobuoys prior to and during activities involving explosive sonobuoys, explosive torpedoes, sinking exercises, ship shock trials, explosive bombing exercises, and air-to-surface and surface-to-surface explosive missile and rocket exercises.</li> <li>• Requests to include the requirement to delay, relocate, or cease activities if floating vegetation or jellyfish are observed in the mitigation zone during activities involving active acoustic sources, pile driving, airguns, and explosives, which would be consistent with Phase III mitigation measures.</li> <li>• Requests that the military services cease any active acoustic, explosive, pile driving, or airgun activities if a marine mammal is observed to be injured or killed during or immediately after the activity; not just conducting this action after an individual detonation for ship shock trials.</li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests for better transparency on what "Navy funded efforts" for marine species populations and migrations are and what effects these efforts had on predicting stressors to the marine mammal environment.</li> <li>• Concerns that the military services do not thoroughly explore or propose effective protection measures to reduce air quality effects.</li> <li>• Concerns about limited protections for humpback whales.</li> <li>• Concerns about insufficient protective measures in place to minimize effects on coral reefs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Limiting training and testing activities to within 350 yards of coral reefs may not be sufficient to prevent damage from underwater sound and other activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns that the current protections in place and proposed mitigation measures for marine species are inadequate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns about the effectiveness of these mitigation measures and what evaluation methodologies would be used to measure effectiveness.</li> <li>○ Concerns about how the military services would ensure compliance with environmental regulations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Questions about whether mitigation measures to minimize increases in noise, such as quiet hours, would be implemented.</li> <li>• Requests to consider additional mitigation methods, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Imposing a 10-knot ship speed limit in whale mitigation areas to reduce the risk of vessel strikes.</li> <li>○ Improving detection of marine mammals using alternative detection methods including thermal and acoustic methods.</li> <li>○ Restricting activities during times of low visibility.</li> <li>○ Capping the maximum level of activities each year.</li> <li>○ Avoiding training and testing exercises in key migration corridors and prime feeding areas.</li> <li>○ Avoiding training and testing exercises during key feeding times.</li> <li>○ Avoiding training and testing exercises in areas where the whale presence in the area is "High" or "Very High," per WhaleSafe.</li> <li>○ Maintaining mitigation for the core feeding biologically important area for blue whales in the San Nicolas Island Mitigation Area.</li> <li>○ Prohibiting sonar and explosives in all the whale mitigation areas off California from June through November.</li> <li>○ Removing exemptions for aircraft in mitigation areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns that military services do not consider updated science on biologically important areas, including "watch lists," which are areas that cetacean experts believe are likely biologically important areas, but currently lack sufficient information to meet the criteria for a biologically important area.</li> </ul>
Cumulative Effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about the cumulative effects on marine species from warming seas, increased pollution, climate change, and military activities.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS does not adequately address the cumulative and global effects of military activities, and that it is incorrect to</li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<p>claim that military readiness activities are insignificant on the scale of global issues, especially climate change and ocean effects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns about the military services' cumulative effects on climate change and air quality, and on the ocean environment, which people rely on for food, livelihoods, and cultural practices.</li> <li>• Concerns about the cumulative effects from military readiness activities that would leave chemicals, hazardous materials, and debris in the ocean, and the concerns about bioaccumulation in marine life.</li> <li>• Concerns about the cumulative effects of military and non-military vessel strikes on marine species.</li> <li>• Concerns about the cumulative effects of military readiness activities, including Rim of the Pacific exercises, with deep-sea mining, long-liner fishing fleets (foreign and domestic), and the aquarium trade.</li> <li>• Concerns about how quantitative versus qualitative analyses were used in the determination of cumulative effects.</li> <li>• Concerns about the cumulative effects of ongoing and expanded military readiness activities on marine ecosystems over time.</li> <li>• Concerns that the military services evaluate noise effects from individual events rather than considering the cumulative effects of multiple training and testing activities over time, which underestimates the overall effect of noise pollution on marine and terrestrial life.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS inadequately assesses the effects on marine species from explosions, physical disturbances, and strikes from vessels, seafloor devices, and pile driving.</li> <li>• Concerns about in-water detonations and the cumulative effects on marine species from these ongoing activities.</li> <li>• Concerns about the cumulative effects on sea turtles, whales, and other endangered species because of fishing gear entanglement coupled with military readiness activities.</li> </ul>
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about the online comment form website functionality.</li> <li>• Concerns about the format of the in-person public meetings and not allowing a question-and-answer (town hall) style.</li> <li>• Concerns about the format of the virtual public meeting, and not accepting official comments during the question-and-answer session. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that it was not adequately stated that questions submitted or asked at the virtual public meeting would not be accepted as an official public comment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns that the public information materials, including the virtual open house presentation and in-person public meeting materials, were vague and not informative for comment facilitation.</li> <li>• Concerns about inadequacies and misleading statements in the Draft EIS/OEIS.</li> <li>• Requests to include various updated scientific literature in the Final EIS/OEIS.</li> <li>• Concerns about various errors, inconsistencies, or missing information observed in tables and figures included in the Draft EIS/OEIS.</li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about the NEPA process and the timing of the release of project information prior to the holiday season.</li> <li>• Concerns that the public review and comment period was not adequate for such a complex and lengthy document.</li> <li>• Concerns about the accessibility of Draft EIS/OEIS and ability to conduct searches within the Draft EIS/OEIS, in addition to missing or broken links.</li> <li>• Concerns that statements made at the virtual public meeting (e.g., no explosives in Kaneohe Bay) contradict with information contained in the Draft EIS/OEIS.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS is deficient and that the military services should prepare a revised Draft EIS/OEIS for public review and comment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that environmental effects were not adequately analyzed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS yields a description of environmental effects that is indistinguishable from prior analyses, despite the increase in training and testing.</li> <li>• Concerns that disaggregated data, in the form of multiple tables across the Draft EIS/OEIS, obscures the action alternatives' effects.</li> </ul>
Other Regulations and Laws	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns that the Draft EIS/OEIS exceeds the maximum page limits set forth by the Council on Environmental Quality regulations for implementing NEPA.</li> <li>• Requests for the military services to prepare consistency determinations in accordance with federal consistency determinations to be submitted to the California Coastal Commission and the Hawaii Office of Planning.</li> <li>• Concerns that military readiness activities violate federal polices of MMPA since it is unlikely that activities would have a “negligible impact” on an affected species or stock.</li> </ul>
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests to demilitarize the Hawaiian Islands, returning the land to the people of Hawaii with no trace of previous military activities.</li> <li>• Concerns about how the military is perceived to treat the Hawaiian Islands and the Native Hawaiian community.</li> <li>• Requests for the Hawaiian Islands to secede from the United States of America to become a Kingdom again. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that the military services are illegally occupying the Hawaiian Kingdom and has no treaty from the Hawaiian Kingdom to use its waters for military readiness activities.</li> <li>○ Concerns that the military services are violating international law by conducting military activities in Hawaii.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns about the state government releasing bacteria-infected mosquitoes in Maui and Kauai.</li> <li>• Concerns about conducting military readiness activities with other international militaries that are perceived to be conducting genocide.</li> <li>• Concerns that recurring pollution events (underground oil plume beneath Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, jet fuel leaks at Red Hill, recent wastewater spill into the ocean near Pearl Harbor) violate federal and state environmental standards and threaten Hawaii’s fragile marine ecosystems,</li> </ul>

---

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<p>and that long-term effects of these spills are not adequately addressed in the Draft EIS/OEIS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests for the military to immediately cease all activities around Hawaii and to provide reparations for any environmental and cultural harm caused by those activities.</li> </ul>

**Notes:** Calif. = California, DDT = Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane, EIS/OEIS = Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, ESA = Endangered Species Act, HCTT = Hawaii-California Training and Testing, MMPA = Marine Mammal Protection Act, NAEMO = Navy Acoustic Effects Model, NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act, NHPA = National Historic Preservation Act, SCUBA = Self Contained Underwater Breathing Apparatus, Sonar = Sound Navigation and Ranging, U.S. = United States.