



SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT

Mariana Islands Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

**FINAL
September 2025**

ID#-EISX-007-17-USN-1744382878

**Mariana Islands Training and Testing
Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement
Scoping Summary Report**

This report includes a summary of public involvement and stakeholder outreach activities conducted by the Department of the Navy (lead agency), including both the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Marine Corps; the U.S. Air Force; the U.S. Army; and the U.S. Coast Guard (referred to as “Action Proponents”), during the public scoping period for the *Mariana Islands Training and Testing (MITT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS/OEIS)*. This report also summarizes comments received during the public scoping period, which was open from June 7 to July 22, 2025, Chamorro Standard Time (ChST).

The Action Proponents invited the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the SEIS/OEIS. Since the close of the scoping period, NMFS has accepted the cooperating agency invitation. As a cooperating agency, NMFS subject matter experts review sections related to potential effects on marine mammals and other protected marine species. Additionally, after independent review, NMFS may adopt the SEIS/OEIS to fulfill its [National Environmental Policy Act](#) (NEPA) obligations for the rule-making process under the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

The Action Proponents recognize the importance of engagement with the public and stakeholders and made significant efforts to encourage their participation and submission of comments. The purpose of public involvement during the public scoping period was to:

1. Notify the public and stakeholders of the Action Proponents’ intent to prepare a supplement to previous environmental analyses to assess the potential environmental effects associated with the [Proposed Action](#) to continue [military readiness activities](#) at sea and on Farallon de Medinilla (FDM) within the [MITT Study Area](#) and associated public involvement opportunities;
2. Disseminate information about the Proposed Action and NEPA and [National Historic Preservation Act](#) (NHPA) Section 106 processes; and
3. Provide an opportunity for the public to comment during the public scoping period; a means to submit information or comments regarding historic properties; and a way to request information on the [NHPA Section 106 consultation process](#), roles of consulting parties, and how to participate.

Involvement and outreach efforts were conducted in accordance with NEPA and Department of Defense 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:

- Holding a 45-day public scoping period, which is not required for an SEIS/OEIS, to ensure understanding of the proposal and receive input from the public and stakeholders to enhance the accuracy and thoroughness of the environmental analysis.
- Focused stakeholder briefings.
- Multiple newspaper advertisements throughout the Study Area.
- Notification letters and other direct mailings.
- A news release and social media post.

- A fact sheet booklet translated into CHamoru (Guam) and Carolinian.
- A virtual scoping presentation (including narration and transcript) on the project website.
- Project video on the importance of training and testing and environmental stewardship efforts.

Summary of Public Involvement and Outreach Activities

A. PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

The Action Proponents prepared materials to notify the public of their intent to prepare an SEIS/OEIS and the public scoping period. All public notices included information about the Proposed Action and its purpose and need; virtual scoping presentation; NEPA and NHPA Section 106 processes, including how to request information on the NHPA Section 106 consultation process and how to participate; public commenting opportunities; and the project website address. The Action Proponents disseminated notices beginning June 5, 2025 (ChST). The following is a summary of those notices.

Federal Register Notice

The Department of the Navy published a [Notice of Intent in the Federal Register](#) on June 7, 2025 (ChST).

Newspaper Advertisements

Newspaper display advertisements were published in the Guam Daily Post and Pacific Daily News (Guam), and Marianas Variety (Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands [CNMI]). The advertisements were published for three consecutive days, including a Sunday (if publication schedule allowed), beginning June 7, 2025 (ChST), to coincide with publication of the Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register*.

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

Table 1: Newspaper Publications for the Notice of Intent

Newspaper	Newspaper Coverage	Publication Frequency	Publication Dates (local time)
<i>The Guam Daily Post</i>	Guam	Daily (publications are print and online)	Saturday, June 7, 2025 Sunday, June 8, 2025 Monday, June 9, 2025
<i>Pacific Daily News</i>	Guam	Monday-Friday (publications are online only)	Monday, June 9, 2025 Tuesday, June 10, 2025 Wednesday, June 11, 2025
<i>Marianas Variety</i>	CNMI	Monday-Friday	Monday, June 9, 2025 Tuesday, June 10, 2025 Wednesday, June 11, 2025

Notes: CNMI = Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

Stakeholder Database/Mailing List

The Action Proponents developed a stakeholder database/ mailing list, that included stakeholders from the 2020 MITT SEIS/OEIS. The list was updated and validated to manage and document the distribution of project notices.

Stakeholder Notification Letters

The Action Proponents mailed personalized stakeholder letters with a fact sheet enclosure first-class

June 5, 2025 (ChST), to 251 federal and local elected officials and government agencies and other key stakeholders. All letters offered a briefing upon request and provided a point of contact for questions.

Postcards

The Action Proponents mailed postcards first-class June 5, 2025 (ChST), to 500 interested individuals; nongovernmental organizations; research institutes; universities; and aviation, marina, business, community, fishing, and recreation groups.

News Release and Media Distribution

The Public Affairs Office (PAO) for Joint Region Marianas (JRM) distributed a [news release](#) June 6, 2025 (ChST), to local and regional print and broadcast (radio and television) media. The news release provided contact information for media questions.

Social Media Post

The JRM PAO posted information on existing social media platforms, such as Facebook, June 5, 2025 (ChST).

Website Subscribers and Email Notification

The Action Proponents emailed a notice June 7, 2025 (ChST), to 75 website subscribers.

B. PUBLIC INFORMATION

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

Project Website

The Action Proponents established a project website to make information readily available to the public in one convenient location. The website was made available to the public on June 6, 2025 (ChST). All materials posted were compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. The website address (www.nepa.navy.mil/mitteis/) was included in all public notices and informational materials. During the public scoping period, information available on the website included:

- Previous analyses and technical documents for the following projects:
 - 2020 MITT SEIS/OEIS
 - 2015 MITT EIS/OEIS
 - 2013 Mariana Islands Range Complex Airspace Environmental Assessment/Overseas Environmental Assessment
 - 2010 Mariana Islands Range Complex EIS/OEIS
- Proposed Action and the importance of military readiness activities, including training and testing with sonar and explosives
- Public notices
- Project fact sheet
 - English
 - CHamoru (Guam)
 - Carolinian
- Project video
- Map of the Study Area
- NEPA schedule

-
- Virtual scoping presentation
 - NEPA and NHPA Section 106 processes, including a Section 106 consulting party informational request form
 - Links to other Navy 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. Parties with demonstrated interest in the undertaking and its effects on historic properties were able to request to become a consulting party in the NHPA Section 106 process via the informational request form. The NHPA Section 106 informational request form will continue to be available on the project website throughout the life of the project or as otherwise directed.

Virtual Scoping Presentation

The Action Proponents hosted a [virtual scoping presentation](#) on the project website with information organized by topic. The public could view the presentation anytime during the public scoping comment period, and the presentation remains available for viewing on the project website. Audio narration and written transcripts were also available for each topic. Some of the topics included:

- Overview of the SEIS/OEIS
- Importance of military readiness activities, including those involving active sonar and explosives
- Changes from previous environmental analyses
- Proposed Action, including purpose and need
- Military readiness activities, including training and testing with sonar and explosives and range modernization and sustainment
- MITT Study Area
- Resources to be analyzed in the Draft SEIS/OEIS
- Regulatory processes, including NEPA and NHPA Section 106
- Environmental protections at sea
- Marine species research and monitoring program
- Project schedule
- Public involvement opportunities and commenting information

The presentation will remain accessible on the Project Materials webpage.

Stakeholder Briefings

The Action Proponents briefed multiple project stakeholders to provide information and identify and respond to issues early in the process. Briefings were also offered upon request to recipients of the notification letters. 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

Stakeholders	Conducted By	Format of Outreach	Date
CNMI Department of Land and Natural Resources Fish and Wildlife	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 16, 2025
CNMI Army Coordination Element Guam	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 16, 2025
CNMI Commonwealth Bureau of Military Affairs	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 16, 2025
DoD-CNMI Environmental & Land Stewardship Work Group	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 16, 2025
National Marine Fishery Service Pacific Islands Regional Office, Saipan Office	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 16, 2025
Mariana Trench Marine National Monument	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 17, 2025
CNMI Historic Preservation Office	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 17, 2025
CNMI Department of Community and Cultural Affairs	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 17, 2025
CNMI Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality Divisions of Environmental Quality and Coastal Resource Management	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 17, 2025
DoD-CNMI Senior Stakeholders Executive Session	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 17, 2025
DoD-CNMI Agency Session	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 18, 2025
Western Pacific Fisheries Management Council CNMI Advisory Panel	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 18, 2025
Tinian Women's Association	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 19, 2025
Western Pacific Fisheries Management Council Guam Advisory Panel	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 19, 2025
Tinian Mayor's Office	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 20, 2025
Guam Department of Agriculture	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 20, 2025
Guam Department of Agriculture Department of Aquatic & Wildlife Resources	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 20, 2025
Guam Bureau of Statistics and Plans Guam Coastal Management Program	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 20, 2025
Guam Community Defense Liaison Office	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 20, 2025
University of Guam -- Sea Grant Program	U.S. Pacific Fleet Environmental Readiness	In Person	June 20, 2025

Fact Sheet Booklets

The Action Proponents developed a 4-page [fact sheet booklet](#) which included the following topics:

- Importance of at-sea training and testing
- Proposed Action, including purpose and need
- Virtual scoping presentation
- Military readiness activities, including training and testing with sonar and explosives
- MITT Study Area
- Environmental protections at sea
- NEPA process
- Resources to be evaluated in the Draft SEIS/OEIS
- Consultations with regulatory agencies
- NHPA Section 106 process, including existing Programmatic Agreements
- Public involvement opportunities
- Commenting information

The project fact sheet was developed in English and translated into [CHamoru \(Guam\)](#) and [Carolinian](#). Downloadable copies of the fact sheet booklet were posted on the project website, and printed copies were available at the briefings and provided in the notification letter mailings.

C. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

This section is intended to illustrate the main public concerns presented during the public scoping 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 SEIS/OEIS. Substantive comments received during the public scoping period will be considered in the development of the Draft SEIS/OEIS.

The public scoping period was open from June 7 to July 22, 2025 (ChST). The Action Proponents received 19 website comments during the public scoping period. Comments were also accepted via postal mail; however, no mailed comments were received. 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 SEIS/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 Draft SEIS/OEIS. All comments submitted through the appropriate channels during the public scoping period are part of the public record.

Table 3 includes a summary of public comments to provide a brief overview of the general issues or concerns expressed during the public scoping period. The Action Proponents welcomed, valued, and appreciated public and stakeholder participation in this important process.

Table 3: Summary of Public Comments

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
Proposed Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about continuing military training and testing in the Mariana Islands. • Questions about the scope of the project, including changes in proposed activities from previous analyses and activity baselines. • Concerns about potential impacts on infrastructure by military activities. • Concerns about sinking ships and the effects on fishes and other marine species. • Concerns about long-term effects of military activities on the FDM (No'os) ecosystem and surrounding marine environments. • Concerns that debris or expended materials from military activities would remain in the environment. • Requests for the Action Proponents to evaluate an alternative that includes the demilitarization of the Study Area and Mariana Islands. • Questions about where military readiness activities would be conducted in proximity to Rota. • Questions about equipment or expended materials left on FDM. • Recommendations to shift Warning Area-517 slightly eastward to reduce fisher access limitations to productive fishing grounds. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concerns about training and testing activities closing access for fishers at various Warning Areas and other ranges off Guam during prime fishing times and in prime fishing areas, such as Ritidian. • Concerns about environmental impacts resulting from temporary minefields and underwater detonations in Agat Bay and other similar areas. • Statements expressing general opposition to the proposal. • Requests to consider alternatives that support geographic exclusion zones to better protect critical ecosystems and Indigenous resources. • Concerns about the impacts on Apra Harbor from proposed activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requests and suggestions for close coordination with local agencies to prevent disruption to time-sensitive cargo deliveries, fuel resupply, and essential civilian maritime activities. • Requests to consider the impacts military activities may have on infrastructure upgrade planning.
Sediments and Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about how military readiness activities would affect water quality. • Recommendations for direct water quality and sediment monitoring, including baseline and reference data collection, and comparing values to water quality standards and coral-specific thresholds. • Recommendations to consider the inclusion of the antidegradation policy that is part of CNMI's water quality standards. • Requests to detail active monitoring techniques used to limit suspended solids and control turbidity in the water following training and testing activities. • Concerns about biosecurity risk associated with ballast water and incidental discharges from military vessels.

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about the effects of chemicals, metals, and hazardous discharges from military expended materials and military equipment. Concerns about groundwater contamination from military activities. Questions about the general approach to be taken for the water quality analysis in the SEIS/OEIS, and requests for a comprehensive assessment. Recommendations for toxicology assessments on the potential bioaccumulation of toxins and chemicals in marine organisms found in the Study Area.
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about how military readiness activities would affect clean air and climate change.
Biological Resources <i>(Marine Habitats, Marine Mammals, Sea Turtles, Marine Birds, Marine Vegetation, Marine Invertebrates, Fishes)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about the effects of military readiness activities on coral reefs, especially from debris and expended materials. Recommendations for updated dive surveys to assess the health and status of coral reefs and undersea flora/fauna. Concerns about the effects military readiness activities would have on sensitive species, seafood contamination, and invasive species. Concerns about the impacts of proposed military readiness activities on the Micronesian megapode; migratory birds, such as boobies, terns, and frigates; cetaceans, such as beaked whales, humpback, and false killer whales; and green sea turtles. Concerns about how noise from military readiness activities could startle marine species and could lead to hearing loss. Concerns about the effects of sonar and other military activities on marine species and the potential linkage to stranding events. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests for equipment and/or financial assistance to manage strandings and perform necropsy studies. Concerns about the impacts military readiness activities would have on fisheries and marine biodiversity. Concerns about how military readiness activities would affect endangered and endemic marine species. Recommendations to increase the frequency of coral health surveys and monitoring. Requests to analyze the effects of noise on coral reefs. Concerns about the potential effects military activities would have on critical habitats of marine and terrestrial species, such as the Mariana crow, green sea turtles, and the Mariana fruit bat. Recommendations to integrate data from recent scientific cruises in the Mariana Islands (May 2025 Ocean Exploration Trust and July 2025 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration expeditions) to support spatial analysis of deep-sea coral, seamounts, hydrothermal vents, and other sensitive habitats. Requests to minimize disruptions to traditional and commercial fishing activities through early and inclusive coordination. Questions about how the proposal would impact permitting fees from Distant Waters Fishing Nations for fishing in Exclusive Economic Zones of Palau and Federated States of Micronesia.

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests to incorporate all previously stipulated conditions from the Guam Bureau of Statistics and Plans Coastal Zone Management Act consistency determination, and to follow the proper channels to satisfy the Federal Consistency requirements of the Coastal Zone Management Act. • Concerns about vessel strikes on marine mammals and sea turtles. • Concerns about contaminants affecting fish populations and the people consuming these fish. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Questions about fish species most impacted by military activities. • Concerns about potential impacts on essential fish habitat.
Terrestrial Species and Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the negative effects of military activities on the local fauna and flora of FDM (No'os). • Concerns about impacts on the Marianas fruit bat and tree snails from military activities. • Concerns about terrestrial species ingesting military debris. • Concerns about noise from military readiness activities startling wildlife, including driving out roosting sites for the Marianas fruit bat. • Concerns about how military readiness activities would affect endangered and endemic species, such as the Mariana fruit bat, Mariana crow, and the Rota bridled white-eye. • Concerns about how military readiness activities would affect species habitats, such as forests, limestone cliffs, and coastal ecosystems.
Cultural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about military activities in the Mariana Islands and effects on Indigenous people of the Pacific, sacred lands, and sacred water. • Concerns about the impacts military readiness activities would have on traditional fishing grounds. • Concerns that military readiness activities would interfere with traditional practices, such as talaya fishing, reef gleaning, and communal gatherings.
Socioeconomics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about how activities would affect food security. • Recommendations to describe the effects of activities on local infrastructure and utilities, and the storage and disposal of hazardous substances and solid waste, on Guam and CNMI. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Include discussions on the impacts on goods, services, and resources on the islands, and how these impacts would be minimized. • Questions about the effects of military activities on marine tourism, public access, navigation routes, recreation, fishing, and shipping. • Questions about whether access restrictions would disproportionately affect local communities who primarily rely on certain ocean areas contained in the Study Area. • Questions about the general approach to be taken on the socioeconomics analysis; potential for compensation to cover economic hardships; deployment of Fish Aggregating Devices and financial support for saltwater aquaculture programs to minimize fishing impacts; and financial contributions to local infrastructure improvement projects.
Public Health and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests to prioritize the long-term health of the local people, waters, and ecosystems.

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about ocean access. • Concerns about how activities would affect public health, especially of children. • Recommendations to conduct a seafood contamination study representative of local seafood consumption patterns to determine any potential connection to testing and training activities. • Concerns about the effects of minefields, underwater explosives, sonar, and other underwater noise on public safety. • Concerns about military activities compromising vessel safety and Apra Harbor port efficiency. • Requests to post signage for Surface Danger Zones in the Study Area.
Mitigation Measures and Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the effectiveness of existing mitigation measures, such as observation-based mitigation. • Concerns that adaptive management plans are reactive rather than proactive, and that development of proactive mitigation measures are necessary. • Requests for new mitigation measures to address noise, maritime safety, climate change, and legacy damage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recommendations for new measures include temporal separation protocols, predefined safety corridors, hazard simulation modeling with commercial vessel data, and inclusion of third-party observers. ○ Requests for passive acoustic monitoring to be a mandated mitigation measure. ○ Questions about whether new mitigation measures would be developed to address the changes in type, location, duration, and frequency of proposed activities. • Recommendations to consider geographic mitigations to avoid coral reef habitats, areas with shipwrecks, and hard substrate areas, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Measures that minimize military readiness activities during coral reef bleaching events to eliminate additional stressors and foster reef recovery. ○ Measures that minimize or halt in-water activities during primary coral spawning events each year for both hard and soft corals. • Recommendations to consider mitigation measures to prevent water runoff into the ocean from training and testing activities conducted on FDM. • Requests to detail the biosecurity measures/plan that would be employed to ensure that invasive species, such as the brown tree snake, do not spread from island to island due to training and testing activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requests to collaborate with local agencies focused on marine invasive species. • Requests to post notices to mariners at Agat and Agana marinas detailing schedules and locations to help minimize disruptions to fishing operations and ensure maritime safety. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requests to consider expanded notices to mariners and use real-time digital alerts.

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests for Action Proponents to distribute information on area closures and activity schedules to local government agencies, nongovernmental organizations, fishing clubs, air and sea transport companies, and local media. Distribution methods should include email, social media, and podcasts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Place printed notices at agency bulletin boards, fishing supply stores, local shops and markets, and announcements on AM radio to reach elders and rural communities. • Recommendations to schedule activities to avoid overlapping with local fishing tournaments, cargo transport operations, and traditional inter-island voyages. • Recommendations to conduct or support baseline and post-training environmental monitoring for water quality, fish stock health, catch rates, acoustic impacts, and overall ecosystem conditions; make findings publicly available. • Recommendations to consider funding and supporting fishing ground restoration projects if degradation occurs. • Recommendations to consider other geographic mitigations, such as avoidance of humpback whale breeding sites and seasons. • Recommendations to consider independent, third-party monitoring and enforcement. • Recommendations to communicate and collaborate with the U.S. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to identify submerged historic properties within the Study Area and to create avoidance measures around those areas. • Concerns about oversight and enforcement of proposed mitigation measures. • Requests for survey methods and reports for marine species avoidance measures, including marine mammals and endangered species, and questions about the effectiveness of those measures.
National Environmental Policy Act and Public Involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions about how the Action Proponents will be coordinating with Pacific Island agencies, such as the Guam Environmental Protection Agency and CNMI Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality. • Concerns about the Action Proponents ability to effectively consult with NMFS, the Environmental Protection Agency, CNMI agencies, and other regulatory agencies because of funding constraints and budget cuts under the current administration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concerns that failure to properly consult would compromise data integrity, responsiveness, and oversight over the analysis process. ○ Concerns that regulatory agencies would not be able to monitor and ensure adherence to environmental regulations. ○ Requests to postpone the MITT SEIS/OEIS and implementation of activities until proper review, regulatory oversight, and monitoring can be guaranteed. • Concerns that a 45-day comment period was inadequate and requests for a scoping comment period extension.

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requests for the Action Proponents to exceed the standard 45-day comment period when the Draft SEIS/OEIS is available for public review and comment. • Concerns that the project website and virtual scoping presentation were not easy to navigate. • Concerns that many people do not have access to the internet or technological devices, and that a lack of in-person meetings and non-digital resources meant that information was not being adequately disseminated to the local communities. • Concerns that translated materials were not available or were delayed. • Concerns about the content presented in the virtual scoping presentation, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The content was vague, especially when it came to the sonar testing and live-bombing exercises. ○ No technical information on the types of ammunitions and sonar technology that would be used, or the frequency and intensity of these activities. • Requests to use tables to present technical information in a clear and understandable way. • Requests to ensure proper coordination with CNMI Bureau of Environmental and Coastal Quality and Guam Department of Agriculture. • Recommendations to consult with the fishing community during the environmental planning and mitigation processes. • Requests for full transparency and public engagement by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Holding in-person public meetings on Guam and the CNMI with ample notice and providing direct responses to community concerns. ○ Clarifying whether the rescission of Council on Environmental Quality NEPA regulations would limit future public outreach by the military services and any impacts on the MITT NEPA outreach approach. • Recommendations to improve communication, coordination, and transparency with local stakeholders. • Requests to integrate the best available science and traditional ecological knowledge into planning and impact analyses. • Recommendations to ensure the SEIS/OEIS is comprehensive and thorough; include in-depth descriptions of the Proposed Action, surrounding installations, Action Proponent activities, and cumulative effects; and provide detailed and accurate assessments of the environmental impacts on biological resources using updated data and scientific research, including peer-reviewed publications. • Concerns about assessment inadequacies of the 2020 Final SEIS/OEIS, specifically of the cultural resource assessment, and carrying those over in the development of the Phase IV SEIS/OEIS.

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations for various independent resources and studies for the Action Proponents to review and consider during the development of the SEIS/OEIS. • Requests for the implementation of targeted community outreach and educational initiatives. • Requests for transparency to show all the agencies consulted with during the development of the SEIS/OEIS. • Concerns that outreach efforts were focused on federal and territorial agencies and not community members. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requests to consider more active engagement and consultation, including recurring meetings, with local and federal regulatory agencies and community members.
National Historic Preservation Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the existing Programmatic Agreement, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Protecting cultural and historical resources, including those not currently listed, but that are eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places. ○ Overcoming the limited scope and depth of consultation with the CHamoru community members during the Programmatic Agreement development. ○ Working collaboratively with Guam's State Historic Preservation Office and CHamoru cultural experts to conduct annual reviews and updates to constraint maps and conducting archaeological surveys in high-risk or inaccessible areas, such as FDM. ○ Developing mitigation measures and environmental stewardship protocols that exceed technical compliance, including avoidance measures that reflect spatial data and cultural sensitivity. • Concerns about the current Programmatic Agreements and application of the Programmatic Agreements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concerns about the adequacy of the 2020 Programmatic Agreement and its ability to fulfill Section 106 requirements of NHPA. ○ Requests that any future Programmatic Agreements are shaped collaboratively, transparently, and with a commitment to Indigenous heritage and land stewardship. • Questions about the Section 106 consultation process and requests for proper community consultation and respect for Indigenous knowledge. • Concerns that the Area of Potential Effects includes Guam's surrounding waters and landscapes that are home to submerged shipwrecks, artifacts, and sacred sites that hold historical and cultural significance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requests to limit or restrict conducting military readiness activities in these areas. • Requests that the Section 106 review process continue to have oversight and accountability, that annual reviews be conducted collaboratively with Guam's State Historic Preservation Office and local cultural advisory boards, and to communicate findings to the community.

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns that the 2020 Final SEIS/OEIS did not accurately identify submerged historic properties or actively engage with Indigenous communities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests to consider Traditional Cultural Places and consult with Indigenous communities. Questions about the potential development of a Built Environment Treatment Plan and/or an Archaeological Treatment Plan.
Cumulative Effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions about the interaction of with nearby large-scale projects and other military build-up in the area, and potential cumulative effects. Projects include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CNMI Joint Military Training Tinian Divert Infrastructure Improvements F-15 Beddown and Infrastructure Upgrades at Andersen Air Force Base Enhanced Integrated Air and Missile Defense System on Guam Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active Ship Training and Testing Other applicable projects Requests to address cumulative environmental, cultural, and health effects of the proposed military readiness activities in the SEIS/OEIS. Questions about the analysis of cumulative effects. Concerns about how the reopening of the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument to fishing may affect the MITT analysis. Concerns about the cumulative effects of military activities and severe weather events, such as typhoons, on marine and terrestrial environments.
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions about the amount of waste from military activities that would need to be disposed of on Rota. Concerns about the current administration's adherence to environmental laws and constitutional rights. Concerns about military activities in other regions and the release of potential pollution and toxic substances. Statements of opposition to the perceived militarization of the Mariana Islands. Recommendations to participate in the Guam Civil-Military Coordinating Council meeting to present project information.

Notes: CNMI = Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, FDM = Farallon de Medinilla, MITT = Mariana Islands Training and Testing, NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act, NHPA = National Historic Preservation Act, NMFS = National Marine Fisheries Service, OEIS = Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, SEIS = Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement