



# **SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT**

## **Northwest Training and Testing Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement**

**March 2026**

**ID# SEIS-007-17-USN-1757623448**

---

**Northwest 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 United States (U.S.) Navy (Navy; lead agency) and the U.S. Coast Guard (Coast Guard; joint lead agency) during the scoping period for the *Northwest Training and Testing (NWTT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS/OEIS)*. This report also summarizes comments received during the scoping period, which was open from Dec. 5, 2025, to Jan. 19, 2026.

The Navy and Coast Guard 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 because of its expertise and regulatory authority over marine resources. NMFS accepted the cooperating agency invitation in September 2025. As a cooperating agency, NMFS subject matter experts will provide authoritative input to discussions of the 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 Navy and Coast Guard recognize the importance of engagement with the public, stakeholders, and federally recognized tribes and made significant efforts to encourage their participation and submission of comments. The purpose of public involvement during the scoping period was to:

1. Notify the public, stakeholders, and federally recognized tribes of the Navy and Coast Guard's 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 within the NWTT 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, stakeholders, and federally recognized tribes to comment during the 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, stakeholders, and federally recognized tribes. Examples of additional outreach efforts include:

- Holding a 45-day scoping period, which is not required for an SEIS/OEIS, to ensure understanding of the proposal and receive input from the public, stakeholders, and federally recognized tribes 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, distributed to national, regional, and international media outlets, and social media post.
- A virtual scoping presentation (including narration and transcript) on the project website.

**Summary of Public Involvement and Outreach Activities**

**A. NOTIFICATIONS**

The Navy and Coast Guard prepared materials to notify the public, stakeholders, and federally recognized tribes of their intent to prepare an SEIS/OEIS and the scoping period. All 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; commenting opportunities; and the project website address. The Navy and Coast Guard disseminated notices beginning Dec. 5, 2025. The following is a summary of those notices.

***Notice of Intent***

The Navy and Coast Guard [posted a notice of intent on the project](#) website Dec. 5, 2025.

***Newspaper Advertisements***

Newspaper display advertisements were published in 17 newspapers throughout Washington state, Oregon, Northern California, and Southeast Alaska. The advertisements were published for three consecutive days, including a Sunday (if publication schedule allowed), beginning Dec. 5, 2025, to coincide with posting the Notice of Intent on the project website.

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

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

<b>Newspaper</b>	<b>Newspaper Coverage</b>	<b>Publication Frequency</b>	<b>Publication Dates</b>
<b>Washington</b>			
<i>The Seattle Times</i>	King County, Statewide	Daily	Friday, Dec. 5, 2025 Saturday, Dec. 6, 2025 Sunday, Dec. 7, 2025
<i>Whidbey News-Times</i>	Island County	Wednesday and Saturday	Saturday, Dec. 6, 2025 Wednesday, Dec. 10, 2025 Saturday, Dec. 13, 2025
<i>Journal of the San Juan Islands</i>	San Juan	Wednesday	Wednesday, Dec. 10, 2025 Wednesday, Dec. 17, 2025 Wednesday, Dec. 24, 2025
<i>The Daily World</i>	Grays Harbor County	Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Saturday	Saturday, Dec. 6, 2025 Tuesday, Dec. 9, 2025 Wednesday, Dec. 10, 2025
<i>The Daily Herald</i>	Snohomish County	Tuesday through Saturday	Friday, Dec. 5, 2025 Saturday, Dec. 6, 2025 Tuesday, Dec. 9, 2025

<b>Newspaper</b>	<b>Newspaper Coverage</b>	<b>Publication Frequency</b>	<b>Publication Dates</b>
<i>The Kitsap Sun</i>	Kitsap County	Daily, except Saturday	Friday, Dec. 5, 2025 Sunday, Dec. 7, 2025 Monday, Dec. 8, 2025
<i>Port Townsend and Jefferson County Leader</i>	Jefferson County	Wednesday	Wednesday, Dec. 10, 2025 Wednesday, Dec. 17, 2025 Wednesday, Dec. 24, 2025
<i>Forks Forum</i>	Forks	Thursday	Thursday, Dec. 11, 2025 Thursday, Dec. 18, 2025 Thursday, Dec. 25, 2025
<i>Peninsula Daily News</i>	Clallam County and Jefferson County	Tuesday through Saturday	Friday, Dec. 5, 2025 Saturday, Dec. 6, 2025 Tuesday, Dec. 9, 2025
<i>Sequim Gazette</i>	Sequim, WA	Wednesday	Wednesday, Dec. 10, 2025 Wednesday, Dec. 17, 2025 Wednesday, Dec. 24, 2025
<b>Oregon</b>			
<i>The Oregonian</i>	Statewide	Wednesday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday	Friday, Dec. 5, 2025 Saturday, Dec. 6, 2025 Sunday, Dec. 7, 2025
<i>The Astorian</i>	Clatsop County, including Astoria	Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday	Saturday, Dec. 6, 2025 Tuesday, Dec. 9, 2025 Thursday, Dec. 11, 2025
<i>Lincoln County Leader</i>	Newport	Wednesday	Wednesday, Dec. 10, 2025 Wednesday, Dec. 17, 2025 Wednesday, Dec. 24, 2025
<b>California</b>			
<i>Eureka Times-Standard</i>	Eureka	Daily, except Monday	Saturday, Dec. 6, 2025 Sunday, Dec. 7, 2025 Tuesday, Dec. 9, 2025
<i>Fort Bragg Advocate-News</i>	Fort Bragg	Thursday	Thursday, Dec. 11, 2025 Thursday, Dec. 18, 2025 Thursday, Dec. 25, 2025
<b>Alaska</b>			
<i>Ketchikan Daily News</i>	Ketchikan	Tuesday through Saturday	Friday, Dec. 5, 2025 Saturday, Dec. 6, 2025 Tuesday, Dec. 9, 2025
<i>The Juneau Empire</i>	Juneau	Wednesday and Saturday	Saturday, Dec. 6, 2025 Wednesday, Dec. 10, 2025 Saturday, Dec. 13, 2025

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

The Navy and Coast Guard developed a stakeholder and tribal database/ mailing list, that included stakeholders and federally recognized tribes from the 2020 NWTT SEIS/OEIS. The list was updated and validated to manage and document the distribution of project notices.

---

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

The Navy and Coast Guard mailed personalized stakeholder letters first-class Dec. 4, 2025, to 95 federal elected officials, and mailed 537 generic stakeholder letters to state and local elected officials and federal, state, and local government agencies. The Navy and Coast Guard mailed personalized tribal letters Dec. 4, 2025, via certified mail to 56 tribal chairpersons and presidents. Two stakeholder letters and one tribal letter were returned due to incorrect addresses. The tribal letter was corrected and sent via certified mail Jan. 6, 2026, to the Quileute Tribe of the Quileute Reservation. It was deemed not necessary to resend the two stakeholder letters due to other recipients of the organizations that also received the stakeholder notification letter. All letters offered a briefing upon request and provided a point of contact for questions.

### ***Postcards***

The Navy and Coast Guard mailed postcards first-class Dec. 4, 2025, to 3,402 tribal staff; tribal groups and organizations; 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 Commander, Navy Region Northwest (CNRNW) distributed a [news release](#) Dec. 5, 2025, to local, regional, national, and international print and broadcast (radio and television) media. The news release provided contact information for media questions.

### ***Social Media Post***

The CNRNW PAO posted information on existing social media platforms, such as [Facebook](#), Dec. 5, 2025, to notify their followers.

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

The Navy and Coast Guard emailed a notice Dec. 5, 2025, to 256 website subscribers. That notice had a broken link and a corrected notice was emailed approximately one hour and fifteen minutes later to 246 website subscribers. The difference in subscriber number is due to failed sends, “bounced back” emails, or recipients who unsubscribed after initial receipt. Website subscribers include those from the 2020 NWTTS SEIS/OEIS.

An individual can subscribe or unsubscribe from the website at any time. As of Feb. 24, 2026, there were 239 total website subscribers.

## **B. PROJECT INFORMATION**

The Navy and Coast Guard developed and disseminated informational materials to provide the public, stakeholders, and federally recognized tribes with comprehensive, accurate, and timely information. These materials are described below.

### ***Project Website***

The Navy and Coast Guard established a project website to make information readily available in one convenient location. The website was made publicly available Dec. 4, 2025. All materials posted were compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. The website address ([www.nepa.navy.mil/nwtteis](http://www.nepa.navy.mil/nwtteis)) was included in all notices and informational materials. During the scoping period, information available on the website included:

- 
- Previous analyses and technical documents for the following projects:
    - 2020 NWTT SEIS/OEIS
    - 2015 NWTT EIS/OEIS
  - Proposed Action and the importance of military readiness activities, including training and testing with sonar and explosives
  - Notices
  - Project fact sheet
  - 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, stakeholders, and federally recognized tribes were 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 until the release of the Final SEIS/OEIS.

#### ***Virtual Scoping Presentation***

The Navy and Coast Guard hosted a [virtual scoping presentation on the project website](#) with information organized by topic. The public, stakeholders, and federally recognized tribes could view the presentation anytime during the 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
- Cooperating agencies
- Previous environmental analyses
- Importance of military readiness activities, including training, testing, range modernization and sustainment, and activities involving active sonar and explosives
- Changes from previous environmental analyses
- Proposed Action, including purpose and need
- NWTT Study Area, including the Offshore Study Area, Inland Waters Study Area, and Southeast Alaska Study Area
- Potential resource areas to be analyzed in the Draft SEIS/OEIS
- Regulatory processes, including NEPA and NHPA Section 106
- Protecting marine species
- Marine species research and monitoring program, including research and monitoring conducted in the Study Area
- Environmental stewardship
- Public access and safety

- Project schedule
- Public involvement opportunities and commenting information

The presentation will remain accessible on the Project Materials webpage.

**Stakeholder Briefings**

The Navy and Coast Guard 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
California Coastal Commission	U.S. Pacific Fleet	Video conference	Jan. 29, 2026
Environmental Protection Agency	U.S. Pacific Fleet	Video conference	Jan. 15, 2026
Washington State Department of Ecology	U.S. Pacific Fleet	Video conference	Jan. 12, 2026
Environmental Protection Agency	U.S. Pacific Fleet	Video conference	Dec. 18, 2025

**Fact Sheet Booklet**

The Navy and Coast Guard developed an 8-page fact sheet booklet which included the following topics:

- Importance of at-sea training and at-sea testing
- Proposed Action, including purpose and need
- Virtual scoping presentation
- Military readiness activities, including training and testing with sonar and explosives, and range modernization and sustainment
- NWTT Study Area
- Environmental protections at sea
- Southeast Alaska Acoustic Measurement Facility
- NEPA process
- Potential resources to be evaluated in the Draft SEIS/OEIS
- Coordination and consultations with regulatory agencies
- NHPA Section 106 process
- Military and tribal partnerships
- Public involvement opportunities
- Commenting information

[A downloadable copy of the fact sheet booklet was posted on the project website.](#)

**C. SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS**

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

The scoping period was open from Dec. 5, 2025, to Jan. 19, 2026. The Navy and Coast Guard received 338 comments during the scoping period. Comments were received via the website (120), by postal mail (3), and via email (215). Of the 215 emailed comments, 212 (approximately 98.6%) 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 email 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.

Scoping comments were received from various government agencies, organizations, federally recognized tribes, and individuals. Table 3 includes a breakdown of scoping commenters.

**Table 3: Scoping Commenters**

Commenter Category (Total)	Commenter Name
Elected officials/government agencies (8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bureau of Land Management</li> <li>• California Coastal Commission</li> <li>• Olympic Region Clean Air Agency</li> <li>• State of Alaska, Department of Fish and Game</li> <li>• State of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources, Division of Mining, Land and Water</li> <li>• Washington State Attorney General's Office</li> <li>• Washington State Department of Ecology</li> <li>• Washington State Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife</li> </ul>
Federally recognized tribes (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suquamish Indian Tribe</li> <li>• Swinomish Indian Tribal Community</li> </ul>
Nongovernmental Organizations (13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Athletes United for Peace</li> <li>• Citizens of Ebey's Reserve (COER)</li> <li>• Environmental Protection Information Center</li> <li>• Hood Canal Environmental Council</li> <li>• Lost Coast League</li> <li>• Olympic Park Advocates</li> <li>• Orca Network (2)</li> <li>• Orca Conservancy</li> <li>• Orca Nexus</li> <li>• Oregon Wild</li> <li>• Sonoma County Climate Activist Network (2)</li> </ul>

Commenter Category (Total)	Commenter Name
Businesses (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rainshadow Running</li> <li>• Roper Resources Limited</li> </ul>
Academia (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Johns Hopkins University</li> </ul>
Individuals (312)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Individual names excluded from table</i></li> </ul>

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

Table 4 includes a summary of scoping comments to provide a brief overview of the general issues or concerns expressed during the scoping period. The Navy and Coast Guard welcome, value, and appreciate public, stakeholder, and tribal participation in this important process.

**Table 4: Summary of Scoping Comments**

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
Proposed Action and Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests to develop alternatives that would minimize sonar and explosives training and testing activities, including a true No Action Alternative and non-acoustic training options.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Study Area includes federally designated critical habitat and important feeding grounds and is a vital migratory corridor for certain whale species.</li> <li>• Requests for the Navy and Coast Guard to consider the location of where they conduct military readiness activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests for the Navy and Coast Guard to conduct activities westward beyond the continental shelf.</li> <li>○ Requests to continue shifting sonar and other military readiness activities further offshore and outside Olympic National Park, which is outside the Study Area, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary.</li> <li>○ Requests to commit to not conducting activities in any marine reserves proposed for future establishment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Questions about whether Coast Guard helicopter training near the high bluffs in Port Angeles, WA, West of Ediz Hook, would cause bluff destabilization or landslides because of helicopter vibrations and extreme winds from rotors.</li> <li>• Requests to not use mid-frequency active sonar to minimize impacts on marine species, including potential for strandings.</li> <li>• Requests to develop and consider alternatives designed to limit the amount of impulsive sound, such as from explosives, and therefore reduce impacts on marine mammals, fish, and other wildlife.</li> <li>• Concerns about the activities included under Alternative 2.</li> <li>• Concerns that the purpose and need statements are too broad and unlawfully predetermine the outcome of the NEPA process by defining the purpose as a continuation of existing activities, rather than evaluating whether, where, and how activities should occur.</li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
Proposed Action and Alternatives (cont'd.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests for clarifying information on what activities would occur in Oregon, where these activities would occur in Oregon, and whether the frequency of conducting these activities is increasing, decreasing, or staying the same from previous activities.</li> </ul>
Military Readiness Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about conducting military readiness activities in sensitive and pristine marine environments, such as the Salish Sea, Puget Sound, and other areas in the Pacific Northwest.</li> <li>• Concerns about military aircraft violating Federal Aviation Administration requirements.</li> <li>• Request for the Navy and Coast Guard to consider non-acoustic simulation-based training and testing activities.</li> </ul>
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about air pollution resulting from low-level flights and inefficient engine performance.</li> </ul>
Marine Vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about how military readiness activities, such as Explosive Signal Underwater Sound Buoys and Gunnery Exercises, could be impacting the accumulation of kelp on the shoreline.</li> <li>• Questions about using lookouts to observe concentrations of attached and detached floating vegetation during offshore training and testing activities.</li> </ul>
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about noise pollution from aircraft and military vessels and the potential impacts on people and natural resources, especially wildlife and marine species, such as the Southern Resident killer whale.</li> <li>• Questions about the upcoming analysis, studies, and research to be used for determining the impacts of sound and shock waves on marine species.</li> <li>• Concerns about the Navy's acoustic modeling, including 1) the models and thresholds used are inconsistent with peer-reviewed science and 2) the Navy has not disclosed sufficient information to allow independent peer review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests for the Navy to disclose and submit acoustic modeling for independent peer review.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns that previous aircraft noise analyses were underestimated because of the data used, and requests for improved analyses and modeling.</li> </ul>
Fishes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about sonar, explosives, and other sources of sound and the potential impacts on commercial fishing, sports fishing, and subsistence and cultural fishing, especially salmon, rockfish, and trout. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns about compliance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.</li> <li>○ Requests to analyze impacts on Essential Fish Habitat and fishing communities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns that military readiness activities could cause fish mortality, injury to eggs and larvae, and degradation of Essential Fish Habitat.</li> </ul>
Marine Mammals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about the potential impacts of vessel activities, noise, weapons testing, explosives, other sources of sound, and other military readiness activities on marine mammals, especially threatened and endangered marine mammals, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Southern Resident killer whales</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
Marine Mammals (cont'd.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Central America distinct population segment of humpback whales</li> <li>○ Blue whales</li> <li>○ Pacific gray whales</li> <li>○ Western gray whales</li> <li>○ Harbor porpoises</li> <li>● Concerns that military readiness activities could lead to marine mammal strandings.</li> <li>● Concerns about individual and population-level marine species impacts, and how military activities coupled with other environmental and disturbance factors (vessel traffic, commercial shipping, ferries, whale-watching activity, other background sound sources, chronic prey limitation, persistent contaminants) may further impact marine species.</li> <li>● Concerns that the Navy did not consider National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration research describing the spatial and temporal overlap between military activities and the presence of Southern resident killer whales in the analysis presented in the 2020 NWTT SEIS/OEIS, as stated in the final report of the Southern Resident Orca Task Force. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns that the Navy did not consider “Recommendation 25” from the Southern Resident Orca Task Force, which calls for coordination with the Navy to reduce acoustic disturbance.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Requests for the Navy and Coast Guard to treat the Southern Resident killer whale as a focal species, rather than as one of many affected species, and for the SEIS/OEIS analysis to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Recent Southern Resident killer whale population status and demographic trends, including number of sightings and other sightings data;</li> <li>○ Updated spatial and seasonal habitat use within inland and coastal waters;</li> <li>○ Best available science on acoustic masking, reductions in prey capture success, and energetic consequences; and</li> <li>○ Cumulative and repeated exposure to noise from military readiness activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Requests that the Navy and Coast Guard incorporate scientific research and publications, including those provided via scoping comments, on cetacean species and densities occurring within the Study Area, including the most recent marine mammal population estimates and updated habitat use data, and peer-reviewed research on noise impacts, into the SEIS/OEIS. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests to assess all relevant and newly published findings.</li> <li>○ Requests to provide the average monthly number of observations in or near each training and testing area compared to the historical mean monthly number of training and testing events.</li> <li>○ Suggestions for various scientific research and articles to reference.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Concerns that action areas for biological risk assessments have not been established accurately for previous Navy projects in the Pacific Northwest.</li> <li>● Concerns about the impacts on marine species from contaminant exposure and expended military materials.</li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
Marine Mammals (cont'd.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests to consider impacts on Southern Resident killer whales in 1) open waters and 2) confined waters where movement is restricted, such as Sinclair Inlet and Hood Canal.</li> </ul>
Seabirds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about military activities impacting tufted puffins and marbled murrelets.</li> </ul>
In-Water Cultural Resources and American Indian and Alaska Native Traditional Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests to consider Traditional Ecological Knowledge.</li> <li>• Requests to analyze impacts on cultural seascapes.</li> <li>• Concerns about previous and future analyses for usual and accustomed fishing grounds and stations and the descriptions of tribal fishing practices.</li> <li>• Concerns about impacts on tribal treaty fishing activities, particularly for salmon species, and on fishing gear.</li> <li>• Requests to inform and coordinate with all the Native American tribes listed by the California Native American Heritage Commission.</li> <li>• Questions about the Navy's tribal consultation efforts.</li> <li>• Questions about the impacts of military readiness activities on mitigation banks and restoration and preservation sites in Hood Canal, including proposed sites in Sinclair Inlet and adjacent areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests for the Draft SEIS/OEIS to include an overlay of established or proposed mitigation banks and restoration and preservation sites with training and testing areas.</li> <li>○ Requests to consider conducting military readiness activities away from established or proposed mitigation banks and restoration and preservation sites.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Questions about the process for submitting claims for loss or damaged fishing gear, issues with the current website link available in previous EISs, and requests for the NWTT SEIS/OEIS to include a new claims link, more details on the claim process, and estimated time for reimbursement after a claim is filed.</li> </ul>
Mitigation Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns that established mitigation measures would not help to avoid or reduce impacts on people, flora, or fauna within the Study Area.</li> <li>• Requests to develop effective mitigation measures to minimize potential impacts from activities that use sonar and explosives.</li> <li>• Concerns that existing lookout procedures, visual observations, and safety zones are biologically insufficient for detecting deep-diving species before they are exposed to harmful acoustic levels.</li> <li>• Concerns that mitigation measures are compliance-oriented rather than conservation-oriented.</li> <li>• Requests for the Navy and Coast Guard to include in the SEIS/OEIS mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate impacts on cetacean species, critical habitat, and important migratory corridors.</li> <li>• Requests for mitigation measures to be enforceable and include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Conducting ongoing, real-time coordination and detection with whale sighting communities and networks, and tribal and Indigenous monitoring programs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Use available cetacean alert systems.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
Mitigation Measures (cont'd.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coordinate with the U.S. Coast Guard’s Cetacean Desk and use the whale report alert system to detect whales and gain information on marine mammal movements to minimize interactions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Considering seasonal and spatial avoidance of whales, especially Southern Resident killer whales’ critical habitat during biologically sensitive periods.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conduct activities when the fewest species are present.</li> <li>▪ Avoid migration periods and conducting activities in or near migratory routes.</li> <li>▪ Implement biologically important areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Expanding exclusion and buffer zones for active sonar and explosive use.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ensure an adequate spatial buffer for Southern Resident killer whales leaving the Strait of Juan de Fuca and heading south along the coastline.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Stopping sonar and explosives when whales are nearby.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Stop when Southern Resident killer whales are observed within 1,000 yards of an activity.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Establishing acoustic safety zones and dynamic area management.</li> <li>○ Deploying independent observers and passive acoustic monitoring, such as hydrophone networks.</li> <li>○ Implementing adaptive management informed by current science.</li> <li>○ Employing thermal whale detection cameras.</li> <li>○ Conducting certain activities during daylight hours only.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests to use precautionary, science-based mitigation to avoid potential impacts on marine species.</li> <li>• Concerns about the impacts of Navy and Coast Guard activities on current mitigation banks, restoration sites, preservation sites.</li> <li>• Requests to conduct enhanced monitoring.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Navy and Coast Guard do not consider behavioral impacts as significant and that all impacts, including disruptions to feeding, rest, and reproduction; area avoidance; and physical injury or death, should be equally considered.</li> <li>• Coordinate with the Southern Resident Orca Task Force.</li> <li>• Consider Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife public and stakeholder feedback on rules for recreational and commercial whale watching vessels operating near Southern Resident killer whales to inform its adaptive management process aimed to reduce the impacts on Southern Resident killer whales to forage, communicate, and rest. Feedback was collected via an online survey and a series of focus group meetings.</li> <li>• Requests for reports on the effectiveness of avoidance, minimization, mitigation, and monitoring measures, and reporting commitments, and how these measures and commitments will be incorporated into the Draft SEIS/OEIS.</li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
Socioeconomics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about potential impacts on socioeconomics, especially in the Pacific Northwest and Puget Sound.</li> </ul>
Public Health and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about potential impacts on public health and safety.</li> <li>• Concerns about the impact low-level flights may have on naval aircraft crews and the health of the community under the airspace, particularly schools and businesses (although outside of the NWTT Study Area), from increased noise levels and pollution.</li> <li>• Questions about safety protocols for aircraft flights and Federal Aviation Administration flight altitude regulations.</li> </ul>
National Environmental Policy Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about taxpayer costs for completing the SEIS/OEIS.</li> <li>• Praise for the Navy and Coast Guard proactively extending the comment period at the start of the scoping period.</li> <li>• Statements of general opposition to the project and Proposed Action, specifically continuing or increasing the use of mid-frequency active sonar, explosives, and other sources of sound within the Study Area.</li> <li>• Statements of general support for the project and continuing military readiness activities for Sailors and Coast Guardsmen.</li> <li>• Concerns that project information is not written in plain language.</li> <li>• Requests for clear descriptions of changes from the 2020 SEIS/OEIS to the 2026 SEIS/OEIS, specifically changes in activities conducted in the Study Area.</li> <li>• Concerns that extensive reporting requirements and environmental regulations may negatively impact the SEIS/OEIS process, the ability to achieve military readiness, and the safety of service members.</li> <li>• Requests for the Navy and Coast Guard to follow all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations, such as permits requests, and coordinate and consult with the appropriate agencies, such as the National Marine Fisheries Service, California Coastal Commission, and other state and federal agencies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Understand federal consistency review requirements of Section 307 of the Coastal Zone Management Act.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Statements that all comments should be given equal weight, including those from tribes.</li> <li>• Concerns about the adequacy and accuracy of the Draft SEIS/OEIS*.</li> <li>• Concerns that the Navy and Coast Guard will not adequately assess cumulative effects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests that the cumulative effects analysis consider shipping noise, fisheries depletion, ocean warming, acidification, hypoxia, and climate change.</li> <li>○ Requests for the Navy and Coast Guard to analyze existing cumulative impacts and net loss of species and habitat in Puget Sound and Hood Canal.</li> <li>○ Requests to analyze the cumulative effects of commercial shellfish farming and military activities on habitat, fishes, and marine species.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
National Environmental Policy Act (cont'd.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that previous NWTT EIS analyses include deficiencies, such as predetermination of outcome, failure to use best available science, unlawful reliance on undisclosed acoustic models, inadequate mitigation, and failure to analyze cumulative and climate-amplified impacts, and how those deficiencies may carry over to the NWTT SEIS/OEIS.</li> </ul>
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns and questions about EA-18G Growler flights; noise impacts from Growler flights on marine and wildlife species, especially listed species; and Growler flight training safety protocols.</li> <li>Requests that the Growler analyses not be included in the NWTT SEIS/OEIS but instead be incorporated into the Growler EIS.</li> </ul>

Notes: EIS = Environmental Impact Statement, NWTT = Northwest Training and Testing, NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act, SEIS = Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, OEIS = Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, WA = Washington

\* Many scoping comments received suggested flaws in the Draft SEIS/OEIS analysis; however, there has been no document publications since the release of the NWTT Final SEIS/OEIS in 2020. The Draft SEIS/OEIS is expected in summer 2026.