

I.7 ORAL COMMENTS

I.7.1 PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPTS

I.7.1.1 KODIAK

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Anchorage, AK 99501
Phone: 907.223.1145
Fax: 907.223.1148

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC HEARING ON
GULF OF ALASKA NAVY TRAINING ACTIVITIES
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/OVERSEAS ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT
January 7, 2010
5:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.
Kodiak High School Cafeteria
722 Mill Bay Road
Kodiak, Alaska 99615

- 1 -

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Anchorage, AK 99501
Phone: 907.223.1145
Fax: 907.223.1148

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MODERATOR

Lewis Michaelson
Katz and Associates, Inc.
4250 Executive Square
Suite 670
San Diego, California 92037

PANELISTS

Alex Stone
NOICEIAS
COMFACFLT Environmental
NASNI
P.O. Box 357033
San Diego, California 93135

Vic Weber, CDR, USN
COMTHIRDFLT
53690 Tomahawk Drive
San Diego, California 92147

Amy Cox, LT, NOAA
National Oceanic and
Atmospheric Administration
NMFS Alaska Region
222 West 7th Avenue, Room 517
Anchorage, Alaska 99513

- 2 -

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Carolyn Heitman	Page 20/30
David Kubiak	Page 23
Katherine Ellanak	Page 24/29
Teresa Peterson	Page 26/31
Amanda Barnette	Page 29
Richard Courtney	Page 32/36
Geneneiea Pearson	Page 35

-3-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

PROCEEDING

MR. MICHAELSON: Good evening and thank you for coming tonight. My name is Lewis Michaelson and I will be the moderator for tonight's hearing on the Gulf of Alaska Navy Training Activities Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, which you will hear tonight referred to as the draft EIS.

Hear to receive your comments are Commander Vic Weber, U.S. Third Fleet Joint and Air Training Officer, MR. Alex Stone, who's the Project Manager from the Navy's Pacific Fleet and Lieutenant Amy Cox, from the National Marine Fisheries Service.

Let's look at the agenda for tonight. Hopefully you all had the opportunity to talk to the many subject matter experts who were staffing the poster stations during the open house. The primary purpose for this portion of the hearing is for the panel members to listen to your comments firsthand. They will not be answering questions during this phase of the proceedings. Comments and questions will be addressed in the final EIS.

After I finish this introduction, Commander Weber will give a brief overview of the Navy's training activities in the Alaska Training Areas. Next, MR. Alex Stone will brief you on the environmental impact analysis process and summarize the results reported in the draft EIS.

-4-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Bethel, AK 99801
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 The last item on the agenda, however, is really the
2 most important. The public comment session is your
3 opportunity to provide information and make statements on
4 the record. Your input insures that the decision makers
5 can benefit from your knowledge of the local area and any
6 environmental effects you think may result from the
7 proposed action or alternatives.

8 Keep in mind the EIS process is intended to ensure
9 that decision makers will be fully informed about the
10 potential environmental impacts associated with the various
11 alternatives before they decide on a course of action.
12 Remember that comments on issues unrelated to this EIS are
13 beyond the scope of this hearing.

14 To request an opportunity to make a verbal comment
15 during tonight's hearing, please fill out a verbal comment
16 card. They're available at the registration table and if
17 you'd like speak and you haven't filled one out, just raise
18 your hand and Allison will bring you one. I have three
19 speaker comment cards so far. Every speaker, including
20 public officials, and spokespersons for organizations will
21 have three minutes each to provide your comments. If you
22 don't feel comfortable standing up here tonight to make a
23 statement, the majority of the public, we know. You have
24 until January 25th, 2010, to submit a written statement for
25 consideration in the final EIS, or you can wait until

-5-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Bethel, AK 99801
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 tonight's public comment session is over and you can
2 provide your comments privately to the court reporter,
3 who's seated to my right. He's here to make a verbatim
4 transcript of all comments made during the public comment
5 session. Keep in mind that written comments are given the
6 same weight and consideration as oral comments offered here
7 tonight.

8 Now it's my pleasure to introduce Commander Weber.

9 COMMANDER WEBER: Thank you Lewis. Welcome to the
10 public hearings for the Gulf Alaska Navy Training
11 Environmental Impact Statement. I'm Commander Vic Weber
12 and I'm the Joint and Air Training Officer for the
13 Commander, United States Third Fleet. I have served as the
14 lead air planner for the previous two fleet exercises,
15 Northern Edge the past couple years. So very knowledgeable
16 on that subject.

17 I want to thank you all on behalf of the United States
18 Navy for attending this evening. This is one of five
19 public hearings that the Navy is holding in Alaska for the
20 Navy Training Activities EIS.

21 As Lewis mentioned, we hope you've had a chance to
22 visit all the poster stations and meet with the Navy
23 project team members. At the conclusion of this
24 presentation you'll have the opportunity to make those
25 comments as we've discussed.

-6-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 Navy air and sea training activities occur in the
2 Alaska originate from Navy ships located within the
3 Temporary Maritime Activities Area. That's going to be
4 that yellow area shown in the Gulf of Alaska.
5 The Navy also conducts air activities in established
6 Air Force and Army inland training areas. Inland training
7 that we've established military operating areas, those are
8 those purple regions on the chart. And the four restricted
9 areas or targeted live fire range are showing up on the
10 chart in red.
11 The Temporary Maritime Activities Area and the inland
12 training areas together make up the Alaska Training Areas.
13 The Navy participates in training exercises in Alaska
14 Training Areas that are crucial in helping the Navy meet
15 its missions. These ranges have attributes which
16 contribute greatly to the success of Navy training there.
17 The first attribute is location. The Temporary
18 Maritime Activities Area is located within flight range of
19 several Air Force and Army bases and their associated air
20 and land training areas. The proximity of personnel,
21 resources, and equipment within a few hundred miles of the
22 Gulf of Alaska allows for joint training opportunities for
23 Navy forces.
24 The second attribute is area of the training area
25 space. The vast area of the Alaska Training Areas provides

-7-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 ample space to support necessary forces and allows for the
2 conduct of the full range of training activities.
3 Oceanographic conditions is the third attribute. The
4 sea state of the Gulf of Alaska creates a challenging
5 environment for training in the search and detection of
6 submarines in anti-submarine warfare. Furthermore, the
7 Alaska Training Areas serve as the principal training venue
8 for annual joint training exercises, which can involve
9 forces from the U.S. Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Army,
10 Coast Guard, and local, state, and non-governmental
11 agencies.
12 Training activities are organized by primary mission
13 areas. The Navy currently trains in these five primary
14 mission areas in the Alaska Training Areas. The training
15 activities consist of operating aircraft and ships,
16 conducting training against ships and aircraft, and
17 practicing aerial surveillance.
18 The Navy trains in Alaska Training Areas to prepare
19 the Navy -- Navy personnel and other military forces for
20 global conflicts and homeland defense and homeland security
21 activities. To meet our mission, the Navy must conduct
22 their training activities in a realistic, live training
23 environment. Realistic training insures Navy personnel
24 maintain the highest level of readiness and capability and
25 is the single greatest asset the military has in preparing

-8-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hennock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 to protect the American service men and women that defend
 2 the nation.

3 There's no such thing as a routine training when it
 4 comes to practicing combat skills. Diverse training
 5 opportunities insure that Navy personnel are able to react
 6 swiftly and decisively in a wide range of potential
 7 situations. Insuring Navy forces are prepared for
 8 deployment requires training where military personnel can
 9 learn through practical hands on experience the skills
 10 necessary to effectively plan and conduct operations.
 11 Additionally, advancing technologies also require more
 12 complex and varied training scenarios.

13 Alaska Training Area's provide training opportunities
 14 essential for the success of the military mission. While
 15 fulfilling our mission to train sailors, protecting the
 16 environment is a priority for the Navy. The Navy is
 17 committed to protecting the physical and natural
 18 environment and has established a successful track record
 19 of environment stewardship while meeting our missions. To
 20 accomplish our environmental stewardship goals the Navy
 21 implements protective measures on land and at sea to reduce
 22 potential affects on the terrestrial marine environment,
 23 and to insure public safety and accessability.

24 I will now turn the presentation over to Alex Stone,
 25 United States Pacific Fleet and will tell you about the

-9-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hennock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 Navy's proposed action and give you an overview of the
 2 draft EIS and the environmental analysis process.

3 MR. STONE: Thank you Commander Weber. Again, my
 4 name is Alex Stone and I am the Project Manager for the
 5 Gulf of Alaska EIS. I'm here tonight to give you an
 6 overview of the findings contained in the draft EIS.

7 The draft EIS was prepared by the Navy to comply with
 8 the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA and Executive
 9 Order 12114. The draft EIS represents compliance with
 10 these environmental statutes and is an important part of
 11 the Navy's overall commitment to environmental stewardship
 12 as it trains.

13 The Navy is the lead agency for this EIS. In addition
 14 to their role as a regulator, the National Marine Fisheries
 15 Services, is a cooperating agency pursuant to Federal
 16 Regulations. Present with us here tonight is Lieutenant
 17 Amy Cox of the National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska
 18 Region Office. She's here with us tonight to record your
 19 comments and issues. As a regulator, the National Marine
 20 Fisheries Service helps to insure the EIS and the proposed
 21 action are in full compliance with appropriate
 22 environmental laws and regulations. As a cooperating
 23 agency they provide early review of the proposed action,
 24 alternative, and analysis methods.

25 To keep up with advances in global defense

-10-

q

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 of Defense current and near term training requirements. In
2 addition to training activities currently conducted,
3 Alternative 1 proposes to increase levels of training
4 activities for one annual Carrier Strike Group training
5 exercise, to include first, increasing the duration of the
6 exercise from current 14 to 21 days in the summer, and
7 second, conducting anti-submarine warfare training
8 exercises, which include the use of active SONAR.

9 Additionally, Alternative 1 proposes to implement
10 training activities associated with force structure
11 changes, including new ships, submarines, aircraft, new
12 weapons systems, new training instrumentation, including a
13 Portable Undersea Tracking Range.

14 Alternative 2 is also designed to meet current and
15 near term training requirements. This alternative includes
16 all elements of Alternative 1, and further increases the
17 number of training activities, including conducting a
18 second annual Carrier Strike Group training exercise of up
19 to 21 days during the summer, and also a sinking exercise
20 during each summer exercise, for a maximum of two.

21 Alternative 2 is the Navy's preferred alternative
22 because it would fully support required Navy and joint
23 training activities. It also allows the Navy the greatest
24 flexibility to carry out its training mission in the Alaska
25 Training Areas.

-12-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 In preparing the draft EIS, the Navy evaluated the
2 potential effects of the alternatives on the marine,
3 natural, and human environment. The Navy took a
4 comprehensive approach in assessing the potential effects
5 on 14 different resource areas. I will present some of
6 these findings here.

7 We encourage you, if you have not already done so, to
8 review the draft EIS, which presents the findings of the
9 Navy's environmental analysis for each of these resource
10 areas. We welcome your comments on the findings and the
11 methods used in the analysis.

12 The Navy's use of active SONAR and explosives puts
13 sound into the marine environment. While preparing the
14 EIS, Navy scientists analyzed the potential effects of
15 sound in the water on marine life, including marine
16 mammals, sea turtles, fish, birds, and marine
17 invertebrates. The method for determining potential sound
18 exposures to a marine animal was jointly developed by the
19 Navy and the National Marine Fisheries Service, and
20 represents the best science currently available.

21 The results of the analysis indicate that there is the
22 possibility for physiological effects on marine mammals.
23 Behavioral effects are also predicted. However, these
24 results do not consider the use of protective measures,
25 which would reduce the likelihood of these predicted

-13-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 exposures. There would be no significant impacts on sea
 2 turtles given that SONAR frequencies used by the Navy fall
 3 outside the hearing range of sea turtles hearing range and
 4 the low occurrence of sea turtles in this training area.

5 Effects on marine invertebrates are predicted to be
 6 localized and minimal given the size of the training area
 7 and frequency of explosions. No significant impacts of
 8 fish and birds are anticipated from the use of active
 9 SONAR. The use of explosives in Navy activities may result
 10 in injury or mortality of individual fish or birds in the
 11 immediate area, however, these activities would not result
 12 in significant impacts to the overall fish population or
 13 bird population, or habitat.

14 The Navy does not expect any impacts on marine mammal
 15 populations, but we recognize that there may be potential
 16 effects on individual marine mammals. To minimize
 17 environmental impacts while training at sea, the Navy has
 18 developed and implements protective measures, including
 19 posting a minimum of three well trained lookouts at all
 20 times, and an additional two dedicated marine mammal
 21 lookouts during training activities with active SONAR.
 22 Establishing a safety zone during training exercises using
 23 mid-frequency active SONAR. Coordinating with the National
 24 Marine Fisheries Service and reporting marine mammals
 25 sighted during major exercises. And during certain

-14-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 exercises, surveying the area for marine mammals including
 2 conducting aerial sweeps by Navy aircraft.

3 Additionally, during the past five years, the Navy has
 4 funded more than \$100 million dollars in marine mammal
 5 research. Through this research, the Navy is continually
 6 improving the ability to use SONAR in an environmentally
 7 sensitive manner.

8 The Navy also analyzed effects from other sources or
 9 stressors on physical and biological resources including,
 10 air quality, expended materials, water resources, marine
 11 plants and invertebrates, fish, sea turtles, marine
 12 mammals, and birds.

13 For most of the resources analyzed in the draft EIS,
 14 we found no significant impacts. There is a potential for
 15 effects on marine mammals from the proposed action as I've
 16 discussed.

17 The Navy is in consultation with the National Marine
 18 Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife to ensure
 19 the effects on species protected by the Marine Mammal
 20 Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act are
 21 minimized.

22 The Navy analyzed the effects on the human
 23 environment, including cultural resources, traffic,
 24 socioeconomics, environmental justice and the protection of
 25 children, and public safety. The findings in the EIS show

-15-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hennick Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 that no significant impacts on the human environment are
2 likely from the implementation of the proposed action.
3 There would be no significant impacts on civilian
4 access or tourism, and there would be no risk to public
5 safety. In addition, the Navy is communicating with 12
6 Alaska native tribes in the area.
7 The Navy has completed the first three steps of the
8 NEPA process and we are now in the phase providing for
9 public review of the draft EIS. To review the progress so
10 far, the EIS was initiated back in March 2008, and the Navy
11 held public scoping meetings here in Kodiak, Anchorage, and
12 in Cordova.
13 Government agencies, organizations, and the public
14 were encouraged to submit comments at the scoping meetings
15 or to provide written comments throughout the public
16 comment period. The comments received were considered in
17 the preparation of the draft EIS that we've discussed
18 tonight.
19 We are now in the phase -- in the public hearing and
20 document review step of the NEPA process. This phase is an
21 essential part of the process because it allows the public
22 to review the document and comment on the Navy's analysis
23 of environmental effects. We encourage you to provide your
24 input by January 25th so that it can be considered for
25 incorporation during the development of the final EIS. All

-16-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hennick Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 comments received will be considered.
2 The Navy is committed to keeping the community
3 informed throughout the development of the EIS. These
4 public hearings are just one of many opportunities to share
5 information about the EIS and, more importantly, to
6 encourage your feedback and comments.
7 Now I will turn it back over to Lewis to describe how
8 to obtain more information and how to comment on the draft
9 EIS.
10 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you Alex. In addition to
11 holding these public hearings, as I think many of you know,
12 the Navy has established a website to make it easy for you
13 to find and comment on the environmental documents. The
14 draft EIS is posted on the website. Also there's
15 additional background information and links to the fact
16 sheets and posters that you saw here tonight.
17 You may also review the draft EIS and other publicly
18 available documents by visiting one of the designated
19 information repositories. The addresses of these
20 repositories are provided in the fact sheet packet that you
21 received when you came in. There are eight of them
22 currently established in various cities in Alaska. Both
23 the information repositories and the project website
24 contain project documents, fact sheets, and background
25 information for you to review.

-17-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 The Navy, as you've already heard from both of our
2 panelists here, welcomes your input and review on the
3 analysis contained in the draft EIS and there are several
4 ways for you to submit comments.

5 In just a moment here we'll be accepting oral
6 comments. You can also provide written comments in several
7 different ways. With a comment form that you can turn in
8 tonight if you'd like. You can give it to a staff member
9 at the registration table, you can mail it in. That
10 address is posted here right and on the fact sheets. You
11 can also submit comments electronically via the project
12 website.

13 All comments must be postmarked or received by January
14 25, again, 2010, to be considered in the final EIS.

15 We're now begin the oral comment period of the portion
16 of the public hearing. If there is anyone again, who
17 wishes to speak please fill out a card. I know we've
18 collected a few more, again if you would like to please
19 raise your hand. I want to make sure that anyone and
20 everyone who wants to speak gets that opportunity to do
21 that tonight. Please help me get through this in a way
22 that we can capture all of your comments. Again, the court
23 reporter -- it's very important that we get this on the
24 record. So, I ask first that you please speak clearly and
25 slowly into this microphone here. I'm going ask you to

-18-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 come up to the lectern. Each person will be allotted three
2 minutes to speak. If you have prepared a written
3 statement, you may turn that in at the registration table
4 and/or you can read it out loud as long as you can do so
5 within the three minute time limit. Finally, please honor
6 any request that I make for you to stop speaking when you
7 reach the three minute time limit. In order to make that
8 easy for you to do that, I have a card that I will hold up
9 when you have 30 seconds left. That will make it easy for
10 you to wrap up your comments on time and should you go the
11 whole three minutes I have this handy little red one that
12 says, end. I think the meaning is probably pretty clear on
13 that one too.

14 We are scheduled to be here until 8:30. I only have
15 five cards here. It's quite common that as we go through
16 those comments others of you will be inspired to speak.
17 Nonetheless, my guess is we will not exhaust the time
18 between now and 8:30. And in cases of that nature we're
19 usually more than happy to take what I call, second
20 helpings, which would be an opportunity to come up a second
21 time for another three minutes. So, anyway I think that's
22 going to work out quite well for us tonight.

23 So, we're ready to begin. Let me go head, because it
24 is a little bit of a walk up here and so that you can be
25 ready to come up, and know when your time is I'm going to

-19-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 read all of the names out to begin with so that you will
 2 know where you are coming up in the rotation. My first
 3 speaker is Carolyn Heitman, followed by David Kubiak,
 4 Katherine Ellanak, Theresa Peterson, and Amanda Barnette.
 5 So, if you would just do the favor of coming up, the first
 6 speaker Carolyn Heitman. And you don't have to provide
 7 your address or anything like that. If you just give us
 8 your name and if there's any organizational affiliation
 9 that you want reference. Yeah, if you -- why don't you
 10 actually pull the whole gooseneck down.

11 MS. HEITMAN: Oh, okay.

12 MR. MICHAELSON: So it doesn't fall out of the hole
 13 there. And there we go, that should work. All right. You
 14 all right?

15 MS. HEITMAN: Is that good enough?

16 MR. MICHAELSON: I think we can hear you. You're
 17 close enough.

18 CAROLYN HEITMAN

19 Commented as follows:

20 My name is Carolyn Heitman. Is that good?

21 MR. MICHAELSON: Yeah.

22 Okay. One of the things that was confusing to me and
 23 one of the gentlemen cleared up for me earlier was on --
 24 let me find the page here. On page 2-4 of the draft it
 25 showed the whole Island of Kodiak in red, which was

-20-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 enclosed within the restricted area, and that was a little
 2 bit confusing to me. Because I do know a couple years ago
 3 the FAA did enforce restricted air space over parts of
 4 Kodiak Island which included our airport. And -- so anyway
 5 he cleared up and we looked in the book and he it -- on
 6 your map over there it's not on the map, but he said it was
 7 a misprint and then at final he was going to make sure that
 8 it was in black. So, if I understand Kodiak is not
 9 included in restricted area as Fort Richardson. Okay.

10 And, let's see here -- and one of the things I had
 11 requested in my comments is a boundary line in the training
 12 area covers the Aleutian Trench and I had requested that
 13 the Navy list what types of exercises would take place in
 14 the trench, what type of SONAR and the effects that it --
 15 the impacts it would have to the sea life that lives within
 16 the trench, and I didn't see that addressed.

17 And it states here that the Gulf -- the Gulf of Alaska
 18 draft states that the Navy does not know what the
 19 environmental damage or harm would be to birds from mid-
 20 frequency at long range, and I'd like to see that
 21 addressed. No detailed information on how the Navy
 22 exercises will impact fisherman. Whether or not, you know
 23 they'll be restricted. I understand if you go by -- one of
 24 the choices was that there would be two 21 day training
 25 periods rather than just one, if that one was chosen. So,

-21-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 I'd like to see more emphasis on how it would affect the
2 livelihood of fisherman.
3 Also, it's -- okay, let me find it here. On section
4 3.14, on public safety you say there would be no public
5 safety issues. In that section though under public safety
6 it says, activities that could affect public safety include
7 electromagnetic energy, but no details were given
8 concerning that. And I would also like to know -- when
9 you did the EIS for Hawaii uranium and red and white
10 phosphorus was used in the training exercises. I would
11 like to know if that will be used in the Gulf of Alaska.
12 And, let's see, and although you mentioned new
13 proposed weapons systems, you didn't identify them. I'd
14 also requested that the Navy fund our electromagnetic radar
15 system here and -- through the University of Alaska and
16 it's classified as an electromagnetic warfare systems radar
17 that the Navy could use. So, I would like to see that
18 addressed if it will be used.
19 MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Our next speaker is David
20 Kubiak.
21 MR. KUBIAK: Is this counting?
22 MS. TURNER: No. Of course not.
23 DAVID KUBIAK
24 Commented as follows:
25 Yeah, thank you ladies and gentlemen for the

-22-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 opportunity to address this EIS -- the draft EIS. And I
2 appreciate you coming to Kodiak. I -- with 18 days left,
3 I'm the Chairman of the Alaska Marine Conservation Council.
4 So, I'm here sort of on duty, like you are.
5 With only 18 days left to comment, if the January 25th
6 deadline is to be kept, I've got slow upload for my
7 computer. I guess might be able to leave it on all night
8 and download your EIS on the computer. But 25 megabytes at
9 56K takes a long time. And I think I have a obligation
10 since I don't have the information really here to review, I
11 think it would be a mis-step and be irresponsible for me to
12 make a pointed comments about that impact statement. I did
13 though here Carol say that -- and it reminded me that if we
14 have 21 days -- two periods of 21 days, basically six weeks
15 of training exercises, and they're up on the edge of the
16 Gulf there, that's prime fishing bottom. And that's a huge
17 chunk of time out of a commercial fisherman's opportunity
18 especially -- I'm a halibut fisherman and that would be a
19 huge chunk of time out of the halibut season. I don't
20 myself go there, I've got a small boat. But I know the
21 more nautical fellows are out there all the time and that's
22 prime halibut bottom. So that's a huge -- a huge divot in
23 their -- in their season, 21 days times two.
24 But other than that I just want to say, I appreciate
25 you coming here and I'll look forward to reading the EIS

-23-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hennick Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 completely. But that really -- that 18 days left to
2 comment, wow, that's going to be very difficult. Thank
3 you.
4 MR. MICHAELSON: Two things. Can you just state your
5 name for me, I didn't hear it.
6 MR. KUBIAK: Yeah, I sorry. David Kubiak.
7 MR. MICHAELSON: And before you leave I'm pretty sure
8 we can get you a CD.....
9 MR. KUBIAK: Okay.
10 MR. MICHAELSON:so you don't have to deal with
11 the download.
12 MR. KUBIAK: Yeah, well either that or I have to wait
13 for the mailing time for this thing to get to me.....
14 MR. MICHAELSON: I'm sure we've got a CD around here
15 we can get you.
16 MR. KUBIAK: All right, thank you.
17 MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Thank you MR. Kubiak.
18 The next speaker is Katherine Ellanak.
19 MS. ELLANAK: I'm sorry, I'm eating an orange.
20 MR. MICHAELSON: I haven't started yet.
21 KATHERINE ELLANAK
22 Commented as follows:
23 Good evening, my name is Katherine Ellanak. I'm with
24 the Sun'ag Tribe Environmental and Natural Resource
25 Director here in Kodiak.

-24-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hennick Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 And although your EIS came in -- sent out dated
2 December 2, we only received the EIS last week. And this
3 January 25 deadline is not fair. There are other deadlines
4 that we need to work with here in Kodiak. But out of
5 respect for this time, and consideration for the fisherman,
6 and the sea life whatever's happening there -- I saw -- I
7 skimmed through that and there are a lot of fish in that
8 area that you want to be training in.
9 And that is not only affecting Kodiak fisherman and
10 subsistence and sports. It goes all the way through the
11 coast of Alaska up to my people in the Bearing Sea areas.
12 And the seals -- we don't know how nomadic our animals are
13 from the sea, the (indiscernible) and the fish, and the
14 whales, the seals, the birds -- they have no boundaries.
15 Even if you make a boundary there they're going to be
16 coming in and out of there. And the fish, the sea's
17 abundance, it's crucial right now because fishing is very
18 critical right now. It's starting to be hard to be a
19 fisherman anymore because of the prices. And we know
20 nationwide that Alaska fish is like gold for anywhere in
21 the world.
22 The other thing is when you guys do that April to
23 October, 21 days, that's crucial time also for anything,
24 fishing and the rearing of the babies from the seas. And
25 the amount of lead, cadmium, and everything else is going

-25-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hennick Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 to be used and exposing to our seas is detrimental. And I
2 just would like to see that you guys can extend this
3 January 25 deadline into something more appropriate for us
4 to really review the EIS document. And we had a meeting
5 yesterday with our tribe and it's -- you know, like I said,
6 we just received that EIS last week and today's Thursday.
7 And then there's no time for me and my Environmental
8 Committee to meet with the Tribal Council and have a good
9 meeting about this. Quiana.
10 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. The next
11 speaker is Theresa Peterson.
12 THERESA PETERSON
13 Commented as follows:
14 Good evening and thank you for coming to Kodiak and
15 giving us the opportunity to talk about this proposed
16 action off our island home here.
17 My name is Theresa Peterson. I'm a member of a long
18 time fishing family and I work with Alaska Marine
19 Conservation Council. The Alaska Marine Conservation
20 Council is a community based organization dedicated to
21 protect the integrity of Alaska's marine ecosystem. And
22 AMCC is concerned about the potential increases in Navy
23 training activities in the Gulf of Alaska. Particularly of
24 concern are the effects of underwater noise on living
25 marine resources, especially noise resulting from the use

-26-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hennick Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 of SONAR in this productive and important marine
2 environment.
3 We support the no action alternative, which would
4 maintain current training activities and does not involve
5 the use of SONAR. The alternatives listed in the analysis
6 are inadequate to explore a range of options to consider
7 anything else at this juncture.
8 Overall the proposed action would result in dramatic
9 changes in the acoustic marine environment inside and
10 adjacent to the operating area that could have significant
11 impacts on the marine mammals inhabiting these waters.
12 Critical habitat for the North Pacific right whale, the
13 world's most endangered whale is located directly adjacent
14 to the training area.
15 The draft EIS is lacking a robust analysis regarding
16 potential impacts to the halibut and the halibut fishery.
17 It includes no discussion or maps showing the major halibut
18 regulatory area that directly overlaps the training area.
19 Nor does it discuss halibut habitat in the area. This
20 information needs to be added.
21 The draft EIS does not include an adequate discussion
22 of salmon migratory routes in the Gulf of Alaska, and
23 therefore lacks a robust analysis of impacts to migrating
24 salmon species in the region. There is not a thorough
25 assessment of the overlap with fishing areas, and the

-27-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 conclusion that there will be no socioeconomic impacts from
2 the proposed action, including fishing is impossible to
3 predict without comprehensive answers to the above
4 mentioned comments.

5 It is probable that the Navy under estimates the
6 number of marine mammals and fish that will be harassed,
7 injured, and killed because it simply does not have the
8 density estimates needed in order to accurately make this
9 determination. There is no reliable estimates for current
10 or historical abundance numbers for many of the affected
11 marine mammals in the Gulf of Alaska.

12 And finally, I know firsthand there are not adequate
13 measures to mitigate the harmful affects of SONAR. The
14 proposed mitigation measures are basically safety zones.
15 And from what I'm understanding, visual sighting of whales.
16 And having fished in that area for over 25 years and having
17 spent sometimes days looking for a buoy in the adverse
18 weather conditions that we have out in the Gulf of Alaska,
19 probably 80 or 90 percent of the time. I do not have
20 confidence that visual sightings is an adequate mitigating
21 measure.

22 And finally in closing, I would very much suggest that
23 you extend the comment period an additional 45 days in
24 order to allow people adequate time. And again, thank you
25 for coming.

-28-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 MR. MICHAELSON: Amanda Barnette.

2 AMANDA BARNETTE

3 Commented as follows:

4 My name is Amanda Barnette. I'd also like to thank you for
5 coming to Kodiak and listening to our comments. I think
6 the Navy should establish minimum visibility requirements
7 while training, especially while training with active
8 SONAR, so that the lookouts may identify marine mammals in
9 the immediate area. Thanks.

10 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Is there
11 anyone else who has been inspired at this point to add
12 their comments to those that have already been offered? I
13 want to make sure everyone has had at least a first chance.
14 If not is there anyone who has already spoken who would
15 like to take advantage of second helpings? Yes ma'am,
16 please do. Just all you need to do is state your name one
17 more time for me, okay?

18 KATHERINE ELLANAK

19 Commented as follows:

20 Katherine Ellanak with the Sun'aq Tribe of Kodiak.
21 The other thing is we already have visual and historical
22 history about what Exxon oil spill did. And it shows what
23 the current is going to be like. And the red tide that
24 happens and years of evolutionary natural disasters that
25 there used to be abundance of fish here of all kinds. But

-29-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Hechman, AK 99501
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 after the '64 earthquake, right over there in Yuzhni where
2 there used to be herring and everything else. The fish
3 that used to be there are no longer there and the fish that
4 we have presently here are in danger of other disasters
5 that are going on. And you know, Bligh Reef is hit again
6 and even the Arctic Slope with the BP having their pipeline
7 problems, I mean even if it's far and beyond us, it's
8 helping to come down here from the pipeline. And things of
9 that kind of disaster, we need to consider those before the
10 fish is going to be depleted.

11 It's -- I cannot name and I'm not a scientist to see
12 when I was scanning through the EIS -- it's unfathomable to
13 me to try to determine what all else is going to be
14 affected by all the chemicals and toxins and hazardous
15 materials that are going to be expended into the sea.

16 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Anyone else? Yes.

17 Yes, can I have a....

18 MR. MICHAELSON: Yes you bet.

19 I just want to....

20 MR. MICHAELSON: You just come up, okay?

21 MS. HEITMAN: Okay.

22 MR. MICHAELSON: What's your name again please?

23 CAROLYN HEITMAN

24 Commented as follows:

25 I'm sorry, it's Carolyn Heitman.

-30-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Hechman, AK 99501
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 When the Navy did the Environmental Impact Statement
2 for Hawaii, the west coast, Gulf of Mexico, and the entire
3 east coast of the United States they got a permit from NOAA
4 to -- and this is something that I had mentioned in my
5 comments in a -- the last time. They got a permit from
6 NOAA to incidently take two million marine mammals per year
7 for the next five years. And I would like to have you
8 include in the final if that permit will extend to the Gulf
9 of Alaska. And if not will you be requesting a new permit
10 for incidental takes and for how many marine mammals?

11 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Anyone else who wants a
12 second chance?

13 I have another comment.

14 MR. MICHAELSON: Okay.

15 THERESA PETERSON
16 Commented as follows:

17 Thank you. Theresa Peterson again. I have two brief
18 comments. In reflecting on what Katherine was saying, I
19 feel strongly that we have a lot of unknowns that are
20 approaching our waters in the Gulf of Alaska and this
21 northern climate -- and worldwide, in particular the ocean
22 acidification and the changing ocean environment. But also
23 in reflecting about commercial fishing off of that edge
24 which has been -- like I said, I've spend decades out there
25 doing that. And I've noticed a change in the whales habits

-31-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 when you're long lining halibut and primarily black cod.
2 The sperm whales and the killer whales -- we're kind of
3 like dinner bells out there. They recognize a boat out on
4 the edge, they hear you. You turn on the hydraulics, they
5 come charging up to the boat. The whales in the Gulf just
6 -- primarily over these last 10 years are getting
7 habituated to associating the sound of a fishing vessel to
8 a feeding opportunity. And so in thinking about this, when
9 there's Navy operations going on and the other boats have
10 been requested to leave the area, I would think there's
11 going to be a natural tendency for the boat -- the whales
12 to actually approach a vessel and explore to see what
13 they're doing. Because they have been doing that. And I
14 just wanted to share that thought. Thank you.
15 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. We've had someone turn
16 in a card for his first opportunity. I believe it's
17 Richard Courtney. Yes sir.
18 RICHARD COURTNEY
19 Commented as follows:
20 My name is Richard Courtney and I'm here representing
21 myself. I'm also representing myself as a 20 year Navy
22 veteran. I served on two aircraft carriers, a helicopter
23 carrier, and a -- one of those large ones that you see
24 right over there. I've ridden smaller destroyers and
25 LST's.

-32-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 I find it absolutely critical for the U.S. Navy to
2 practice in an area such as the Gulf of Alaska. I am an
3 expert on meteorology and oceanography. I'm also an expert
4 on the American sailor running around on a ship. And if
5 you haven't figured it out, I'm still a little nervous
6 here.
7 One of the things we don't recognize very much is what
8 it is to be out there on a ship doing the good deed, that's
9 defending your nation. You cannot go down to Hawaii in the
10 middle of the summertime, run through a five to an eight
11 foot sea state with a 20 knot trade wind and say, hey I
12 know what it's going to be like to be up here in the Gulf
13 of Alaska. It's a different environment. You walk out
14 through your front door, you put a coat on, you put a hat
15 on. You don't run out there bare chested in Kodiak in
16 January. So it's absolutely necessary for us to understand
17 that we have to work in other environments. That's what
18 this is all about.
19 Now back when I was in they didn't have these, or they
20 were greatly reduced. And this is a great thing, it's an
21 honest effort to try and make sure we don't screw something
22 up. But bare in mind that the United States Navy has been
23 around 200 -- more than 200 years actually. We still have
24 fish out there, we still have whales. I have not in the
25 time I road on aircraft carriers, looking for submarines --

-33-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hennock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 yes, I did that. I didn't see any dead whales wash up
2 behind my ship. I never saw the Navy go out of it's way to
3 try and hurt anything in the ocean. They are very, very
4 studious about watching out for things. I was directly
5 involved in that.

6 I'm not here because I think I owe the Navy something.
7 I'm hear about my own personal interest. I'm not here for
8 every man and woman that is out there on a ship right now
9 that does not know what it's like to get beat up out there.
10 All of you that claim that you've got fishing boats out
11 there, would you take a nice 23 foot skiff and go running
12 through the Bering Sea this time of the year, to go from
13 St. Paul to Dutch Harbor? No, you wouldn't. You'd pick
14 the biggest boat that you can, they one that rides the best
15 and most comfortable. And that's what we're doing with
16 ships. We're training people how to survive an
17 environment. And there's only one way to do that, there's
18 only on way to survive combat. Train like you fight and
19 fight like you train. That comes right out of the Navy.
20 Thank you for putting up with me.

21 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Anyone else?
22 With that, like I said we are here until 8:30. We're going
23 to take a recess. If anyone else comes along and would
24 like to make a comment we will do that. If you'd like to
25 make a comment just one on one with Clyde over here you can

-34-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hennock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 do that as well. And we're going to ask subject matter
2 experts to go back to the poster stations in case people
3 have thought of any new questions that they wanted to ask.
4 Thank you very much.

5 (Recess)

6 GENENEIEA PEARSON

7 Commented as follows:

8 My name is Geneneiea Pearson. I've lived in Kodiak
9 since 1941 and have observed the whales since that time.
10 But what I'd like to say is, that I'm disappointed in this
11 meeting in that you did not have an open meeting so that we
12 could hear your answers to questions. I think that would
13 have been helpful and we could hear what -- other peoples
14 concerns are more than just these comments. Because a lot
15 of people are shy about talking, like me.

16 The other suggestion I would like to make is that you
17 have a civilian observer, maybe on or two on each of these
18 carriers to observe for the public as to what goes on. So
19 that there's an honest assessment of what happens. If you
20 can come up with something out there, I know it's hard
21 because of the ocean, you can't really tell what's going
22 on. But I'm very concerned for the fisherman that are
23 being replace -- displaced during the period that the
24 exercises will be taking place. And I'm very concerned for
25 the marine mammals that will be out there and will be

-35-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 attracted to the boats. Because I know the whales now a
2 days come up to the boats. I have fished myself for many,
3 many years. I know that they're trusting us now, which
4 they didn't used to during the years ago. When they were
5 slaughtering them out here, when the Russians were right
6 off shore out here, slaughtering whales. We could see the
7 fleet at night, I looked like a city out there. But I know
8 that at -- after that slaughter was over the whales were
9 very skiddiest. If they saw us they were gone. We only
10 saw then once. Where as now they aren't afraid of boats
11 and they come right up to the boats sometimes. So I'm very
12 concerned about this whole process and I wish the Navy
13 figure out another way of working their ideas out for anti-
14 submarine warfare. I wish they would go somewhere else to
15 do it. Thank you.

16 RICHARD COURTNEY

17 Commented as follows:

18 Hi, this is Richard Courtney. I live in Kodiak,
19 Alaska. I'd also like to add on to my statement that I
20 made earlier. And one of the biggest reasons I feel it's
21 critical to come up here and learn, as a sailor is exposure
22 to the harsh weather conditions that are up here. At one
23 point in my Navy career, I was up off the coast of Norway
24 and I had 70 knots of wind and 35 foot seas. There was
25 millions of dollars of damage done to five amphibious

-36-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 warfare ships and a destroyer. We had no exposure up there
2 and very few people ever got a chance to work up there.
3 And by learning to come up here and work in these harsher
4 conditions, you have a better understanding of what it
5 takes to survive. Especially in a combat situation. You
6 don't have to look back any farther than World War II, and
7 look at some of the actions of what ships had gone through
8 and how much better they would have been prepared if they
9 actually practiced in foul weather instead of practicing in
10 the calm waters off of Hawaii.

11 So that's why I think it's critical to come up here.
12 I don't expect a complete understanding of everything, but
13 I think it's real critical for the military to come to work
14 as a team up in rough weather. And that's about --
15 basically all I've got to say.

16 MR. MICHAELSON: It is now 8:30, my name is Lewis
17 Michaelson, hearing moderator and we have no one left in
18 the room and we have gone back on recess [sic] to
19 officially close out and adjourn this meeting. Thank you.

20 (Hearing adjourned)

-37-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE
2 I, CLYDE PASTERSKI, hereby certify that the foregoing
3 pages numbered 4 through 37 are a true, accurate, and
4 complete transcript of Hearings held in Kodiak, Alaska on
5 the Gulf of Alaska Navy Training Activities Draft
6 Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental
7 Impact Statement transcribed by me from a copy of the
8 electronic sound recording to the best of my knowledge and
9 ability.
10
11
12 Date Clyde Pasterski, Transcriber
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

-38-

This page intentionally left blank.

1 I.7.1.2 ANCHORAGE

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Anchorage, AK 99501
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1146

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC HEARING ON
GULF OF ALASKA NAVY TRAINING ACTIVITIES
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/OVERSEAS ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT
January 8, 2010
5:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.
Fairview Recreation Center
Main Gymnasium
1121 East 10th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

- 1 -

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Anchorage, AK 99501
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1146

1 MODERATOR
2
3
4
5 PANELISTS
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Lewis Michaelson
Katz & Associates
4250 Executive Square
Suite 670
La Jolla, California 92037

Alex Stone
NOICEIAS
COMPACFLT Environmental
NASNI
P.O. Box 357033
San Diego, California 93135

Vic Weber, CDR, USN
COMTHIRDFLT
53690 Tomahawk Drive
San Diego, California 92147

Amy Cox, LT, NOAA
National Oceanic and
Atmospheric Administration
NMFS Alaska Region
222 West 7th Avenue, Room 517
Anchorage, Alaska 99513

- 2 -

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Paul D. Kendall	Page 19/27/31/34
Wade Willis	Page 22/30
Tom Lakosh	Page 24

-3-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

out the comment sheet that you should have received when you came in here tonight. You can turn it in tonight or mail it to the address provided on the form. You can also log onto the project website that we provided and you can provide your comments electronically if you would like.

Keep in mind that all comments should be postmarked or received by January 25, 2010, in order to insure that they're considered in the final EIS.

So it's now time for the oral comment portion. Again, if there's anyone who wishes to, please just fill out a card, hold up your hand and Allison will come over and do that. I have four simple rules for the comment portion. First, please speak clearly and slowly into this microphone at the lectern over there. That's one of the ways we make sure we get your comments verbatim, recorded, and become part of the transcript and part of the official record of comments made on the EIS. Just give us your name and your organization you represent, you don't need addresses. Second, each person will have three minutes to speak. Third, if you prepared a written statement you can turn it in at the registration table or you can read it out loud if you can fit it into the three minute time limit. Fourth, please honor any request that I make to stop speaking when you've reached your three minute time limit. In order to make that easy for you to do, I have two signs with me

-18-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1146

1 tonight. One of them lets you know when there are 30
2 seconds left, that allows you to comfortably wrap up your
3 comments. This is the one that I hold up when you've
4 reached three minutes.

5 We've used this same format and will use it at all the
6 meetings, however give that we be here until 8:30 for this
7 portion of it and I only have two comment cards at this
8 point. What we do usually and what we did at Kodiak last
9 night, is I'll take everyone's first time for three minutes
10 and then if you want to have a second helping, you can come
11 up again and speak again. But I want to make sure we get
12 through everybody first -- who had a first opportunity.
13 So, with that the names that I have, Tom Lokash had asked
14 to go first.....

15 MR. LAKOSH: Let him go second, because I'd like to
16 take my additional three at that time.

17 MR. MICHAELSON: You know, I was going to suggest that
18 actually. I'm totally with you on that, good deal, good
19 deal. So, actually Wade Willis if you would go first. All
20 we need to get is your name and any organization. Thank
21 you very much.

22 PAUL D. KENDALL

23 Commented as follows (prior to start of hearing):

24 My name is Paul, middle initial D, Kendall. I'm an
25 Anchorage, Alaska citizen. And I just came in for the

-19-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1146

1 first time to see what you had. It's my first time to be
2 at one of these and I found it to be efficient,
3 professional, entertaining, and amenable. And all you
4 people have been very congenial and professional.

5 Because you're in what they call the Gulf of Alaska up
6 around Cordova, Kodiak and the entry to Cook Inlet, I'd
7 really like to see you bring some type of studies on the
8 tidal. I think it's a high tidal area and there are only
9 so many tidal areas around the world. And I'm of
10 particular interest between Cordova and the Cook Inlet.
11 And when I look at the resources that you're going to bring
12 into the inlet like that, the ships and all of those
13 monitoring devices. I'd like to have you make your data
14 available to the local communities in the event that they
15 move to some type of tidal generation for energy for our
16 residential sectors.

17 And when you consider the fact that a pound of water
18 weights about 62 [sic] pounds, and you put that into a ten
19 foot by ten foot by ten foot cube, which is equal to
20 something along the lines of a UPS delivery van. That
21 content of that van equals about 31 tons or 62,000 pounds.
22 And if you were to bring that poundage on board a ship, in
23 essence you could use that weight on just one van, which is
24 a ten by ten by ten cube of water. You could use that as a
25 counter weight to move down to push gears. And then if you

-20-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 release that water you can actually have crawler or water
2 wheel turn to make electricity as you move the water out.
3 And as you move that water out back into the ocean through
4 a pipe, what will happen is you can displace the air that's
5 in the pipe, and that air will push turbines. And if you
6 close off the back of that pipe as you release the water
7 from the front end of it, you can also as the water runs
8 out it draws the air the other way into a vacuum and those
9 air reversals will turn turbines. So, you in essence have
10 a ship that can generate energy onboard, especially with
11 the tides. And when you begin to look at those ten foot
12 cubic capacities of movement in tide, the numbers are huge
13 and astronomical. So, if you're going to come into an area
14 like that, around Cordova and Kodiak and the Cook Inlet, I
15 would think that there would be some type of a
16 participation. And I think they're getting ready to start
17 the meeting, so I think I'm going to -- no.

18 So, what I'm saying, when I look at the resources and
19 the competency of your people who come into this area, I
20 think you could bring to the people maybe a ship. And you
21 could bring that in -- into the communities of Kodiak and
22 Cordova and Seward, and maybe bring us a couple of extra
23 ships and we could use those ships as power plants and the
24 community could learn about waves and tidal capacity for
25 generating electricity, which is clearly our next future.

-21-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 Other than that I think that's about it. Except well
2 there's one more thing. I do think you should have a video
3 webcam here. And that this gentleman which is -- gosh, I
4 have to get my glasses -- the gentleman who's taking this
5 testimony, Clyde E. Pasterski, I think you should furnish
6 him with the money to have a webcam. And the way that
7 should be done is that an individual should be escorted
8 over here and asked if they'd like to make a video or a
9 video and audio, or if they'd like to have a video from a
10 distance and let them sit down and perhaps make their own
11 little video. Because the writing is just too onerous.
12 And I think that the children would like to do that. You
13 get more involvement from the public and it's much more
14 easy. And even if the communication were to go on at
15 length, I think it could still be monitored and curtailed
16 at appropriate times such as we have coming up now.
17 Because I think they're getting ready to have a
18 presentation. Thank you very much for what you're doing.
19 And I love my America and I want it back the way old
20 American values. Thank you.

21 WADE WILLIS

22 Commented as follows:

23 Thank you very much and I appreciate -- first I want
24 to say I appreciate very much the Navy coming up to Alaska
25 and allowing us to speak. We're a State that is very

-22-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 supportive of the military and we are very appreciative of
2 your coming up here to talk.

3 My name is Wade Willis, I'm a biologist for the State.
4 Been up here for 20 years. I have worked extensively in
5 Prince William Sound and worked as a biologist in the Gulf
6 of Alaska, so I know the country pretty well.

7 Some of the concerns I have are that the operation
8 area is being conducted in shallow areas and shallow shelf
9 areas. And certainly those are areas that are very
10 critical habitat for our resources -- our fisheries
11 resources in Alaska. And I've very -- also very concerned
12 that the operation area is in the middle of critical for
13 migrating whales. I don't really know if it's an
14 appropriate operation area for the military to be
15 conducting more -- it's more aggressive SONAR operations.
16 I would hope there would be areas of the country where we
17 could identify for SONAR work that would not put such a
18 risk to a lot of unknowns with our migrating whales.
19 Several are endangered that move through this area. And
20 using visual sightings of whales is notoriously quite you
21 know, inaccurate. And a lot of the whales like blue whales
22 can be underwater for very long extended periods of time.

23 So, I'm very, very concerned that the military is
24 proposing 42 days in the summer. And as a guide I can tell
25 you there's 90 days in the summer up there. And that's

-23-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 you know, about half of the summer you're proposing of
2 possibility being out there conducting SONAR operations.
3 That's a real concern of mine. I would hope that possible
4 high use times for migrating whales could be avoided. And
5 that possibility SONAR operations could be minimized as
6 much as possible for the Alaska operation area due to the
7 potential risk.

8 I'm also very concerned with the amount of toxins, the
9 hazardous waste that's being proposed -- 10,300 pounds. I,
10 particularly am very concerned with persistent organic
11 pollutants which are really going through the roof in
12 Alaska due to multiple sources. Our fisheries, our
13 halibut, and long lived fishes like rockfish and lingcod
14 are being limited in our ability to eat now because of
15 persistent organic pollutants. And our marine mammals are
16 showing extremely high levels of persistent organic
17 pollutants.

18 So, I wasn't able to figure out how much of the 10,300
19 pounds would be POP's, but I would encourage the Navy to
20 try to mitigate any POP discharge. Thank you.

21 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Mr. Tom Lakosh.
22 And he's requested that he take his second helping back to
23 back. But since I have no other cards, I'm fine with that
24 request.

25 TOM LAKOSH

-24-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Anchorage, AK 99501
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 Commented as follows:

2 My name is Tom Lakosh, I'm an Anchorage -- Anchorage
3 resident. But I've long been user of Prince William Sound
4 resources and we appreciate your service, but find that
5 some of the responses to my earlier inquires quite
6 distressing.

7 First of all with respect to mitigation methods, I
8 felt it's wholly inappropriate to use the standard of
9 impairment -- hearing impairment of whales as the necessary
10 triggering standard for abating operations. Clearly the
11 standard should be, and adverse behavioral impacts upon
12 marine mammals and should be the standard to cease
13 operations and for avoidance of those oper -- of those
14 species.

15 And when I inquired as to why we wouldn't schedule the
16 training sessions for periods outside the migration of
17 whales, towards winter obviously. And outside of the
18 migration paths, I was told that, oh well stuff breaks in
19 Alaska winters. Well, we know that. We're out there, I've
20 been a fisherman in the wintertime. You know, freezing
21 spray, et cetera, et cetera.

22 And if you guys don't want to build equipment to
23 protect your 49th state, you might as well just take your
24 stuff elsewhere. You know, bring up stuff that will work,
25 do it in the wintertime outside of the migration seasons,

-25-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Anchorage, AK 99501
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 and outside of their migration path. Establish a standard
2 of avoidance of populations based on impacting behavioral
3 standard of practices of the marine mammals. Set up a
4 preliminary observations both with passive SONAR that is
5 sensitive to the vocalizations of the whales, to find out
6 where they are. Conduct your operations away from them to
7 the greatest extent possible.

8 We realize you need areas to train -- designated areas
9 to train to keep out other commercial activities and
10 vessels and so forth. But that area should be large enough
11 so that you can avoid populations, take adequate time to
12 you know, preliminary you know, pre-scanning of the areas
13 where you plan to train and make concerted effort to avoid
14 population densities to the greatest extend practicable.

15 One other method that is -- that Alaskan's have
16 learned is that you can also call some of these species you
17 know, particularly pilot whales and orcas to your presence
18 by just fishing for black cod and halibut. So, you can
19 call those species out of your test area by hiring a
20 licensed commercial fisheries, ones that have had
21 particular problems in the past, given that the marine --
22 the whales recognize their hydraulic sounds. And bring the
23 whales out of harms way. Pay the fisherman to feed the
24 whales while you happily ping away out in the Gulf. There
25 are a number of methods here that you haven't fairly

-26-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 considered, you haven't done your job. You could do a
2 better job, you could bring better equipment to operate
3 outside of our peak summer migration and commercial fishing
4 seasons. And you know, and a much less impact on our
5 resources. You're here to protect us, not only our hides
6 but our resources. When you talk about Alaskan's, our
7 resources are apart of us. We live in subsistence, we live
8 in tourism, we live in commercial fishing. That's our
9 livelihoods, and that's why a lot of us come here to Alaska
10 is to experience the wild, an undisturbed wild. And we
11 don't need you know, disturbances that we clearly know are
12 going to harm our interests. We want you to protect us as
13 whole people, not just part of us. And we want you to
14 bring the proper equipment, make the proper preparations,
15 and accordingly appreciate the resources and particularly
16 marine mammals the way we do. Thank you for this
17 opportunity.

18 MR. MICHAELSON: Is there anyone else who would like to
19 speak tonight?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

21 MR. MICHAELSON: Yeah. I just want to make sure I've
22 got everybody who had a first -- anybody else who hasn't
23 had a first shot yet and wants to come up here? Yes sir,
24 go head.

25 PAUL D. KENDALL

-27-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 Commented as follows:

2 My name is Paul, middle initial D, Kendall and I'm an
3 energy activist. And as far as credentials go, I'm neither
4 accomplished, degreed, or published. And I came here
5 primarily out of curiosity and because of my -- I love the
6 Navy, and I love the military, and our services and I think
7 they're one of the few groups in our society that is being
8 taught to represent us all as one society, America.

9 But I'd like to make some suggestions to you. These
10 will most likely be outside the scope of your EIS, but I'm
11 really not sure what the scope is. In my world anything
12 that contributes to a better society is a good thing and
13 should be considered. So, I came here because I'd like to
14 have you consider having some type of assigned energy -- an
15 energy science technology officer, team, or department that
16 travels with these fleets or groups of vessels. And I'd
17 really like to see an actual vessel itself as designated as
18 an energy science technology with each group of ships or
19 vessels. And I'd like to see you gathering a tremendous
20 amount of data in realtime, ice, tidal, temperature, wave,
21 content, body contents, currents, et cetera.

22 I just made a brief list of the things that you could
23 do to contribute to our society. I think that you come to.
24 I'd also like to see you, because you're in such a high
25 tidal impact area, and there's so few tides I think around

-28-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 the world. I'd like to see you check your mothball fleet
2 to see if you couldn't bring some type of a vessel to
3 Homer, Kodiak, Seward, and Cordova. Something that has
4 been mothballed that the community might be able to use.

5 I'd like to see you come up in the winter so that we
6 can get some ice data. And I'd like to see you -- let's
7 see, consolidate your -- I forgot what that was about. My
8 premise this, I'm convinced that we're going to be moving
9 very, very quickly into water partnerships. And that there
10 is no such thing as water ladies and gentleman. It's all
11 hydrogen compounds, or contaminants, or particulates, or
12 partnerships. And if I'm not wrong about this, we're about
13 to see a whole new era of energy. And that energy is going
14 to revolve around magnetic fields and the hydrogen atoms.

15 And when I see these bodies, these vessels of tremendous
16 capacity, intellectual and data rich with being able --
17 technology, with gathering -- data gathering rich devices,
18 it would seem to me that it would be more interactive in
19 those bodies of water for multiple reasons.

20 I don't see how we could disconnect energy from
21 anything. I have come to conclusion later in my life that
22 most of the things you see are manifestations of energy.
23 And our children within the next decade are about to learn
24 that connectivity and with that comes responsibility for
25 our balance and our in harmony. And that cast is huge, and

-29-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 the Navy has, I think has a fundamental fiduciary
2 obligation to those creatures in that ocean and those
3 communities along the way. And in closing, I'm coming to
4 an end here, I'm opposed to the War in Iraq and I'd like to
5 see all of my troop and all of my people come back to
6 America and begin to rebuild our values that we all share
7 in common and quality of lifestyles and family lives.
8 Thank you.

9 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Anyone else who has been
10 inspired to speak? And Allison will catch you on the way
11 out to fill out a card, okay? If not then you can come up
12 for a second time. Thank you.

13 WADE WILLIS
14 Commented as follows:

15 Thank you again, my name is Wade Willis. And I want
16 to impress upon the Navy the opportunity they have to help
17 the scientific community acquire baseline data. It is a
18 critical, critical component to our long term stability as
19 a nation and as a State that we understand, as best as
20 possible the current populations of animals that we have,
21 the migration routes, things like that. This is an
22 incredibly good opportunity for the Navy to address that
23 and to support the scientific community in ways maybe
24 beyond the EIS evaluation. But to say you know, if we're
25 going to have MOA we're also going to support some science

-30-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Kennebunk, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 research beyond this EIS listing, you know. Just to say
2 that that's an important national strategic point as well.
3 That you know, in exchange for our maybe degradating the
4 environment a bit, we're going to help the State and the
5 scientific community know more for the long term benefit,
6 overall benefit may be far greater from the science we
7 learn than the small amount of environment degradation that
8 occurs due to our operations out there for 16 to 41 days a
9 year.

10 So I really hope the Navy will look really hard in
11 helping the scientific community which is dramatically
12 under funded, to acquire some of that baseline data.
13 Especially in the areas that you're getting ready to
14 operate. You know, the Gulf of Alaska is some of the most
15 difficult areas for the scientific community to get funding
16 for. So that's mainly what I wanted to say on my second
17 round. Thank a lot you guys.

18 MR. MICHAELSON: Anyone else ready for a second --
19 okay.

20 MR. KENDAL: I think these moments of gathering are
21 very, very special. It's my -- pardon?

22 MR. MICHAELSON: Sorry, I missed your name.

23 PAUL D. KENDALL

24 Commented as follows:

25 Oh, my name is Paul, middle initial D, Kendall.

-31-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Kennebunk, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 I think these moments are very, very special that we
2 gather. And the reason that they are is it allows us a
3 collective view of diverse opinions and unknown moments of
4 not really going where everyone's at and allows us to
5 reflect on our own values and ideas. And I wanted to thank
6 you for your ability to come around again. In today's
7 world we're seeing a tremendous repression of the ability
8 to collectively communicate in some unhurried fashion.
9 Some contemplated mode, the more complex our problems
10 become in coming back to some greater understanding of
11 balance is going to require a slower thought process due to
12 the complexity to find a resolution.

13 In having you allow a person to get up and have a fair
14 share of time and then to come back around and circle, I
15 think that's admirable and appreciative thing that deserves
16 recognition. And I just can't stress enough that you
17 should have these moments on camera, on video to share with
18 the rest of the world. So that you can set the bar and
19 show other people. It's very important, I think that all
20 of our data be videoed on the internet. Something that's
21 very magnificent that's happening there.

22 And the reason I actually came up here was to -- I
23 hope that you'll chose Kodiak, and Homer, and Seward, and
24 Cordova, and those places to come in with a couple of
25 ships. There is something magnificent and inspirational

-32-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 about those ships and the men and women that represent some
 2 of our more fundamental values that created this great
 3 country, that I think are immeasurable in the long term.
 4 And naturally you won't forget the energy science
 5 technology designated vessel to share with the community.
 6 And if I might -- one more thing real quick. To give
 7 you and idea of why I'm here to give you -- there are
 8 things moving very, very quickly sweeping across the, I
 9 think the entire plant, but especially America. There are
 10 over 40 manufactures of electric vehicles that are reaching
 11 in the next three years. In addition to that the Chinese
 12 have announced they are going all electric bicycles. And
 13 when you look at things like that, within three years every
 14 seven year old child in India, China, and Asia is going to
 15 know more about the lithium ion battery and electron
 16 (indiscernible) they ever learned. And when you put that
 17 into the internet on such a worldwide scale the bookends of
 18 those impacts, then pour tens of the times we have never
 19 seen before, like an industrial revolution. This new sense
 20 of awareness that is now coming through energy, responsible
 21 energy management. It not only brings us a new individual
 22 freedom and will which we've never seen before. Because
 23 it's heading home and transportation. But they pour tons
 24 of new degrees of awareness. So, when I see these fleets
 25 that represent large amounts of energy in partnershiping

-33-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 and transitioning with the water bodies, the great water
 2 bodies. Which are really hydrogen. I think these are
 3 moments that I hope that you'll discuss amongst yourself --
 4 maybe more than you are. And thank you again.
 5 MR. MICHAELSON: Anyone else who hasn't had a chance to
 6 speak tonight? If not, as I said we're going to go into
 7 recess now. We will still be here until 8:30. If anyone
 8 else comes forward in that time we will be happy to take
 9 their comments, or if someone wants to say something but
 10 doesn't like to doing it in front of a crowd people, again
 11 Clyde is available to take your comments orally, one on
 12 one. Keep in mind again that you do have the January 25th
 13 deadline for any written comments. So we're going to go
 14 into recess now. Thank you.
 15 (Recess)
 16 PAUL D. KENDALL
 17 Commented as follows:
 18 Well, my name is Paul, middle initial D, Kendall.
 19 This is like my fourth time I think here on giving
 20 testimony. It's my first time to be at one of these. And
 21 I just wanted to note for the record that your people have
 22 been very accommodating and professional and amiable. And
 23 they've made me feel very comfortable. And sometime those
 24 little moments in our everyday events go unnoticed and I
 25 just wanted to give notice to that.

-34-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 And also your presentation allowing the individuals to
2 come back up after a second comment, I think that really
3 needs to be recognized. These meetings where we gather as
4 a community, as a collective group are very important.
5 They need to be unhurried and plenty of time. But more
6 importantly sometimes when you take testimony from such a
7 diverse gathering, you will actually learn things onsite in
8 multiple orders or reviewing your thoughts. And it's
9 important, I think to allow that person to have a second
10 opportunity to come back up and reflect on a prior position
11 of change or some new insight. And I thought that was
12 really wonderful of being able to have that little nuance.

13 Other than that you might have a little time clock up
14 there with a large six or ten inch LED that -- where a
15 person can see their time, and that way a person can have
16 the dignity to shut themselves down when they're talking,
17 which gives them more -- it empowers the individual to have
18 more capacity to develop their personality and knowing the
19 responsibility of time limit -- time limitations on
20 talking. Anyway, thank you very much. That's it.

21 MR. MICHAELSON: This is Lewis Michaelson. It is now
22 8:30, we have not had anyone else present themselves asking
23 to speak orally on the record here in front of the panel.
24 So we are officially concluding, adjourning this meeting at
25 8:30 on January 8th. Thank you.

-35-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 (Hearing adjourned)
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

-36-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Anchorage, AK 99501
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE
2 I, CLYDE PASTERSKI, hereby certify that the foregoing
3 pages numbered 4 through 36 are a true, accurate, and
4 complete transcript of Hearings held in Anchorage, Alaska
5 on the Gulf of Alaska Navy Training Activities Draft
6 Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental
7 Impact Statement transcribed by me from a copy of the
8 electronic sound recording to the best of my knowledge and
9 ability.

10
11
12 Date Clyde Pasterski, Transcriber
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 I.7.1.3 HOMER

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Anchorage, AK 99501
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1146

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 PUBLIC HEARING ON
9 GULF OF ALASKA NAVY TRAINING ACTIVITIES
10 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/OVERSEAS ENVIRONMENTAL
11 IMPACT STATEMENT
12 January 9, 2010
13 5:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.
14 West Homer Elementary School Gymnasium
15 3719 Soundview Avenue
16 Homer, Alaska 99603
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- 1 -

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Anchorage, AK 99501
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1146

1 MODERATOR
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PANELISTS

Lewis Michaelson
Katz & Associates
4250 Executive Square
Suite 670
La Jolla, California 92037

Alex Stone
NOICEIAS
COMPACFLT Environmental
NASNI
P.O. Box 357033
San Diego, California 93135

Vic Weber, CDR, USN
COMTHIRDFLT
53690 Tomahawk Drive
San Diego, California 92147

Amy Cox, LT, NOAA
National Oceanic and
Atmospheric Administration
NMFS Alaska Region
222 West 7th Avenue, Room 517
Anchorage, Alaska 99513

- 2 -

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		
3	Paul Seaton	Page 19
4	Roberta Highland	Page 21/44/53
5	Robert Archibald	Page 23/48
6	Olga von Ziegesar	Page 24/46
7	Sue Christiansen	Page 26
8	Amy Christiansen	Page 28
9	Whitney Lowe	Page 30/52
10	Don Lane	Page 32
11	Elise Wolf	Page 34/42
12	Make Haggerty	Page 36
13	Todd Hoppe	Page 37
14	Brenda Dulma	Page 40/53
15	Stephanie Zuniga	Page 40/47
16	Linda Feiler	Page 50/55
17	Geneva Craig	Page 55
18	Jasper Kigar	Page 56

-3-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 previous two we've held in Kodiak and in Anchorage, we've
2 also got them coming up in Cordova and Juneau. Is that
3 after everyone has had their first chance, if you have
4 something else you couldn't fit into the three minutes, I'm
5 going to ask you to come up for second helpings if you want
6 those. But I do want to get through everybody first.
7 Okay, and their first three minutes, that everyone's had
8 that opportunity. So that's how we'll handle it tonight.
9 So, I believe Allison is about to bring me up a few
10 more. Also, so that you can be ready when it's your turn,
11 I'll try to occasionally read ahead what the names are that
12 are coming up. So that you can be aware of that and be
13 ready to come up to the microphone.
14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).
15 MR. MICHAELSON: Yes, that is correct, thank you. All
16 right. So, the order that I have here is Paul Seaton,
17 followed by Roberta Highland, Robert Archibald, Olga von
18 Ziegesar, and Sue Christiansen will be the first five. So
19 -- please Mr. Seaton -- and I don't need an address or
20 anything like that. If you'd simply state your name and
21 any organization that you representing, I'd appreciate it.
22 Thanks very much.
23 PAUL SEATON
24 Commented as follows:
25 Well thank you. I am Paul Seaton, I'm the State

-19-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Katiklan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 Representative for District 35, covering Homer, Seward, and
2 the outer Kenai Peninsula.

3 I received comments of concern from continuants at the
4 initiation of the last training exercise. These concerns
5 were mainly centered on the potential effects of new --
6 frequency SONAR on whales.

7 I thank the Navy for scheduling this meeting here in
8 Homer for the convenience of our local residents and I
9 really appreciate it. Alaskan's are concerned about the
10 effects of copper in fresh water and marine environments,
11 especially on fish. This includes reduction of copper used
12 in bottom paints in our fishing fleets, and also we're
13 currently undergoing a review this month of -- by the
14 Alaska Department of Environmental Conversation on the
15 aquatic life standards for copper. As those have been seen
16 -- the current standards have been seen not be adequate to
17 protect juvenile salmon for their homing and responses to
18 avoiding predation.

19 So, I'm concerned that on table 3.2-22 on page 3.2-32,
20 that the sonobuoys that are going to be used will increase
21 the amount of copper discharge from the current level of
22 38.1 pounds to 2520 pounds under -- that's Alternative 2
23 versus the No Action Alternative. And the increase of
24 copper from eight pounds to 540 pounds. And that first was
25 copper thiocyanate, and so I would like to request that the

-20-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Katiklan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 Navy look at analyzing the use of a explosive charge to
2 destroy those sonobuoys that does not incorporate those
3 amounts of copper that would discharge into the Gulf of
4 Alaska.

5 And so I appreciate that, I appreciate the fact that
6 you are looking at the affect of mid-range SONAR on the
7 whales, as that is a prime concern by my constituents. I
8 don't have -- although I have a degree in biology, whale
9 interaction was not that -- my expertise. So, I would
10 appreciate you continuing to look at that. And thank you
11 again for having this meeting here in Homer.

12 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. The next
13 speaker is Roberta Highland.

14 ROBERTA HIGHLAND

15 Commented as follows:

16 Hi, I'm Roberta Highland. And I just found out about
17 this meeting by reading the Homer News on Thursday. And
18 I've always got issues when such a large amount of effort
19 is put into having public meetings, that the people that
20 are putting it together -- probably one idea is to contact
21 any City Clerk office in the area that you're holding and
22 they can give you the times, because really what would have
23 been helpful was to have had this in the Homer News the
24 week before because it's Saturday. And I just saw it on
25 Thursday. It's just one way because of the cost and the

-21-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Kenai, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 work that goes into it. So, that would be my suggestion.
2 I always like to ask people to pretend that you're a
3 whale, or a bird, or a fish, or other mammals when any of
4 these decisions are being made. And just take it from that
5 perspective so we're not doing it from our frequent human
6 ideal and so anyhow that's just one of my ideas. Is really
7 take that -- it sounds silly, but kind of take it
8 seriously. And there are the decisions maybe change
9 because of that.
10 And active SONAR sounds a little problematic, for
11 sure. Underwater explosives sound problematic, and birds
12 and fish dying sound problematic. I understand that you
13 are doing a really good job on making sure that the least
14 amount of environmental damage is done. But it's one of
15 those consequences that happens no matter what.
16 I'm also wanting the carbon footprint and pollution
17 considered. And I don't know if that's being given the
18 amount of consideration that it needs to be. Because every
19 time a ship goes, an airplane takes off, any of the things
20 that will occur, there is a carbon footprint and there is
21 pollution that happens with that. And that needs to be
22 something we really strongly take into consideration these
23 days. And I'm always wondering if there's not a way of
24 doing it more frequently in a -- I'm trying to think of the
25 word, where you are pretending you are doing it. And I

-22-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Kenai, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 know that -- oh, 30 seconds, okay.
2 I'm wondering about the time of year. Summer is when
3 the mammals, and fish, and bird activity is highest and
4 that seems to be a poor choice of time for these exercises.
5 And I'll quit because my time is up. Thank you.
6 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. The next speaker is
7 Robert Archibald.
8 ROBERT ARCHIBALD
9 Commented as follows:
10 Good evening and thank you for coming down. Even
11 though it was short notice, we're happy to see you here.
12 And I'd just like to reiterate on what Paul said, that
13 we've had a big battle going here with the androus fish
14 stocks and the effects of copper on them. And it's proving
15 that they are kind of dizzying their navigational systems.
16 So, the timing of these exercises -- if they're -- you
17 know, if they're going to be at the same time that we're
18 having fish stocks coming back into this Gulf of Alaska and
19 heading up to the Bearing Sea and Bristol Bay. And if this
20 has any significant impact or increases any kind of
21 chemicals in the water, copper be what it is, I don't know
22 what you're using for munitions these days. I would have
23 some problems with that at that particular time of the
24 year.
25 I would hope that if they doubled the length of these

-23-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Anchorage, AK 99501
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 exercises they would take into account the time of year for
2 migrations. And I would certainly hope that NMFS and the
3 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would have a significant
4 impact on that, as far as giving the Navy adequate
5 information on that.

6 Because I've sailed in and out of Prince William Sound
7 a lot and it's going to be an area where there is an awful
8 lot of mammal interactions. I so I just hope you sharpened
9 your pencil on that one. And we don't want to see a whole
10 lot of destruction out there with our fish stocks. So,
11 thanks for coming.

12 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Next speaker is Olga von
13 Ziegesar.

14 OLGA VON ZIEGESAR

15 Commented as follows:

16 Hi, my name is Olga von Ziegesar. I am the Director
17 of Eye of Whale, a nonprofit research group here in Alaska.
18 Our mission is to study and protect the humpback whale and
19 to educate people of the status and the health of the
20 species.

21 We've been documenting the population of humpback
22 whales in Prince William Sound and the north gulf coast of
23 Alaska for 30 years. In 1966 the humpback whale was put on
24 the endangered species list and protected and protected by
25 the Marine Mammal Protection Act. In the 30 years of my

-24-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Anchorage, AK 99501
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 study I have seen the population of the North Pacific
2 humpback whale go from 3000 to 20,000. About 5,000 of
3 these whales migrate up into the north Gulf of Alaska to
4 feed. This area includes the Cook Inlet, Kodiak, the
5 Barren Islands, Kenai Fjords, and Prince William Sound, and
6 the waters in between.

7 It is known that military SONAR testing is very
8 damaging to the soft tissue in the marine mammal skulls and
9 organs. These effects can cause brain hemorrhages, mass
10 stranding, and even death. Mid-frequency SONAR has been
11 proved to be very destructive to whales diving and feeding
12 behavior. They will avoid the intense sounds by surfacing
13 too quickly and causing conditions similar to the bends.

14 Now you may think that the military tests would be
15 harmless if they were done in the winter or slightly off
16 season, and not during the summer months when the whales
17 are definitely most abundant in these areas. We are now
18 finding that many whales stay in the northern waters during
19 the winter to continue their feeding. Hydro phone arrays
20 hung from buoys in the Gulf of Alaska have recorded whale
21 songs and calls during every month of the year.

22 You will say that your plan is to have observers
23 aboard to watch for whales. When they are present the
24 testing will be ceased. Marine mammals can hear for many
25 miles underwater. And from the deck of a ship a whale blow

-25-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 can only be seen if it is within a couple of miles. For
2 these reasons it will be impossible to avoid effecting the
3 whales and other marine mammals during any time of the year
4 in the Gulf of Alaska.

5 Finally, the humpback whale population is recovering
6 to healthy numbers. And now the Navy proposes to endanger
7 them with intensive SONAR and explosives. It seems to me
8 that we must change something if protecting our country
9 means sacrificing the whales. Thank you.

10 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. I'm going to read a head
11 again so that you know where you're coming up. Sue
12 Christiansen will be next, followed by Amy Christiansen,
13 Whitney Lowe, Don Lane, and Elise Wolf.

14 SUE CHRISTIANSEN
15 Commented as follows:

16 I to want to thank you so much for this public
17 process. I thank you for your service to the United States
18 and all of you in your professional roles, your expertise,
19 your commitment to science, and research. I just found out
20 about this today as I was flying in on Era on the same
21 flight as all you guys. So, I'm glad I was able to be
22 here. And what I remember, I think it was about five
23 years ago the Navy was doing research off the coast of New
24 Zealand on SONAR -- on new acoustics. And maybe you guys -
25 - are you familiar with that? I heard about this from NPR

-26-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 and I've thought about it after I got off the plane this
2 morning. But there was like a hundred whales that breached
3 [sic], and it -- you know, it started out with about 20 and
4 they tried to figure out what was causing the problem. And
5 it turned out after several years that it was demonstrated
6 or proven that it was the new acoustic SONAR research that
7 was going on that was effecting them.

8 And I just don't want to see that happen here. And I
9 know that everyone involved with the Navy or no one in the
10 Navy wants any of our marine animals to be injured in any
11 way or you have a good intention as well, and that you are
12 doing the best of your -- to your abilities to protect our
13 nation. And have the highest good in mind for all species.
14 And I would just say, my feeling at this time is I think
15 it's a little early for us to be doing this kind of
16 research -- or you know, the games or the activities that
17 you've presented happen here. And I support no action
18 alternative at this point. And I'm not sure I support the
19 research for SONAR, if it has the effects of breaching
20 [sic] whales or that kind of thing. Okay, that's it.

21 MR. MICHAELSON: Could you state your name for the
22 record?

23 MS. CHRISTIANSEN: Sue Christiansen.

24 MR. MICHAELSON: Thanks.

25 MS. CHRISTIANSEN: And I also would just underline as

-27-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 well as what Senator Seaton said about the chemicals.
2 MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thanks. Next speaker is Amy
3 Christiansen.
4 MS. CHRISTIANSEN: Beaching, yeah did I say breaching.
5 Beaching, yeah beaching whales. Did I say breaching?
6 MR. MICHAELSON: You did, thank you.
7 MS. CHRISTIANSEN: Okay, sorry.
8 MR. MICHAELSON: Amy Christiansen.
9 AMY CHRISTIANSEN
10 Commented as follows:
11 My name is Amy Christiansen, I've lived in Homer -- in
12 and out of Homer for years. But I have some real questions
13 for you guys that don't seem to be addressed, as in how far
14 does the SONAR blast travel? How loud is it 10 miles away?
15 How loud is it 200 miles away? What happens when it comes
16 in contact with some shelf or something? I mean that kind
17 of information, I don't think we really have.
18 I heard a couple people state that we don't really
19 know that much about marine mammals. We really don't. And
20 for me, just from my heart SONAR -- just discharging SONAR
21 for -- I mean, I would really want to know better reasons
22 what science you're really trying to determine here. Or
23 what is the whole weaponry involvement? I haven't heard a
24 link there. I mean it's nice -- the posters are nice and I
25 do appreciate the chance to talk about it. But I don't

-28-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 feel that it's worth while if you really don't know what
2 we're studying yet to harm any marine mammals.
3 I also wonder if there's a lot of this training and
4 stuff going on in California -- I know California and
5 Alaska are different, and waters are different. But I
6 always wonder why -- or I feel like, they can't get away
7 with it in California, so they might be coming up to get
8 away with it in Alaska. And I would really like that issue
9 addressed. Because there's more population in California -
10 - I mean, that part is real for me. And it might be
11 ridiculous because it is different ocean you know, waves or
12 whatever. But some part of that is real for me. That I
13 would like that addressed.
14 And more notice would have been nice. And what else
15 did I think? Oh, like in the book -- science is always a
16 little bit lagging is what I found. If you take sea
17 otters, which are mentioned in your environmental impact
18 study, they are now listed, they are now -- critical
19 habitat has been named. And that's not included in your
20 thick book. And I'm sure that thick book took a long time
21 to put together, but that's something too that is apparent
22 to me. So, okay thanks.
23 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Next speaker is
24 Whitney Lowe.

WHITNEY LOWE

-29-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 Commented as follows:

2 My name is Whitney Lowe, I'm here from Homer, Alaska.
3 And as with everybody else I'd like to thank you very much
4 for giving us the opportunity to be able to comment this
5 evening on this issue.

6 The Navy has a history of poor environmental
7 stewardship including dumping high volumes of garbage into
8 the ocean as well as toxic materials from explosive
9 ordinance. And consequently it is difficult to believe
10 what they might say about being responsible for the
11 environmental impacts of these actions. And I can
12 understand in these times of international terrorism, it's
13 easy to throw out the fear card and say, that all these
14 training exercises are necessary to keep our country safe.
15 But trumping up peoples fears has routinely led to trading
16 off the health and safety of human and other animal

17 habitats because supposedly it was going to make us safer.
18 At some point it would be great that we might learn
19 that the answer to making us safer doesn't result from
20 bigger and more powerfully destructive weapons, nor from
21 destroying our surroundings in the pursuit of those
22 weapons.

23 At the present moment we have a situation of drastic
24 concern with our worldwide fisheries and marine
25 environment. A November 2006 article in the Journal of

-30-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 Science suggested that there will be virtually nothing left
2 to fish from the seas by the middle of this century if the
3 current trends of catastrophic fish populations declines
4 continue. The primary culprits in this involve over
5 fishing, pollution, and other environmental factors.

6 In the face of these issues it's totally irresponsible
7 to increase military training, which involves toxic dumping
8 and tactics known to kill and injure marine life. We
9 should be going to great lengths to do anything we can, not
10 only to mitigate the current practices that are causing
11 precipitous decline, but to reverse this trend. To engage
12 further military exercise in this region that is extremely
13 rich in sensitive marine life is a blunder of epic
14 proportions and represents incredibility poor judgement.

15 Our children and decedents in who's hands we are going
16 to leave this incredibility injured world will be asking
17 us, what were they thinking? We can afford to participate
18 in this process, as it represents the epitome of
19 irresponsibility and drastically poor judgement. Thank
20 you.

21 MR. MICHAELSON: I'm going to go a head and read a
22 head again, so those of you know when you're coming up.
23 Don Lane, followed by Elise Wolf, Mako Haggerty, and Todd
24 Hoppe. Don Lane please.

25 DON LANE

-31-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue, Juneau, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 Commented as follows:

2 Thank you for this opportunity -- thank you for this
3 opportunity to speak. This nation's security is a big and
4 the Navy has always played a large role in the safety and
5 security of this country. It's a large part of the success
6 that we all enjoy, and the freedoms that we all enjoy.

7 Having said that, I also understand the taxpayers
8 investment in the tools of that security, it's important to
9 practice. And it's important to understand those tools and
10 it space and it takes time to practice. Having said that,
11 this map -- the western boundary of the practice area or
12 the football field, as it described to me goes up on the
13 shelf in the Gulf of Alaska. When it goes from dark to
14 light is right around 150 fathom break. Now to the west of
15 that break and over to the edge of the yellow line, that is
16 some of the richest bio-diversity in marine fish as you'll
17 find any place in Alaska. I have spent years out there
18 fishing, long lining, pulling pots and from Montague Island
19 down to off of Kodiak. There are sharks, they are skates,
20 there are halibut, there's grey cod, they are fish there
21 that have air bladders, they are fish there that don't have
22 air bladders. There's this huge bio-diverse population
23 that are -- fish that are there year round.

24 My concern is; is that some of that water that's up on
25 that shelf, it doesn't show on that picture, is 150 to 180

-32-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue, Juneau, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 feet deep. It's not very deep, there are -- Portlock Bank
2 area up there that's 35 fathoms, off of Montague Island,
3 sticking south of that island there's an area -- it's all
4 less than -- some area of it are less than 200 feet deep.
5 And imagine a huge explosion on that wall and you're over
6 here. And you're a fish on the bottom. That's about the
7 distance between the surface and the fish if there was an
8 explosion. So what I would like to see, while I know you
9 need the area to practice.

10 There was the comment about the sinking of the ship,
11 as the target would be in 1000 fathoms. I think it's
12 important to consider any ordnance or major explosions that
13 were to occur during the practice should be off of that
14 ledge into 1000 fathoms. It's not that far to move off
15 that shelf to deep water. It's an area of maybe five miles
16 to break from 180 fathoms down to over 1000 fathoms.

17 And the difference between being that wall to this
18 wall in a major explosion and all those fish that are
19 laying on the bottom and 1000 fathoms is a mile. So, that
20 would be my only is; is that western -- that western shelf
21 there is -- when you talk about environmental impact,
22 there's a lot of environment there. And some of it is not
23 very far down. And if it was considered -- you know, you
24 could drop a bomb there in any of that area, that would be
25 a mistake in some of those areas, because it's not that

-33-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104etchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 deep.
2 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Next speaker is Elise
3 Wolf.
4 ELSIE WOLF
5 Commented as follows:
6 My name is Elise Wolf. I'm on the Board of Directors
7 for the Kachemak Bay Conservation Society. Thank you for
8 being here. And I'll ditto what everyone else has said.
9 While we appreciate you coming to Homer, I have some
10 issues. And I'm surprised that you're not in Seward
11 because as you can see this map shows -- there's a few
12 tourism operators, whale watching companies that probably
13 would have something to say to you that probably wouldn't
14 be very nice.
15 And I think you missed them in your environmental
16 impact statement. You also missed Glacier Bay, I mean if
17 we're going to mimic the French like they do bombing
18 Tahiti, why not hit Glacier Bay too? I mean you picked two
19 -- one of the second most important areas for tourism in
20 Alaska other than Glacier Bay for whale tourism. So, I'm
21 just wondering why we're not in Glacier Bay as well?
22 Now the only reason that you can say that there's no
23 significant impacts on whales is because you deny the
24 impacts from seismic sound on whales. You have been sued
25 over this. The Navy has been sued, and you're going to be

-34-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104etchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 sued again. Not by our little company or little group down
2 here in Homer. But by the other big environmental groups,
3 which don't bother to come to these because they are
4 already planning suing you. So, we can just expect that.
5 But that's why. And the only reason that you can deny
6 impacts on whales is because you're getting your legal
7 advice from the tobacco industry or some other company that
8 -- lawyers that tell you that if you wait 50 years and say
9 that there's no correlation long enough, then everyone will
10 start to believe it, until the suits finally start coming
11 in, and the death toll is high that you can't deny it.
12 Now there is one antidotal evidence and antidotal
13 evidence that shows that beaching occurs with whales and
14 all the other things Olga said. There are science
15 professors around the world that testify on this all over
16 the globe. So, this is something that you just simply are
17 choosing to ignore. There's no evidence to the contrary.
18 The other issue that you have is -- well your timings
19 bad. But as Olga says, maybe there is no good timing.
20 Your mitigation is inadequate. Your cumulative impacts are
21 inadequate. Climate change shows that Ph changes are
22 proving to increase the conduction of sound in our oceans.
23 That's completely absent in your environmental impact
24 statement. So, you are -- your cumulative impacts, which
25 would include climate changes and the impacts thereof, and

-35-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 these Ph changes that we now have evidence of are
2 completely absent in your document.
3 And I'm going to go a head and wait until my time is
4 up. Thank you.
5 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Were you in here when I
6 talked about second helpings?
7 MS. WOLF: Yes.
8 MR. MICHAELSON: Okay, great. So the next speaker is
9 Mako Haggerty.
10 MAKO HAGGERTY
11 Commented as follows:
12 Hi, my name is Mako Haggerty. I run a water taxi
13 here, but I think for this event I'll be an assemblyman,
14 which I was just recently elected to assembly. So, I'll
15 speak from that standpoint. So, I want to thank you for
16 coming here. And the displays here are very informative
17 and I really appreciate that. I learned a lot tonight.
18 I think this openness that we have here is really
19 important. And what I seen on the -- not this slide here
20 but the one that had the deadline for the comments to the
21 EIS is January 25th, which gives the impression that the
22 communication is going to stop between the coastal
23 communities here and the Navy on the 25th. And I would
24 hope and ask you, to please keep the communication open
25 between the coastal communities beyond that deadline.

-36-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 Because there's going to the things that we learn and
2 there's going to be things that you learn, and I would
3 think that a healthy exchange of that information needs to
4 continue beyond that deadline.
5 And you're all real nice people. And I understand why
6 they sent you here, because you are nice people. And we
7 like to you know, sometimes we can be confrontational and
8 you've -- and there's a reason for that. Is because we
9 get the nice people and then you go on and do what you're
10 going to do anyway. And a lot of times those of us that
11 live in these coastal communities get a little tired of
12 that. And so, I guess the main point is let's please keep
13 the communication open. If there's going to be things that
14 are going to impact the various communities in this area,
15 we would like to be made aware of that in a timely fashion.
16 And also if you learn anything, please let us know what
17 that is. We like to learn things here too. Anything about
18 the whales or the environment and we learn things and maybe
19 you'd listen to us too. Thank you.
20 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Todd
21 Hoppe.
22 TODD HOPPE
23 Commented as follows:
24 Thank you. My name is Todd Hoppe, commercial
25 fisherman here in Homer and appreciate you gentlemen coming

-37-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Anchorage, AK 99501
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 and giving me the opportunity of speak. I don't --
 2 actually could you go back to that map please.
 3 I also am concerned about the continental shelf also.
 4 I make a large part of my living along there, and I'm
 5 concerned that Don explaining of activity along there. And
 6 you know, if say there was going to be some impact with
 7 whales and it did -- it wasn't learned until later on down
 8 the line from your things. The commercial fisherman will
 9 be the one's that are targeted first. You'll come up and
 10 do your test for 14 or 21 days, and go and what not. And
 11 down the line if something does happen it will be the
 12 commercial fisherman that are blamed for it first. In my
 13 opinion and in my experience in what we seen happen with
 14 steller sea lions and what was proven scientifically
 15 afterwards.
 16 And I'm also was here to make a comment on a comment -
 17 - public comment you had in Kodiak that your staff was
 18 maybe aware of, that there was a suggestion that you could
 19 hire some boats to do a fair amount of fishing to try to
 20 get the sperm whales to congregate in an area outside your
 21 boundary area. And that possibility could work. But what
 22 wasn't considered in that is who's going to be -- how do I
 23 want to word that -- there's not going to be anybody
 24 responsible for the quota. That's not going to come off
 25 the quota. It will be -- I'm not wording that right, I've

-38-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Anchorage, AK 99501
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 got a fart in my train there. The fish will not be
 2 accounted for. Right now we're in a quota system, every
 3 fish -- every pound that's caught is accounted for. If you
 4 have boats fishing black cod to try to pull the sperm
 5 whales out of your area -- your test area, those fish
 6 aren't really going to be eaten and not accounted for out
 7 of the quota. And that's a reverse -- negative impact on
 8 the quota. So, thank you very much for your time.
 9 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Allison do we have
 10 anymore cards?
 11 MS. TURNER: No.
 12 MR. MICHAELSON: Is there anyone who has been inspired
 13 by any of the other comments that they've heard to take
 14 their first opportunity to speak tonight? And by the way,
 15 I should mention we are staying until 8:30, so I did hear a
 16 couple people say they hadn't heard their questions
 17 answered regarding a couple thing. I think that maybe in a
 18 couple cases that may be because you arrived just as we
 19 were starting this. So, when we do finish this portion
 20 we're going to ask the people to go back to the stations
 21 and answer more questions if -- at least until 8:30. So,
 22 keep that in mind. I'm sorry, are you going to speak?
 23 MS. DULMA: I'll just speak from my heart.
 24 MR. MICHAELSON: This is your first. Okay.
 25 MS. DULMA: I don't have anything else.

-39-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 MR. MICHAELSON: You have three minutes, and just
2 state your name.
3 MS. DULMA: It will just take me a minute.
4 BRENDA DULMA
5 Commented as follows:
6 I just wanted to share -- I'm Brenda Dulma. And I
7 just wanted to share what my daughter said when I just said
8 that there was potentially going to be testing in the area.
9 And this was her one response, how can we think about this
10 when we have genetically unique species in our area. And
11 that was her concern. So, I just want to share that and
12 that may have been addressed, but -- and since I'm late, I
13 was spending time with my child. So, I just wanted to
14 share that. That we need to consider the bio-diversity
15 that we have in this area, it's very unique. And that
16 needs to be seriously considered before you make any final
17 decisions. Thank you.
18 MR. MICHAELSON: Okay, thanks. Yes, go ahead. Just -
19 - we'll get you to fill out a card later. Just go a head
20 and step up there.
21 STEPHANIE ZUNIGA
22 Commented as follows:
23 My name is Stephanie Zuniga and I am a teacher, third
24 through sixth grade as well as I used to be sea bird
25 biologist for Fish and Wildlife Service.

-40-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 And I also just heard of this last minute through a
2 friend. And I wish I would have heard about it before
3 because our kids right now are studying currents. And
4 involved with that are current events and currents in our
5 oceans. And last quarter we studied communication. So
6 this is a perfect -- I'd love for them to have been here
7 tonight. And if you want to stick around until Monday to
8 come into the schools.
9 So I would love to share this with my students because
10 it's -- this is their playground, this is their home, this
11 is where they are going to grow up and fish, be fisherman
12 and fisher women, be tour guides, be scientists,
13 biologists. And this matters to them and they need to be
14 involved in this process of public comment as well.
15 When I was a biologist I worked in the Gulf of Alaska
16 on the Barren Islands. And that area -- it's highlighted,
17 is within breeding grounds of sea lions, within the main
18 feeding grounds of sea birds and humpback whales. I mean I
19 remember standing on -- or sitting on cliffs watching our
20 sea birds and taking down data and looking out you know,
21 for miles away and just seeing humpbacks feed. I mean, 20
22 humpbacks feeding. And you know, I'm looking just -- just
23 in that area where that yellow is. And I'd be concerned,
24 I'd be really concerned and I'd want to know more before
25 just going in there and doing that. Especially that time

-41-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 of year.
2 It was interesting to hear Olga's comments about that
3 all times of year will effect these whales. But they are
4 feeding, they are getting the bulk of their food in them
5 before they head on south -- some of them. Thank you.
6 Thanks for coming.
7 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Anyone else? Yes, ma'am.
8 MS. WOLF: So is this the time to (indiscernible)?
9 MR. MICHAELSON: I'm just trying to exhaust....
10 MS. WOLF: Oh, (indiscernible).
11 MR. MICHAELSON:anyone who hasn't taken their
12 first time. No, I'm not quite there yet. Thanks. Okay, I
13 think we are there. So, anyone who would like to step up
14 and for another three minutes. And again, all I need is
15 your name again. Thanks.
16 ELISE WOLF
17 Commented as follows:
18 My name is Elsie Wolf and I'm on the Board of
19 Directors for Kachemak Bay Conservation Society. This is a
20 continuation of comments previously started.
21 For the audience, there is significant research done
22 by Natural Resources Defense Council on SONAR and seismic
23 testing. So this is a good website to start going in and
24 looking at links. Don't read the environmental impact
25 statement and expect that to be completely fully disclosed

-42-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 information about seismic testing and impact on whales or
2 fish.
3 This is highly concerning. And so let's talk about
4 mitigation for a minutes. Because your mitigation suggests
5 that you're going to power down and shut off your engines.
6 Well we know from what's going on in the Arctic -- seismic
7 testing right for oil and gas development, that it's highly
8 expensive -- very expensive for a vessel of that -- of
9 these sizes to power down. It's extremely costly. So what
10 happens is in the mitigation plans, note p-l-a-n-s, plan,
11 it says that you'll power down. But in reality, Shell for
12 example has yet to power down, because it's too expensive.
13 So they come back a year later when they do their reports
14 to the National Marine Fisheries Service and have in an
15 armful or basketful of excuses as to why they couldn't
16 power down.
17 And then let's talk about the people that are standing
18 on your decks. These three people or however many. Are
19 they going to be standing on the decks when you're out in
20 25 foot seas? How about eight foot seas? How about a
21 cloudy day? How about the dark? How about five hours of
22 daylight in the middle of the -- of you know, December
23 31st.
24 These are unrealistic mitigation plans. Now you're
25 talking about this in the middle of summer, and this is

-43-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 probably why. Because you have 18 or 19 hours of daylight.
2 Still, we have experts in the Arctic Ocean right now,
3 natives who cannot identify whales, and don't know the
4 difference between a bearded seal and a ring seal. So, if
5 Shell is having these problems and they're doing this all
6 the time in these Arctic waters, then I'm not sure -- I
7 don't -- I not -- I don't have any confidence that this is
8 going to happen.

9 National Marine Fisheries Service rubber stamps this
10 stuff all the time. The fact that we are coming up with no
11 significant impacts concerns me greatly. There's one final
12 comment that I have to say, in that there is philosophical
13 and spiritual and ethical proof if you want to call it, or
14 cultural standards among most human societies that place
15 some level of inherent of value. And what I mean by
16 inherent value, that is the value of a being outside of the
17 human want and desire. And that is completely absent in
18 your plan. Thank you.

19 MR. MICHAELSON: Who else would like to -- yes, go a
20 head.

21 ROBERTA HIGHLAND
22 Commented as follows:

23 My name is Roberta Highland and I didn't have time to
24 prepare comments because I did just find out about this
25 meeting. Now that I've heard the comments of people that

-44-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 really know what they're talking about in this area. I
2 have become very alarmed. And I going to ask a question
3 later. And what I would really like to see you do is don't
4 go back to your stations, I would prefer that you take
5 questions from the audience so we can all hear the answers.
6 And I would really hope you will do that since you spent
7 all the money and time to get here. That would be --
8 that's our usual preferred way of being able to communicate
9 with you.

10 So when we get to that point I am going to ask about
11 ocean acidification. And I'm going to find out what the
12 Navy is doing about ocean acidification. And now that I've
13 heard, and I should have figured that out, that this is
14 really a rich area. It's incredibly rich. And what in
15 heavens name are we thinking of even having allowed these
16 types of activities to go on before? I am now feeling like
17 this is a very poor place -- I don't know where a good
18 place is. But this is not one. So, I'm going to be going
19 on record saying, I don't what this activity going on in
20 this area at all.

21 And the other thing I'm going to bring is my four E's.
22 And my four E's is something I would like to go national,
23 state, worldwide when anything is brought up to make
24 decisions on. Is economy, environment, energy, and ethics.
25 And I am trying to get this being used as a template for

-45-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104, Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 every decision that gets made. And when I talk about
2 ethics, I mean is it ethical for the animals, is it ethical
3 for anything? Is it ethical for the worms? Of what we're
4 planning on doing. But when you take into consideration
5 economy, environment, and energy -- what the kind of energy
6 use is being taken to do any of these things. And what the
7 consequences are. I am trying to get that nation,
8 worldwide and you could help. And I hope you think it's a
9 good idea. Thank you.

10 MR. MICHAELSON: Anyone else who would like to come
11 up? Thank you.

12 OLGA VON ZIEGESAR
13 Commented as follows:

14 I also have not followed -- my name is Olga von
15 Ziegesar. I'm from Eye of the Whale and I study humpback
16 whales in Alaska, in the Gulf, and in Prince William Sound.

17 And there are huge numbers that migrate along that
18 shelf there. And we actually don't know exactly how they
19 migrate out in the deeper waters, but there definitely been
20 sightings of even Southeast Alaska humpbacks up there. So,
21 they must circle somewhat before they go to their
22 destinations to feed. I know that there have been a lot of
23 studies on this SONAR. It's been going on for years off of
24 Hawaii, off of New Zealand, off of California. The last
25 Marine Mammal Conference there were lots of papers on the

-46-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104, Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 effects of the SONAR. It's hard for me to believe that we
2 don't know more than you're saying. And I -- I'm afraid I
3 haven't read everything on it. But, I would propose that
4 there be no SONAR and no explosives. I can see -- I was
5 told that it's important that the boats come in that close
6 so that they can fly up into these interior areas. But, I
7 still don't really see why we should take any chances with
8 SONAR or explosives. Thank you.

9 STEPHANIE ZUNIGA

10 Commented as follows:

11 I just -- my name is Stephanie Zuniga. And I just
12 want to -- and somebody made the comment of how ocean
13 acidification or the change in Ph in our oceans is changing
14 the way that sound carries underwater. And I -- this is
15 pretty new for a lot of us. And I just wanted to suggest
16 to those involved in making these decisions with our
17 communities to watch A Sea Change, which is a movie, a
18 documentary that is going to be here in Homer on Tuesday
19 night I believe. I hope everyone here gets a chance to go
20 watch that. It's on ocean acidification and there is
21 website, a sea change.com I think it's called. And I would
22 suggest that that be viewed by our decision makers, as an
23 educator. Thank you.

24 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Is there anyone else who
25 would like a first or second chance?

-47-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 ROBERT ARCHIBALD
2 Commented as follows:
3 My name is Robert Archibald again. And I'm looking in
4 this booklet here, and I haven't had much of a chance to
5 look at your EIS. But, one thing that caught my attention
6 is when they would power down. Is that going to be active
7 SONAR at 1000 feet or 1000 yards? And again, shut it off
8 at 500. And I don't know if that -- I do know that at 1000
9 yards it's still a pretty strong signal. And I don't know
10 the research that's gone on there. But in a high
11 population of mammals it seems a little ridiculous to me to
12 expect to be able to be able to provide a safe environment
13 at 1000 feet when you're going to shut them off.
14 And also, I'm a little disappointed in our State for
15 not putting up a little more -- if we have industry come in
16 with an operation like this, they would certainly be out
17 there demanding a little bit better information to the
18 public than what you people are providing. And I say that
19 myself because I haven't had a chance to review that. And
20 I don't think it's been out -- put out to the general
21 public. And this operation that you're proposing, be it
22 warranted for our national security, I think you know, I
23 don't have a problem with that. I have a problem with the
24 destruction with the environment. And I think everybody
25 should have a little bit better knowledge of what's going

-48-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 here, so. And I think it should be processed through the
2 State also. And I haven't heard anything about the State
3 being involved, so. Thank you.
4 MR. MICHAELSON: Anyone else? If not a couple things
5 from a process standpoint. Can we go back to the last
6 slide again? My favorite slide, because it tells you how
7 you can get involved.
8 Again, the close of comment period is going to be the
9 25th. There is a lot of information there, it's all
10 assessable on the website. Obviously you can go to which
11 ever portion of it, there are a lot of resources to be
12 looked at. You can go to the ones that you are most
13 interested in.
14 In terms of involvement, this is the public portion of
15 it. It's probably worth mentioning that on a mail list and
16 outreach to all the relevant federal, state agencies that
17 was part of this EIS. That's probably worth mentioning
18 too. And I can see a woman raising her hand who made a
19 request. I just -- I don't want to act like I ignored it.
20 We have a format that we're using for the past meetings,
21 this meeting, and future meetings. It does not involve a
22 town hall type meeting. So, I'm going to go into recess
23 and allow the people to go back to their poster stations,
24 unless someone has an additional comment who hasn't had
25 their second helping yet. All right. So, would you like

-49-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 to make a comment? All I need is your name.
2 MS. FEILER: Linda Feiler. Before I came I didn't
3 know about all the....
4 MR. MICHAELSON: Can you pull the mike down so we can
5 hear you? We can't hear you.
6 LINDA FEILER
7 Commented as follows:
8 Sorry, Linda Feiler. Before I came I didn't know
9 about the inner bombs that were going to be dropped, the
10 missiles, the gun shells, the small arms, the pyro flares,
11 the dyes, the expended materials, the hazardous materials.
12 I didn't know a lot of it, and most of the community
13 doesn't know a lot about it because like everything else,
14 you come into the community, bang-o we have these meetings.
15 Nobody ever gets their questions answered.
16 If we have questions and we want them answered, that's
17 why a lot of us come here. You know, because you're the
18 ones who has the answers. I wanted to know how many
19 pounds, how many bombs, how much toxic material is going
20 into the water. You've done this for 40 year for 14 days,
21 40 years you've done it in various parts all over the
22 United States. And I think most of us want to know where
23 we call to get an answer because it's going to be in the
24 newspaper. And we're going to have a dialog with ourselves
25 through the radio station and we want to know were we call

-50-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 and where we get answers. Who's going to answer our
2 questions before the 25th?
3 MS. HIGHLAND: A phone number, that's what I want is a
4 phone number.
5 MS. FEILER: Yeah. A phone number, a name -- someone
6 who's actually going to be there. And it probably should
7 be 20 or 30 people there....
8 MR. MICHAELSON: So far all of the questions I heard
9 asked, I believe the documentation is in a narrative if you
10 will avail yourself of it.
11 MS. FEILER: No. Because we already that. We already
12 looked through the IRS [sic] and found out -- sitting with
13 the expert here, that the answers were not in there. It
14 doesn't say. I've asked all -- every single one of you
15 already, how many, how many pounds, what are they made of,
16 what are the bombs made of? I want -- we what, I'm sure
17 because I know there's at least 10 of us here who believe
18 the same thing. We just want answers, that's all. And we
19 want to know how we can get answers. And if we know that
20 we're not going to be given answers, that is going to be
21 highly publicized. So, please let us know who will answer
22 any questions we have before the 25th. Thank you.
23 MS. HIGHLAND: And a phone number.
24 MR. MICHAELSON: Would you like to make a second
25 comment?

-51-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 MS. DULMA: Yes.

2 MR. MICHAELSON: Sure.

3 BRENDA DULMA

4 Commented as follows:

5 I'm Brenda Dulma, very concerned citizen. I pick up
6 this beautiful image of a sea anemone on the front cover.
7 And I heard an amazing story at our museum the other day.
8 We had a -- so my question is, what is the impact of this
9 testing on the oceans invertebrates? The story I heard was
10 in our own museum we had a sea anemone that hasn't opened
11 up for four months because one fish is harassing it. So,
12 if this is the response to an invertebrate in a very safe
13 environment, that a fish is harassing it. What are the
14 studies on all invertebrates with this kind of testing?
15 So, my questions is, how are the invertebrates responding
16 and other micro-organisms that we have no impact in this
17 web of life? So, my question is, for my third time, what
18 are the impacts on the invertebrates and micro-organisms in
19 the ocean habitat from the testing? Thank you.

20 WHITNEY LOWE

21 Commented as follows:

22 My name is Whitney Lowe. And just a one other --
23 couple other things I want to add in addition to my earlier
24 comments. I want to mention you know, it was brought up
25 too that there's been a good bit of research done with

-52-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 seismic testing in some of the marine environments around
2 here. And the oil companies have actually found that
3 there's a possibility of residence for seismic testing up
4 to 500 miles in some areas. And I know a lot of the focus
5 has been on what's going on with certain marine mammals,
6 such as the effects on whales. But the other thing I would
7 ask you to really think about is that nobody is also taking
8 about -- the whales aren't the only creatures in the ocean
9 and we don't know how this might effect sharks, fish, other
10 animals that are not coming up and beaching themselves that
11 are likely to be affected by this as well.

12 So, while there's a lot study on certain marine
13 mammals, like whales the very fact that we know this is
14 killing a number of marine mammals, would ask us to think,
15 maybe this is also having other damaging effects on other
16 marine life that we really don't know about it. Is this
17 really a good idea to engage in it. Thank you.

18 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Did I see someone else
19 who have something they might want to say?

20 ROBERTA HIGHLAND

21 Commented as follows:

22 I just have to wonder you know, I was talking to
23 everyone presenting and I think that we have come a long
24 way. And that people just don't throw their trash in the
25 ocean anymore they used to, hopefully. I think the Navy's

-53-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 probably come a long way, and they've hired scientists and
 2 they've hired environmentally conscientious people. But I
 3 still say, we are moving to fast at this point to just keep
 4 going. At some point the environmental impact has got to
 5 be totally important to each of us. And most important.
 6 So, I'm glad that there are better things happening all
 7 over the place. But I'm also worried -- what is your
 8 munition? What are you throwing into the ocean? I think I
 9 have a right to know. I mean is that a question of
 10 defense? Because if I know then some Arab might find out?
 11 To bad, I want to know what you're throwing in the ocean.
 12 And I have a right to know.
 13 What the difference between D-U and agent orange?
 14 Okay. That's it.
 15 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much for coming
 16 tonight. We're only going to have a little bit of time
 17 left here at the poster stations. But, let's take
 18 advantage of what we have. And I've had -- did you not
 19 have your second chance?
 20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How.....
 21 MR. MICHAELSON: We're not going to -- just to be
 22 clear. We're not going to do a town hall. If you have a
 23 comment I need you to make it there, it will be recorded on
 24 the transcript. If you have a question that you want to
 25 have answered tonight, I need you to go back to the poster

-54-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 stations. All right? So, I think that all you probably
 2 have is a question, right? Right. That's what I thought.
 3 Okay. So we're going to adjourn this portion of the
 4 hearing and go back to the poster stations. Thank you
 5 very, very much for your hospitality and asking us into
 6 your community, and we appreciate you coming.
 7 (Recess)
 8 GENEVA CRAIG
 9 Ms. Craig was seated next to Ms. Feiler
 10 Comments read by Linda Feiler:
 11 Okay. I'm speaking for Geneva Craig, who is 91 years
 12 old. And this is what she has to say:
 13 I believe in life. I do not believe in killing any
 14 living creature. The oceans are full of life. My reason
 15 for being a long time vegetarian is to avoid having any
 16 creature killed on my behalf. How could you practice
 17 bombing and not kill? I am strongly against any practice
 18 that will harm, stress, or kill in the ocean or on the
 19 land.
 20 I once supported the military because I believed it
 21 would prevent death. But now I have seen that we need to
 22 mend our ways and negotiate or learn ways to have peace.
 23 That was from Geneva Craig, who lives in Homer.....
 24 LINDA FEILER
 25 Commented as follows:

-55-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1and my name is Linda Feiler, and I live in Anchor
2 Point. Unfortunately my brother has brain cancer and I
3 told him I was coming to the meeting, and he wished me luck
4 and said, it's pathetic that we even have to comment on
5 issues like this. I believe that we've done enough damage
6 to our food sources and enough damage to our environment,
7 enough damage to our seas and land. And that I don't
8 believe that it's necessary for anyone to practice harming
9 something else, killing our food sources, or killing our
10 wildlife in the name of the military. If you need to kill
11 in order to help us, what good does it do? Thank you very
12 much.

13 JASPER KIGAR

14 Commented as follows:

15 My name is Jasper Kigar, I live and work in Homer,
16 Alaska. I'm very impressed with the U.S. Navy's
17 presentation and importance that they're placing on
18 protecting marine animals. And I'm confident that the U.S.
19 Navy is doing it's best to protect marine animals in the
20 area in any of its activities.

21 I understand after today that the U.S. Navy uses local
22 fishing fleets and boat fleets in its war games as decoys
23 and targets or for other purposes. And I would encourage
24 the U.S. Navy to continue to use these fleets and to use
25 more local Alaskan vessels in its activities in order to

-56-

1 stimulate the local economy. Thank you.

2 MR. MICHAELSON: This is Lewis Michaelson, it is now
3 8:30 p.m. here in Homer. We have concluded and are
4 adjourning the formal portion of the project -- excuse me
5 the public hearing although we are going keep the poster
6 stations open for a short time because there is a fairly
7 large crowd here still asking questions. Thank you.

8 (Hearing adjourned)

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

-57-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Kenai, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE
2 I, CLYDE PASTERSKI, hereby certify that the foregoing
3 pages numbered 4 through 57 are a true, accurate, and
4 complete transcript of Hearings held in Homer, Alaska on
5 the Gulf of Alaska Navy Training Activities Draft
6 Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental
7 Impact Statement transcribed by me from a copy of the
8 electronic sound recording to the best of my knowledge and
9 ability.

10
11
12 Date Clyde Pasterski, Transcriber
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

-58-

1 I.7.1.4 JUNEAU

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Kennebunk, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC HEARING ON
GULF OF ALASKA NAVY TRAINING ACTIVITIES
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/OVERSEAS ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT
January 11, 2010
5:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.
Juneau Arts and Culture Center
Main Hall
350 Whittier Street
Juneau, Alaska 99801

-1-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Kennebunk, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MODERATOR

Lewis Michaelson
Katz & Associates
4250 Executive Square
Suite 670
La Jolla, California 92037

PANELISTS

Alex Stone
NOICEIAS
COMFACFLT Environmental
NASNI
P.O. Box 357033
San Diego, California 93135

Vic Weber, CDR, USN
COMTHIRDEFLT
53690 Tomahawk Drive
San Diego, California 92147

Amy Cox, LI, NOAA
National Oceanic and
Atmospheric Administration
NMFS Alaska Region
222 West 7th Avenue, Room 517
Anchorage, Alaska 99513

-2-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104, Bethel, AK 99801
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		
3	Greg Brown	Page 20
4	Lynn Wilber	Page 21/41
5	Alex Simon	Page 23
6	Andrea Doll	Page 25
7	Jan Crichton	Page 27
8	Mark Anderson	Page 28/43
9	Victoria Dance	Page 30
10	James Voelckers	Page 32
11	Tina Brown	Page 34/44
12	Dixie Belcher	Page 35
13	Frank Bergstrom	Page 36
14	Henry Larsen	Page 37
15	Murray Walsh	Page 38
16	Dan Holt	Page 40

- 3 -

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104, Bethel, AK 99801
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 written statement, and you may turn it in to the
2 registration table or you may read it out loud if you can
3 do so within the time -- three minute time limit.
4 Finally, please honor any request that I make for you
5 to stop speaking when you reach the three minute time
6 limit. In order to make that easy for you to do, I have
7 two little signs here. I'll hold this one up when you have
8 30 seconds left of your three minutes, that makes it easy
9 to find a comfortable place to wrap up. And then when we
10 reach the three minute, I'll hold up this one. I think the
11 meaning is pretty clear with that. Okay?
12 So we are now ready to begin with the first speakers.
13 What I like to do is read several a head, so that you can
14 get an idea where you're coming up in the rotation, so I
15 don't surprise you when I read your name. So the five that
16 I have -- I apologize in advance for mispronouncing names,
17 it's inevitable. Greg Brown, Lynn Wilbur, Alex Simon,
18 Andrea Doll, and Jan Christian, Crighton [ph], Crichton, who
19 knows, I'm sorry. I'm sure she'll tell me when she gets up
20 here or he does, it could be either. So again, Greg Brown
21 please approach. And just keep in mind all I need is your
22 name. I don't need address, serial number, or any of that
23 good -- just a name so that we know in the transcript who
24 was speaking.
25 MR. BROWN: Ready?

- 19 -

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104, Anchorage, AK 99501
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 MR. MICHAELSON: Yes.
 2 GREG BROWN
 3 Commented as follows:
 4 Okay. My name is Greg Brown. I have no military
 5 experience, but I am a licensed commercial pilot. I'm also
 6 a licensed boat captain. And I've operated a little bit in
 7 Alaska. Live here in Juneau.
 8 And although I'm opposed to this exercise -- I'm not
 9 comfortable at all with the analysis regarding the air
 10 pollution and the water pollution associated with it. My
 11 biggest issues is the Navy SONAR activity. I found it
 12 pretty questionable when I asked why this had to be done in
 13 one of the richest areas in the world for marine mammals
 14 and fish activity. And why it had to be done in May and
 15 June. And the response was, well for safety sake we --
 16 that's the most calm weather for us to do that. And
 17 anybody -- all of us in Alaska, we go out in weather in
 18 November, December, and January. We seem to be able to get
 19 through it okay. So, I think that was a pretty -- that's
 20 not a very good comment in opinion.
 21 I am very concerned about the whales. I make -- I do
 22 whale watching in addition to other activities here in
 23 Juneau. And I'm not at all comfortable that we really know
 24 what the effect of this -- the SONAR, this high intensity
 25 SONAR will do. Thank you very much for your comments and

-20-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104, Anchorage, AK 99501
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 thank you very much for letting us make these comments.
 2 MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thanks for getting us off to a
 3 good start. Lynn Wilbur.
 4 LYNN WILBER
 5 Commented as follows:
 6 I'm Lynn Wilber. I just want it on the record I came
 7 from Sitka. There's quite a few concerned folks over in
 8 Sitka as well, couldn't make it due to the short notice.
 9 I have quite a few concerns. Air quality is supposed
 10 to be 123 fold increase of emissions, including green house
 11 gas emissions. There's only going to be a 3000 foot window
 12 and then you're not going to consider. You think that
 13 these emissions, pollutants will disburse through
 14 precipitation or dealt with. No mitigation plan.
 15 I'm sorry, I support the no action alternative on that
 16 one. Expended materials, the pollutants involved in that
 17 are heavy metals, tungsten, which is toxic to marine life.
 18 Fluoride compounds, which is toxic. One hundred and fifty
 19 times the safe level of hydrogen cyanide, these are all
 20 from bombs, and sonobuoys and other training materials --
 21 also plastics. I'm hoping people are following the issue
 22 we're having in the ocean right now with plastics building
 23 up in gyre, and taking pretty much over the Pacific.
 24 That's a problem to me and I don't see that you've got
 25 much of a mitigation plan for that. I think you're 360

-21-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Bethel, AK 99501
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 percent increase on that one, in your alternative two. So,
 2 I support the no action alternative on that as well.
 3 On fish you agree that there's not a lot of studies
 4 done with sound. There's a lot of disagreement exactly on
 5 how to approach, using controls. You mentioned Grey
 6 literature, yet you reference your own documents, and
 7 letters, and impact statements invalidating your -- no
 8 basically not much of mitigation as far as fish are
 9 concerned. And I can go into more detail later, because
 10 I'm going to run out of time. But I'm going to support the
 11 no action alternative where fish are concerned.
 12 And marine mammals, this is probably where it's going
 13 to hit home for a lot of people. I too, am concerned about
 14 SONAR. Beaked whales are the most vulnerable because
 15 they're deep divers. And in the Bahamas in 2000 there were
 16 some expert witnesses that can attest to what happened
 17 there. I just don't think that in the Gulf of Alaska your
 18 Beaufort 3 conditions are going to be not be really good
 19 for spotting whales. Whale experts have made the comments
 20 that you really can't spot whales very well in anything
 21 over a Beaufort 1 in the Gulf of Alaska.
 22 So, the use of onboard spotters, and you mentioned
 23 maybe possibility ariel craft if the conditions are right
 24 and if they have time, is how I interrupted your mitigation
 25 on that. I just don't think that's suffice. So, again I'm

-22-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Bethel, AK 99501
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 supporting the no action alternative. It seems like you've
 2 dismissed a lot of recommended mitigation's. You've got a
 3 series of them, you've got a lot of them you've dismissed.
 4 Including recommendations from NOAA. And I can go into
 5 that in a little more detail if we get to a second round.
 6 But I'm running out of time. So, again I support the no
 7 action alternative. Thank you.
 8 MR. MICHAELSON: Alex Simon.
 9 ALEX SIMON
 10 Commented as follows:
 11 Thanks for the opportunity to speak. So my name is
 12 Alex Simon. I did have a chance to speak with some of you
 13 before and one of the things that impressed me, you seemed
 14 like well intentioned individuals.
 15 I think the reason why I'm supporting the no action
 16 alternative. Well there's several reasons. But one of the
 17 things, if we look at the history of the military in the
 18 United States, there's a long history of very well
 19 intentioned people concerned with national defense.
 20 Implementing programs that result in long term
 21 environmental health.
 22 And so, before I lived in Alaska I lived in Utah. And
 23 some of you might be familiar with down winders. These are
 24 victims of above ground atomic testing in the 1950's. And
 25 so there's still people alive today who -- and I've met

-23-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Bethel, AK 99801
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 many of these individuals, who suffer from cancers and
2 other effects. And I think you know, if you look back then
3 we were facing you know, the Soviet Union. An adversary
4 that was using weapons that were pretty much comparable to
5 what we had, as far as technology. And that -- I think
6 that was a case of well intentioned individuals, very
7 concerned about national defense, like yourselves. And I
8 worry about those mistakes being repeated.

9 Particularly, back then we were dealing with concerns
10 of human life. I assume the bar is set lower for your
11 concerns about marine life.

12 A second point is I think that geo-politics have
13 changed substantially since then. Military realities that
14 we're facing, really our main adversary at this point at
15 least, I realize there are potential for others to come
16 along. But, is Al-Queda, Al-Queda doesn't have a Navy.
17 That -- none of our adversary's really have advanced
18 Navy's. You know, I mean if we look at you know, Iran, et
19 cetera. That we're spending as much now on the Military as
20 all the nations combined. I really, I know, the case could
21 be made better back in the 1950's that it was critical that
22 such tests be conducted. I don't really think this is
23 critical for national defense.

24 A third point that I would like to make. If we look
25 at the local fisheries. There's many thing --

-24-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Bethel, AK 99801
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 unfortunately whether or not this testing is done, the
2 fisheries, the aquatic life, they're already under a lot of
3 stress. And so locally, of course the lands rising faster
4 than the oceans, is that many of the local salmon runs
5 apparently go extinct due to global warming. That there's
6 already all kinds of problems. I think to step in and
7 exacerbate those problems seems unwise. Okay. That's all
8 I have to say. Thank you for your time and consideration.

9 MR. MICHAELSON: Then next speaker is Andrea Doll.

10 ANDREA DOLL

11 Commented as follows:

12 Well thank you -- thank you for giving me the
13 opportunity. I am not a member of the military, although
14 I've been a military dependent wife for over 30 years. My
15 husband was a DESERON Commander that did exercises in the
16 Gulf for as long as I can remember. And then I had the
17 opportunity to serve the public as a legislator and was on
18 the Military Affairs Committee.

19 So, I'm very interested in what's going on here
20 tonight. And my suspicion is that this huge military
21 machine is moving forward and it's going to take an awful
22 lot to stop it. We have been in that no action alternative
23 for some time, not using SONAR up here. But now the Navy
24 wishes to go not only to one, but they want to go to two.
25 And I am not quite sure just what kind of testimony you're

-25-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 going to hear tonight that will change this machine that's
2 moving forward, to stop that moving and go back to the no
3 action alternative.

4 I am very interested in hearing comments on that from
5 the military and to see exactly what kind of effect this
6 will have -- our testimony here tonight, on you. I think
7 that is fairly much what I wanted to say on this. I did
8 want to point out that while I was in the Capital I was
9 mailed those circular things that you turn around and you
10 can see what kind of whale you're looking at. When you
11 tell me that the Navy is going to be trained on these
12 watches, where they stand on the destroyer and they look
13 out and they see some movement, and then twirl that little
14 card around and say, I want to get to -- let me get to the
15 control tower here and talk to you about this -- you know,
16 I mean it's really pretty laughable actually.

17 So, I am hoping that by this testimony you will be
18 able to show us what areas we will be able to have a real
19 effect on when you start these exercises. I know there are
20 some things the Navy must do, they have to do. And there's
21 no give or take. But there are areas that there are give
22 and take. How can we effect those areas, how can we really
23 have that impact? That is what I would like to know and
24 would like to get some kind of response on. Thank you very
25 much.

-26-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 MR. MICHAELSON: I'm going to go a head and read ahead
2 several names. Jan Crichton, Mark Anderson, Victoria, I'm
3 not sure whether it's Dance or Banof [ph] or something
4 else, and James Voelckers. Jan.

5 MS. CRICHTON: It's Jan Crichton.

6 MR. MICHAELSON: Say it on the microphone.

7 MS. CRICHTON: It's Jan Crichton.

8 MR. MICHAELSON: Okay.

9 JAN CRICHTON

10 Commented as follows:

11 Hi. Alaska already has a long standing problem and
12 history....

13 MR. MICHAELSON: Just pull it up to you so we can
14 hear.

15 MS. CRICHTON: Alaska already has.....

16 MR. MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

17 MS. CRICHTON:a pretty long standing problem
18 with leftovers from the military. All kinds of health and
19 environmental issues where the military has been real eager
20 to go in and do exciting new things. And then left and
21 dumped problems and toxins for future decades to have to
22 deal with. And the cost has been really high to all of us.

23 Also, Alaska is one of the last places that has a
24 really viable, healthy marine mammal population. But
25 they're stressed our. They're going to start experiencing

-27-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 problems, some of them already are. The pinipits and
2 marine mammals are already going down in population, and we
3 don't even know why. I think it's unwise to start shooting
4 off active SONAR in their home waters. Especially during
5 the summer months, which are very critical to them for
6 feeding and everything. We have a short summer, they need
7 that. They need to be uninterrupted. I would have to
8 support the no action alternative simply because it does
9 not include any active SONAR, and that's the thing that
10 concerns me the most.

11 We know that it has already caused problems off
12 California and I don't think the negative impacts that have
13 been happening there have even been researched. It's not a
14 time for us to turn around and start doing this in Alaska
15 waters. I think the problem of potential impacts on marine
16 mammals is not acceptable or reasonable given the perceived
17 need to these repeated active SONAR exercises when I don't
18 really see any good reason to do it. That's basically it.

19 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Mark Anderson.

20 MARK ANDERSON

21 Commented as follows:

22 Yeah. My name is Mark Anderson and I am also in
23 support of the no action alternative. I find the analysis
24 has overlooked, and I think made some incorrect
25 conclusions. Cultural resources, native people, and

-28-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 actually all people of Alaska consider our wildlife a
2 cultural resource. So, I think if you are having an effect
3 on wildlife you are effecting cultural resources.

4 Socioeconomics, a large developing industry in Alaska
5 is marine mammal observation. Also, bird observation. I
6 don't think you've done a good enough analysis on effects
7 to birds, of which there are millions and millions of sea
8 birds out there in this area at this time. May and June is
9 a critical time for them. A lot of them have flown from
10 the Southern Hemisphere to get here. We have very large
11 migration routes and if something upsets them along the
12 migration route. We've been having some serious problems.
13 I don't think you've done enough research on what happens
14 to fish. Most fish have an air bladder that is going to be
15 negatively effected by a sound blast. We know that sound
16 does have an effect of fish, and I don't think you've
17 actually studied that enough to know what is going to
18 happen to the fish.

19 Alaska has a long history of cooperative management
20 between the State and the Federal government. And that's
21 why we still do have marine mammals and fish here. But,
22 they are stressed. We have several endangered species that
23 we're talking about here. And I think that the Endangered
24 Species Act has been really overlooked in your analysis as
25 well. I guess that's really all the comments I have. I

-29-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Scotchman, AK 99501
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 think -- I'm not sure you're going to hear a lot of people
 2 supporting alternative one or two here tonight. I think
 3 that the current level of operations in Alaska is
 4 acceptable. And I think you may just be moving to Alaska
 5 because you think that you can get it done -- you can do it
 6 here where you've had quite a bit of public opposition to
 7 doing it down south and in other areas where you've tried
 8 this before.

9 So, those are my comments. Thank you.

10 MR. MICHAELSON: Victoria.

11 MS. DANCE: Can someone put up the slide of the NEPA
 12 process again?

13 MR. MICHAELSON: All right. We can probably pull that
 14 up. Could you make explicit records though, because they
 15 won't be able to see that in the transcript.

16 MS. DANCE: Okay. So, it's actually Dance, like what
 17 you do on Saturday nights.

18 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

19 VICTORIA DANCE

20 Commented as follows:

21 Victoria Dance. And I'm wondering if this process is
 22 genuine in it's intent. Because I know that you went
 23 through the process in -- or the Navy went through the
 24 process in Southern California when you used the SONAR.
 25 And there was a protest, and one of the outcomes of that

-30-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Scotchman, AK 99501
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 protest was a lawsuit that banned the use of the SONAR.
 2 But then the courts lifted the ban, and they went a head --
 3 the Navy went a head and used the SONAR that they're
 4 wanting to use up here. That was in August. Two weeks
 5 later three great blue whales were reported as floating
 6 dead in that area, the localized area. And then October
 7 2nd another was found dead off of Big Sir. And then
 8 another washed on shore in Fort Bragg. So, when there's
 9 talk about protective measures and those protective
 10 measures being to localize. What we see in -- and of
 11 course we can't prove, that those whales were damaged by
 12 the SONAR. But there's a migration pattern you know, how
 13 can you localize it? I mean you can really localize it.
 14 So, that as a protective measure, I don't think that's
 15 realistic.

16 And then the other protective measure mentioned was
 17 about minimal impact. So, I guess I'd want to know what
 18 the definition of minimal is, because those are three --
 19 those were instances that became visible. But the
 20 unfortunate thing about the ocean is that there's so much
 21 that is invisible. And that was referred to very nicely by
 22 some previous comments about what we can see that has
 23 happened in the Navy's training to birds, and environment,
 24 above -- in the air.

25 And so, I'd have to say I question the genuine intent

-31-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hancock Avenue # 104, Bethel, AK 99801
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 of the Navy stewarding the environment. And I'm really
 2 kind of offended that you use it. I'm questioning this
 3 process that feels like a charade when we see what happened
 4 in Southern California. And I forget the fellows name who
 5 mentioned that he felt like it was -- or Jan -- well, I'm
 6 sorry that I can refer back to some wonderful comments.
 7 But I can refer to Andrea's suspicion that this is a
 8 machine that is going to be difficult to stop. And then
 9 also, Jan's comment on not enough adequate research. It's
 10 only been a year since these events happened in Southern
 11 California. And here you're wanting to go again without
 12 really understanding what you're doing. Thank you very
 13 much.

14 MR. MICHAELSON: The next speaker is James Voelckers.

15 JAMES VOELCKERS

16 Commented as follows:

17 Hello, my name is James Voelckers. Thank you for the
 18 opportunity to speak. I want to express my gratitude first
 19 off to the Navy for keeping us well defended, and other
 20 military institutions. However, I believe there are a
 21 number of points that they have not considered or that are
 22 getting overlooked.

23 You mentioned realistic training a number of times.
 24 Yet, as was brought up before we don't really have any
 25 enemies with naval capabilities. It seems like the

-32-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hancock Avenue # 104, Bethel, AK 99801
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 terrorists certainly don't. So that leaves China or
 2 Russia. With the proliferation of spy satellites it seems
 3 very unlikely that they would be able to attack us with any
 4 sort of sizable surface craft, which brings me to submarine
 5 detection. Which is what I think many of us are here for,
 6 with the SONAR, active SONAR. That seems like -- the only
 7 use for it if we know that they're there. And if we know
 8 that they're there, then I mean, they're not doing what
 9 submarines are supposed to do. Which is, I believe
 10 initiate a first strike. There are way to few ships to
 11 prevent such a first strike, so this seem to me to be a
 12 moot point. We can find them if we know they're there.

13 Secondly, I would wonder why exactly why we are doing
 14 this hear. This was just brought up, it happened in
 15 California, to much public outcry. Which is why I think
 16 perhaps, you'll try here for a lighter population density
 17 so, less protest. However, Alaskan waters are some of the
 18 most -- most fertile in the entire world. Especially this
 19 area which is very pristine. And as you said, that you
 20 were only going to be doing this in the summer months, that
 21 that's when I believe most marine mammals are feeding in
 22 these fertile waters. They go to Hawaii, I believe in the
 23 winter.

24 So, why would our enemies, if we have them, be they
 25 China or Russia, not attack us in the winter when you

-33-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 haven't trained, or during a storm. It seems like it's a
 2 sunny day situation to be running a lot of naval exercises
 3 on sunny days and good weather in the Gulf. Whereas, if
 4 somebody actually did have harmful intent, it seems like
 5 they would want to hit us when a, we could be least likely
 6 to respond. So, I would question why you were not using
 7 the winter weather to be fully prepared and fully trained.

8 And so in conclusion, I believe I would ask that some
 9 of these activities could not be carried out instead in the
 10 deep waters of perhaps the Hawaiian coast or other Pacific
 11 where they wouldn't, as adversely effect the ocean. I
 12 realize you will probably do whatever you have to do.
 13 Which is your job. But here perhaps is not the best
 14 location. Thank you.

15 MR. MICHAELSON: I'm going to read forward again. The
 16 next speaker will be Tina Brown, Dixie Belcher, Frank
 17 Bergstrom, Henry Larsen, and Murray Walsh. Tina Brown.

18 TINA BROWN

19 Commented as follows:

20 I'm Tina Brown. I support the no action alternative
 21 also. The other alternatives pose to many air and sea
 22 pollution problems. And the Navy SONAR testing endangers
 23 marine wildlife. We've listed birds, fish, turtles, whales
 24 of course, all marine mammals.

25 Not even the Navy knows all of the behavioral and

-34-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 physiological effects of SONAR testing on marine life.
 2 Clearly the Navy needs to train. But choosing some of the
 3 most prolific marine wildlife areas in the United States,
 4 if not the world, particularly at a time when migrating
 5 marine life is there is irresponsible. This is not the
 6 place to practice. And the time you chose is not the time
 7 to practice there. Not the place and not the time. Thank
 8 you.

9 MR. MICHAELSON: Dixie Belcher.

10 DIXIE BELCHER

11 Commented as follows:

12 My name is Dixie Belcher, I'm with Turning the Tides
 13 in Juneau. Turning the Tides raises awareness about what
 14 is happening to the ocean and the effect it has on human
 15 health. I want to speak especially to the 360 degree
 16 increase in water pollution and the 123 fold increase in
 17 air pollution. The ocean is 71 percent of our planet. It
 18 provides food, and according to Dr. Sylvia Earle, up to 85
 19 percent of the worlds oxygen. We cannot live without the
 20 ocean.

21 We have dumped millions of tons of poisons, chemicals,
 22 radioactive waste, and other garbage into the ocean. Some
 23 whales and other sea mammals can now be legally classified
 24 as toxic dumps. We have thousands of dead zones where
 25 nothing grows. The largest 1000's of square miles. We are

-35-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 finding fish with cancer. What are we thinking?
2 The ocean is in fragile health. Ocean scientists
3 often refer to their work now as, documenting the decline.
4 If we are to survive we must stop contributing to the
5 demise of the ocean. We must stop using the sea's and the
6 life within them as toxic dumps to do with as we please. I
7 believe the greatest threat to the United States and to the
8 planet is irretrievably damaged ocean.
9 Please consider if SONAR testing and military dumping
10 are contributing to the health of the ocean or furthering
11 its demise. If it's impossible to stop SONAR and
12 additional poisoning of air and water from military
13 exercises, please use the no action alternative. Thank
14 you.
15 MR. MICHAELSON: Frank Bergstrom.
16 FRANK BERGSTROM
17 Commented as follows:
18 Gentlemen, lady I would -- I've got very brief
19 comments here. Not particularly well prepared for them.
20 But it's surprising to say, I would like to thank the Navy
21 for fulfilling its mission. I would like to thank you for
22 training for that mission. I would like to thank you for
23 training all the young sailors and aviators, daughters and
24 sons that come from our communities to join the Navy to
25 protect this country. You do a great job. And I

-36-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 appreciate it very much.
2 I would like to thank you for a careful analysis of
3 this issue. I can't think of another nations military in
4 the world that would go to such efforts to do their job and
5 to take care of the environment at the same time. I would
6 like to thank you for coming to Alaska to fulfill that
7 mission. I would only ask that when you do, you might stop
8 into Juneau, buy some gas, get a burger or two, and spend
9 some time. Thank you very much.
10 MR. MICHAELSON: Mr. Bergstrom, I just need to ask you
11 -- if you could just say your name for the record.
12 MR. BERGSTROM: My name is Frank Bergstrom from
13 Juneau.
14 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Henry Larsen.
15 HENRY LARSEN
16 Commented as follows:
17 Gunalcheesh. Ya'x gu 'oo, my English name is Henry
18 Larsen, L-a-r-s-e-n. I too am opposed to against the --
19 what was that?
20 (Mr. Larsen conferred with Ms. Wilbur)
21 I too support the no action alternative. I think you
22 need to -- the Navy needs to do more studies on the fish
23 and the marine life you know, too. I think they need to do
24 that because, I was talking to somebody earlier, and I too
25 am a captain. I have a 200 ton license. And I've traveled

-37-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 from Sitka to Seward and I've seen fur seal -- fur seal and
 2 sea otter 22 hours offshore. And that's in that yellow
 3 area you guys were thinking about testing. That's all I
 4 have to say. Thank you.

5 MR. MICHAELSON: Murray Walsh.

6 MURRAY WALSH

7 Commented as follows:

8 Murray Walsh. I would extend my compli -- first of
 9 all welcome to Juneau. I guess I don't think anybody's
 10 said that to you yet. You may not feel all that welcome
 11 right now. But I should say that people who do get up and
 12 speak in setting like this show a little more courage than
 13 those that don't. And I have to admire that even if I
 14 disagree with almost everything I heard.

15 But if you want a test a public speaking, go back to
 16 1974 when the Navy was not doing any of this kind of
 17 environment work. I was an employee of the State of
 18 Washington, and I had to be the one to tell the Admiral
 19 there in Seattle that before they could build the Bangor
 20 Submarine Base, they were going to have to talk to the
 21 State of Washington first. You talk about public speaking.

22 I guess I'd offer a little perspective. The actual
 23 amount of activity that the Navy is proposing to do in the
 24 Gulf is insignificant compared to the other human maritime
 25 activity that is already there. You've got a season coming

-38-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
 2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
 Phone: 907.225.1145
 Fax: 907.225.1148

1 where you're going to be operating at the no action
 2 alternative. Maybe make some notes about what happened,
 3 how many times you did change an exercise because you saw
 4 whale or whatever it is. And come back and tell us about
 5 that. Then go a head and go to alternative two and keep
 6 track of it. And reevaluate -- if you are killing whales
 7 right and left, then it's time to go back to something
 8 else. But we don't even know. And so -- and this is a
 9 decision that you get to make every year. So, it's
 10 important to pay attention to the environmental matters. I
 11 admire you for doing it. And Al-Queda does have a Navy.
 12 It's housed in Iran right now and North Korea. Those
 13 countries both use the Kilo submarine, the quietest
 14 submersible fighting ship in the world. Yeah, I want you
 15 guys to be able to find them. Thanks.

16 MR. MICHAELSON: Allison, has anyone else turned in a
 17 speaking slip since then?

18 MS. TURNER: No.

19 MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Then usually what happens at
 20 this point is other people get inspired. Perhaps by people
 21 you have already listened to whether they turned in a card
 22 or not. Do you have another one for me? So is there
 23 anyone else who hasn't taken advantage of the opportunity
 24 to speak tonight who would like to do so at this time?
 25 Good, Dan Holt.

-39-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 DAN HOLT
2 Commented as follows:
3 Thanks for coming. My name is Dan Holt. I applaud
4 you guys for coming and actually doing this. Because most
5 of the time, as far as the military is concerned we hear
6 about it afterwards, after it's done. So, this is great
7 that we have this ability to comment. And I guess if -- if
8 it's true that the SONAR is actually killing off whales,
9 such as the one lady said -- gave a good illustration about
10 Southern California. Then I think that's a good idea to do
11 the -- to oppose it. But otherwise, I'm all for
12 alternative one. Getting in there and learning more and
13 keeping our best interest at heart, and keeping on the
14 cutting edge of research and development.
15 That being said, I'm also with the Civil Air Patrol
16 here in Juneau, Alaska. And I wondering if there's any way
17 our group, as far as the Civil Air Patrol can help out with
18 your exercise, so. And I've actually put that on my card.
19 Thanks.
20 MR. MICHAELSON: Anyone else that would like to come
21 forward at this time? With that, you may have heard
22 someone make reference earlier to a second chance, a second
23 helping. We're here until 8:30, and we'll go back to the
24 poster stations. But if there was something that you
25 neglected to say the first time around and you would like

-40-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 to come take advantage of a second chance, we can do that
2 too. So is there anyone who would like to add to the
3 comments they've already made?
4 MS. WILBER: I would.
5 MR. MICHAELSON: Go a head. Give your name again.
6 LYNN WILBER
7 Commented as follows:
8 I'm Lynn Wilber. I've heard some interesting
9 comments. One of the things that I wanted to fit into my
10 comment was the left over materials from the military.
11 Anybody who's hiked around Sitka knows that we step in
12 stuff from World War II all the time. Bins of oil, weird
13 liquids, I have no idea what they are. And its been a
14 tradition of the military to not deal with the mess that
15 they've made.
16 I appreciate our military, I really do. I appreciate
17 the work you do. And I appreciate that you're training and
18 preparing. But the lack of a mitigation plan is just
19 astounding to me. And the overwhelming opposition you've
20 received in every training range, it doesn't seem that
21 you've taken these public comments to heart. One other
22 thing I want to make clear is the Navy is undergoing or
23 going through the NEPA process because they were court
24 ordered to. They were taken to court and the court ordered
25 you to do this. So they've been training, in fact the

-41-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 Atlantic Fleet Training Range is operating on a no action
2 alternative, which is similar. There are other
3 alternatives -- toning down the exercises and not using
4 SONAR. And they did that and they didn't go through the
5 process, from my understanding from reading the news and
6 following the time line.
7 There's a lot of information, available congressional
8 reports, things on the internet that you can read. I like
9 to enter into these types of debates with an objective
10 mind. And I've heard other people who are -- whether
11 they're experts, whale biologists, scientists, ex-military
12 say that they wanted to go into this objectively. And just
13 couldn't because of the gross negligence, the lack of
14 mitigation. Some of the measures that have been
15 recommended to you for decreasing the chance of harassments
16 or takes on marine mammals have been dismissed. I'd said I
17 was going to try to get back to that. You talk about in
18 the impact statement, you talk about an unusual stranding
19 event. Where NMFS gets involved and tries to recover if
20 there's a dead animal or a mass stranding. They apparently
21 don't have and nor do you have in place yet a stranding
22 response or communication response.
23 And I'm sorry, I actually thought I had a little more
24 time than the three minutes. But this is just not
25 acceptable. Thanks again.

-42-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd like to give my three minutes
2 to the woman who came all the way from Sitka. If she had a
3 few more comments that would be fine.
4 MR. MICHAELSON: Actually we don't do that. We don't
5 trade times. If you have something more you'd like to say
6 -- yeah, no that's not our procedure. Sorry. Is there
7 anyone who would like to append their comments with
8 something they didn't get a chance to say? Yes sir.
9 MARK ANDERSON
10 Commented as follows:
11 Yeah. This is Mark Anderson. I guess the thing that
12 occurred to me as I was sitting and listening to some other
13 comments is, you have three alternatives here. And I don't
14 think that is a reasonable amount of alternatives to really
15 have. I think there are a number of others. You don't
16 have any alternatives that have increased science,
17 increased -- you don't even mention any alternatives where
18 you would be doing some studies before you actually go do
19 your testing. So, I think that you need to go back to the
20 draft EIS and develop some more alternatives that do take
21 into account more scientific study, a slower approach. You
22 may be able to get to a higher alternative in your mind by
23 actually doing these things first. Otherwise, I think
24 you're probably going to be running into another problem
25 with litigation. Thanks.

-43-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1146

1 MR. MICHAELSON: Anything we have not had a chance to
2 hear yet tonight? As I mentioned we are here until 8:30,
3 so whenever we're done here we're going to go back to the
4 poster stations in case anybody has any questions. I know
5 a number of people arrived just as this was starting.

6 TINA BROWN
7 Commented as follows:

8 I'm Tina Brown again. And I just want emphasize the
9 obvious. Once an animal is dead, it's dead. And going
10 back to see why it died doesn't bring it back to life.

11 MR. MICHAELSON: I think we're wrapped up here. I
12 appreciate everyone coming out tonight. Again, we're going
13 to go back to the poster stations. We're hear until 8:30.
14 We very much appreciate you coming out and we look forward
15 to you taking an interest in the final EIS when that done.
16 Remember the deadline is January 25th for comments. We're
17 in recess.

18 (Recess)

19 MR. MICHAELSON: This is Lewis Michaelson, it is now
20 8:30 p.m. in Juneau, Alaska. We've not had anyone else
21 come forward wishing to speak on the microphone, on the
22 record to the assemblage here. So, we are going to
23 officially conclude and adjourn this meeting. Thank you.

24 (Hearing adjourned)
25

-44-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1146

1 TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

2 I, CLYDE PASTERSKI, hereby certify that the foregoing
3 pages numbered 4 through 44 are a true, accurate, and
4 complete transcript of Hearings held in Juneau, Alaska on
5 the Gulf of Alaska Navy Training Activities Draft
6 Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental
7 Impact Statement transcribed by me from a copy of the
8 electronic sound recording to the best of my knowledge and
9 ability.

10
11
12 Date Clyde Pasterski, Transcriber
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

-45-

This page intentionally left blank.

1 I.7.1.5 CORDOVA

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Herndon Avenue d/DOJ Facilities, AK 99501
Phone: 907.235.1145
Fax: 907.235.1148

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 PUBLIC HEARING ON
9 GULF OF ALASKA NAVY TRAINING ACTIVITIES
10 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/OVERSEAS ENVIRONMENTAL
11 IMPACT STATEMENT
12 January 12, 2010
13 5:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.
14 Orca Adventure Lodge Café
15 2500 Orca Road
16 Cordova, Alaska 99574
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- 1 -

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Herndon Avenue d/DOJ Facilities, AK 99501
Phone: 907.235.1145
Fax: 907.235.1148

1 MODERATOR
2 Lewis Michaelson
3 Katz & Associates
4 4250 Executive Square
5 Suite 670
6 La Jolla, California 92037
7
8 PANELISTS
9 Alex Stone
10 NO1CE1AS
11 COMPACFLT Environmental
12 NASNI
13 P.O. Box 357033
14 San Diego, California 93135
15
16 Vic Weber, CDR, USN
17 COMTHIRDFLT
18 53690 Tomahawk Drive
19 San Diego, California 92147
20
21 Amy Cox, LT, NOAA
22 National Oceanic and
23 Atmospheric Administration
24 NMFS Alaska Region
25 222 West 7th Avenue, Room 517
Anchorage, Alaska 99513

- 2 -

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		
3	Rosemary McGuire	Page 22
4	Charles Weaverling	Page 23
5	Ellen Americus	Page 24
6	Kristin Smith	Page 25
7	Carolyn Roesbery	Page 27
8	Kris Ranney	Page 28
9	Danielle Bennett	Page 29

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 all of the hearings so far. So with that let me read the
2 four names that I have, so you know what order you're
3 coming up in. I apologize in advance if I mispronounce
4 anyone's name. Rosemary McGuire, Charles Weaverling, Ellen
5 Americus, and Kristin Smith. So, Rosemary if you'd come up
6 here. And all I need is your name. You'll note that I the
7 lectern pointed kind of towards us, because the idea is
8 that we're addressing the panel here and also if I don't do
9 that you'd never see the sign when I hold them up. All
10 right?

11 MS. MCGUIRE: Yeah.

12 MR. MICHAELSON: Thanks.

13 MS. MCGUIRE: Is this the microphone?

14 MR. MICHAELSON: Yes. Please pull it down.

15 ROSEMARY MCGUIRE

16 Commented as follows:

17 Okay. Sorry to call you guys all back like this. I
18 sort of didn't quite understand how this was going to work
19 out. But I do think it was important that we all get a
20 chance to hear some of what, we as a community -- some our
21 concerns might be.

22 Personally, I listened carefully and looked at the
23 posters and stuff like that. It seems to me that there is
24 a good deal of uncertainty about why, when, and how often
25 marine mammals such as whales are impacted by SONAR. But

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 it's very clear that it does sometimes cause mass
2 strandings and it can cause mortalities. And it seems to
3 me that since we don't know why, we ought to be very
4 careful about using it. I would prefer not to have active
5 SONAR used in the Gulf of Alaska. Our livelihoods do
6 depend on having a working ecosystem out there. And I'd
7 really appreciate it if you guys would consider going with
8 the same level of activity that you're doing now, which
9 does not include active SONAR. So, thank you for your
10 time.

11 MR. MICHAELSON: Thanks very much. Our next commenter
12 is Charles Weaverling.

13 MR. WEAVERLING: Hello, my name is Charles Weaverling

14 MR. MICHAELSON: Pull the microphone down just a little
15 bit closer to you.

16 CHARLES WEAVERLING

17 Commented as follows:

18 My name is Charles Weaverling. I'm the former mayor
19 of Cordova. I organized and operated the wildlife rescue
20 fleet during the EXXON VALDEZ oil spill, and I'm a former
21 Navy submariner. Qualified in diesel electric and FBM's.

22 I'm very concerned about this proposed increase in
23 training activity. And I'm not reassured by the posters
24 and the comments I've seen here tonight. I do not think
25 that it would be a positive impact on wildlife and

-23-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 fisheries to increase the training. I don't think it's a
2 positive impact given the training that's used now. But
3 active SONAR, especially the newer SONAR's that are
4 available, are certainly more effective than SONAR's that
5 were used in the past.

6 I don't think it would be a neutral impact on the
7 wildlife and the fishery. This area has not yet recovered
8 from the EXXON VALDEZ oil spill. I think it would be a
9 negative impact on the fishery, the marine mammals, and the
10 wildlife in the proposed area.

11 This is a very rich biological area. And we depend on
12 a healthy marine environment for our livelihood here.
13 Activity in the wintertime, though I'm not a biologist, I
14 understand is less productive during -- is less productive
15 for -- is less used by marine mammals and fish during the
16 wintertime. But even given that, basically I would prefer
17 to see the level stay at it's current level or reduced.
18 Thank you very much.

19 I'd be happy to answer any questions, but I guess this
20 is not a discussion. Thank you.

21 MR. MICHAELSON: Ellen Americus.

22 ELLEN AMERICUS

23 Commented as follows:

24 Hi, my name is Ellen Americus and I'm just a resident
25 of Cordova. I used to live a Hatcher Pass and there was a

-24-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 lot of air activity over Hatcher Pass, in a pristine
2 environment. And socially I think it really upset a lot of
3 people who recreated there. And I see that the Gulf of
4 Alaska is a wild place, and that area in particular. And I
5 think that bombs and missiles in that area and a lot of
6 aircraft would be upsetting to citizens and wildlife. And
7 I'm especially concerned about when the missiles and the
8 bombs breakdown in the water, and so there's like lead, and
9 heavy metals, and when that stuff goes through the food
10 chain and bio-cumulates. And you know, it's going to
11 effect these people. And you know, I don't have -- we've
12 learned a lot about plastics and how harmful plastics are
13 in the food chain. And heavy metals, that's even scarier
14 to me. So, anyway thank you.

15 MR. MICHAELSON: Thanks very much. I know public
16 speaking is a challenging thing and we appreciate it
17 someone has the courage to do that. Thanks. The fourth
18 speaker I have here, the last one I have a card for is
19 Kristin Smith.

20 KRISTIN SMITH

21 Commented as follows:

22 Hi, I'm Kristin Smith. And I'm here speaking on my
23 own behalf. My day job is working as a nonprofit director
24 for the Copper River Water Shed Project, which is committed
25 to sustainable economic development. And so I have a lot

-25-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 of interaction with fisherman and folks in this area, and
2 what I often tell people is that what we have in this
3 region, both down here in Cordova and up river, is a wild
4 salmon economy. We have a commercial salmon economy, we
5 have a subsistence salmon economy, both here and up river.
6 And we have a sport fish salmon economy. And all that's
7 happening because those fish are rearing and growing to
8 adulthood out in the Gulf of Alaska and in the Pacific
9 Ocean. That is where they live. And that is where this
10 town's livelihood comes from. And I'm only repeating what
11 everybody else has already said, but we do not want to see
12 SONAR in this region because of the effect that it could
13 have on fish and wildlife.

14 And I admittedly took a very quick, cursory look
15 through there on the posters, but I saw words like
16 anticipated. We anticipate this won't have very much
17 effect. That's not good enough for a whole town full of
18 people, both here and up river that depend on fish for
19 their livelihood. And I think it doesn't just Cordova, it
20 effects other towns in the sound and Yakutat, and other
21 areas along the coast. So, I think it's critical that the
22 Navy think very, very hard about the effects that this has
23 on wildlife.

24 And I think that when the Navy started, and maybe
25 other entities started using SONAR, the effects weren't so

-26-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 well know. But we know a lot more now then we did 20 years
2 ago. We know that it has harmful effects on marine
3 mammals. And knowing that -- you know, I understand that
4 you're probably thinking, hey we have a lot to do with --
5 we have to protect national security. Well, in my mind the
6 national security issues are over in the Middle East today.
7 And this money could be better spent doing other things and
8 not adversely effecting our fish and wildlife. Thank you.
9 And I just want to say thank you for doing this EIS.
10 I understand that you haven't necessarily been doing them
11 regularly over the past few years. So, I appreciate that
12 you are coming here and asking us for our comments.
13 Thanks.
14 MR. MICHAELSON: Any one else who heard those comments,
15 has inspired to add their own to those?
16 MS. ROESBERY: I would like to.
17 MR. MICHAELSON: Sure, go a head. We'll just have you
18 fill out this card afterwards.
19 MS. ROESBERY: Thank you.
20 MR. MICHAELSON: Go a head. All I need is your name.
21 MS. ROESBERY: I'm taking off my radio hat now and I'm
22 speaking for myself.
23 MR. MICHAELSON: Okay.
24 CAROLYN ROESBERY
25 Commented as follows:

-27-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue #104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 peoples livelihoods depend on the halibut too.
2 So, that's just what I think. And it takes 25 years
3 to -- for a halibut to get to 100 pounds, so -- and after
4 that they're growth slows even more. So, if one of the
5 ships hits a 600 pound halibut that would take 100's of
6 years to replace. So, thanks for your time.
7 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. And if you need anyone to
8 sign anything for your merit badge, you let us know, okay?
9 All right, thanks. Thanks for speaking. Anyone else? If
10 not this would be a time that if anyone who already spoke
11 would like to add to their comments, then please feel free
12 to come up here and do that.
13 No one actually used up their whole three minutes. I
14 didn't feel anybody ran out of time. Let me look at my
15 watch here real quick. It's now 8:20, so I'm going to
16 recess again, and we're going to go next door again. And
17 my guess is unless somebody else comes forward that's how
18 we'll wrap things up tonight. So, thank you very, very
19 much again for coming tonight. We appreciate you taking
20 the time and energy, and the courage for some of you to
21 come up here and do this. We know that's difficult. Thank
22 you very much.
23 (Recess)
24 DANIELLE BENNETT
25 Commented as follows:

-29-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 My name is Carolyn Roesbery. Any other information?
2 Okay. I'm not convinced that activities -- Naval
3 activities in the Gulf of Alaska won't contribute to the
4 decimation of our fishery. We have one of the last wild
5 salmon fisheries in the world. We have very rich, diverse
6 environment. It is one of the biggest fresh water influxes
7 in the world, here in Prince William Sound.

8 We're just now finding out what our fish are doing
9 when they're not in the spawning and where they're going.
10 We just now have the technology and are researching that.
11 And it is out there where you intend to be. And I'm not
12 convinced that -- that you have all the science that you
13 need. You may have acquired all the available science that
14 is assessable to you, but I think you need to go further.
15 I think it's very, very important. Thank you.

16 MR. MICHAELSON: Anyone else? Sure, go a head.

17 KRIS RANNEY

18 Commented as follows:

19 I'm Kris Ranney, I'm in the Boy Scout Troop 624. And
20 just to add on to what she just said. There's another
21 species of fish that lives out there, the halibut. Most of
22 them move in in the summer to shallow waters, but some of
23 the bigger fish stay out in the deep water. So, when you
24 are bombing those boats and sinking them, and some of the
25 bombs and guns might disrupt their habitat. And a lot of

-28-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1148

1 Okay. My name is Danielle Bennett and I'm a resident
2 of Cordova. From my perspective Alaska has one of the few
3 functioning fisheries left in the world. From what I've
4 seen of the EIS, the impact has been minimized to
5 individuals, but many individual impacts amount to a
6 cumulative negative effect.

7 We know for a fact that SONAR does have a negative
8 impact. And that is reason enough to not expand the
9 activities, as far as I'm concerned. What concerns me even
10 more, however is -- are the things that we don't know.
11 There are a number of uncertain statements. Anticipated
12 effects, possible outcomes that are indicated. This
13 ecosystem is important enough that those things should be
14 addressed first before we have negative impacts that we
15 don't even anticipate.

16 Please find another habitat or an already dead zone in
17 which to operate. Historically speaking, this region has
18 little reason to trust in regulation. When I think of
19 national security, I see protecting whatever is left of
20 functioning ecosystems as of the most vital importance. I
21 recommend proceeding with the no action alternative or
22 reduce activity all together. Thank you.

23 MR. MICHAELSON: This is Lewis Michaelson, it is now
24 8:30 p.m. in Cordova. We have no more speakers this
25 evening, so we are going to officially adjourn this

-30-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1146

1 meeting.
2 (Meeting adjourned)
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

-31-

SEAK Professional Services, LLC
2415 Hemlock Avenue # 104 Ketchikan, AK 99901
Phone: 907.225.1145
Fax: 907.225.1146

1 TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE
2 I, CLYDE PASTERSKI, hereby certify that the foregoing
3 pages numbered 4 through 31 are a true, accurate, and
4 complete transcript of Hearings held in Cordova, Alaska on
5 the Gulf of Alaska Navy Training Activities Draft
6 Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental
7 Impact Statement transcribed by me from a copy of the
8 electronic sound recording to the best of my knowledge and
9 ability.
10
11

12 Date Clyde Pasterski, Transcriber
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

-32-

This page intentionally left blank.

1 **I.8 ORAL COMMENTS AND RESPONSE TABLES**2 **I.8.1 KODIAK**

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Kodiak			
Carolyn Heitman 1-1		My name is Carolyn Heitman. Is that good? [MR. MICHAELSON: Yeah.] Okay. One of the things that was confusing to me and one of the gentlemen cleared up for me earlier was on -- let me find the page here. On page 2-4 of the draft it showed the whole Island of Kodiak in red, which was enclosed within the restricted area, and that was a little bit confusing to me. Because I do know a couple years ago the FAA did enforce restricted air space over parts of Kodiak Island which included our airport. And -- so anyway he cleared up and we looked in the book and he it -- on your map over there it's not on the map, but he said it was a misprint and then at final he was going to make sure that it was in black. So, if I understand Kodiak is not included in restricted area as Fort Richardson.	The red box in question was intended to be a map insert, which is a standard way of identifying a specific geographic region that is being discussed. All "map insets" including the one you specifically referenced (Figure 2-2) has been re-colored to avoid any confusion.
Carolyn Heitman 1-2		Okay. And, let's see here -- and one of the things I had requested in my comments is a boundary line in the training area covers the Aleutian Trench and I had requested that the Navy list what types of exercises would take place in the trench, what type of SONAR and the effects that it -- the impacts it would have to the sea life that lives within the trench, and I didn't see that addressed.	Activities proposed within the TMAA have the potential to occur over the Aleutian Trench. Sound energy from sonar may be present within the trench on occasion. However, the probability of effect is uniform across the entire TMAA. The potential effects to resources are analyzed as a whole and effects to the trench are reflected in potential effects to the entire TMAA. Additionally, as provided in Section 5, mitigation measures will be implemented as appropriate whenever marine mammals are detected. In this manner, the Navy mitigation measures will afford all areas the same least practicable adverse impact.
Carolyn Heitman 1-3		And it states here that the Gulf -- the Gulf of Alaska draft states that the Navy does not know what the environmental damage or harm would be to birds from midfrequency at long range, and I'd like to see that addressed.	As stated in Section 3.9; Birds: "NMFS issued an environmental assessment with regards to the harassment of marine mammals in 2003 in accordance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (MMPA). As part of the environmental documentation, birds were analyzed for potential effects associated with exposure to active sonar. The potential hearing capability of birds was outside the proposed high frequency of the operating system and there is no evidence that birds utilize sound underwater to forage or locate prey. Thus, it was concluded that effects were unlikely. In addition, birds would not be an effective receptor because they are submerged only for short periods and birds at the surface can rapidly fly away from disturbance and annoying sounds."

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Kodiak			
			Please see section 3.9.1.1 of the FEIS/OEIS for NMFS 2003 reference regarding effects of sonar on birds.
Carolyn Heitman 1-4		No detailed information on how the Navy exercises will impact fisherman. Whether or not, you know they'll be restricted. I understand if you go by -- one of the choices was that there would be two 21 day training periods rather than just one, if that one was chosen. So, I'd like to see more emphasis on how it would affect the livelihood of fisherman.	The Navy is very aware of concerns from fishing fleets and fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska. The Final EIS/OEIS describes potential economic impacts to fishing in Section 3.12.2.5. In this section, the analysis concluded that impacts would not be significant due to advanced public notification and primarily short-term duration of military activities. Analysis of impacts to fish is found in the Final EIS/OEIS in Section 3.6. It should be noted that the Navy has no exclusive "right of way" when conducting training activities on the ocean. Navy ships and aircraft intentionally seek areas clear of all other vessel traffic, thereby reducing the likelihood of negatively affecting fishing and tourism industries. Additionally, no new closure or restricted areas are proposed. To help manage competing demands and maintain public access in the GOA, the Navy conducts its offshore activities in a manner that minimizes limitations to recreation and commercial activities. Because of the analysis, the Navy is confident that its training activities will not impact fisheries, fish populations, or the livelihood of fisherman off the Gulf of Alaska.
Carolyn Heitman 1-5		Also, it's -- okay, let me find it here. On section 3.14, on public safety you say there would be no public safety issues. In that section though under public safety it says, activities that could affect public safety include electromagnetic energy, but no details were given concerning that.	As stated in Section 3.14; Public Health and Safety, Electronic Warfare (EW) systems emit electromagnetic radiation (EMR) similar to that from cell phones, hand-held radios, commercial radio, and television stations. Navy standard operating procedures are in place to protect Navy personnel and the public and include setting the heights and angles of EMR transmission to avoid direct exposure, posting warning signs, establishing safe operating levels, and activating warning lights when radar systems are operational. To avoid excessive exposures from EMR, military aircraft operate in accordance with standard procedures that establish minimum separation distances between EMR emitters and people, ordnance, and fuels.
Carolyn Heitman 1-6		And I would also like to know -- when you did the EIS for Hawaii uranium and red and white phosphorus was used in the training exercises. I would like to know if that will be used in the Gulf of Alaska.	Depleted Uranium (DU) is not part of the proposed action for this EIS/OEIS. In February 2009, Commander Pacific Fleet directed that all Pacific Fleet ships offload all depleted uranium rounds at the earliest opportunity. This change is reflected in the EIS/OEIS in Section 3.2.1.1. White phosphorous is listed in Section 3.2.1.1 as a possible constituent of general pyrotechnic materials, but is not a

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Kodiak			
			<p>constituent in training materials proposed for use in the Gulf of Alaska TMAA.</p> <p>Red phosphorous is a compound contained in the MK-58 marine marker. Please see Section 3.2.4.4 under "Targets and Pyrotechnics" for analysis of environmental fate of red phosphorus.</p>
Carolyn Heitman 1-7		And, let's see, and although you mentioned new proposed weapons systems, you didn't identify them.	In Section 2.5.3 of the Draft and Final EIS/OEIS the Navy has included discussion of new platforms and equipment that have not yet become operational in the Fleet. Several future platforms and weapon systems have been identified that are in development, and are likely to be incorporated into Navy training requirements within the next 10 years. These include new ships, submarines, aircraft and new weapon systems such as the Advanced Extended Echo Ranging Sonobuoy, and new training instrumentation such as a Portable Undersea Tracking Range. Several of these new technologies are in early stages of development, and thus specific concepts of operations, operating parameters, or training requirements are not yet available.
Carolyn Heitman 1-8		I'd also requested that the Navy fund our electromagnetic radar system here and -- through the University of Alaska and it's classified as an electromagnetic warfare systems radar that the Navy could use. So, I would like to see that addressed if it will be used.	The electromagnetic radar system at Kodiak is not part of the Proposed Action.
David Kubiak		Yeah, thank you ladies and gentlemen for the opportunity to address this EIS -- the draft EIS. And I appreciate you coming to Kodiak. I -- with 18 days left, I'm the Chairman of the Alaska Marine Conservation Council. So, I'm here sort of on duty, like you are. With only 18 days left to comment, if the January 25th deadline is to be kept, I've got slow upload for my computer. I guess might be able to leave it on all night and download your EIS on the computer. But 25 megabytes at 56K takes a long time. And I think I have a obligation since I don't have the information really here to review, I think it would be a mis-step and be irresponsible for me to make a pointed comments about that impact statement. I did though hear Carol say that -- and it reminded me that if we have 21 days -- two periods of 21 days, basically six weeks of training exercises, and they're up on the edge of the Gulf there, that's prime fishing bottom. And that's a huge chunk of time out of a commercial	Please note that long-range advance notice of scheduled activities and times will be made available to the public and the commercial fishing industry via the Internet. The local 17th District U.S. Coast Guard Notices to Mariners may be found at: http://www.navcen.uscg.gov/Inm/d17/ . This site provides the public notice that the military will be operating in a specific area and will allow you to plan activities accordingly to avoid potential conflicts. The training events will not preclude fishermen from using any portion of the Gulf of Alaska.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Kodiak			
		fisherman's opportunity especially -- I'm a halibut fisherman and that would be a huge chunk of time out of the halibut season. I don't myself go there, I've got a small boat. But I know the more nautical fellows are out there all the time and that's prime halibut bottom. So that's a huge -- a huge divot in their -- in their season, 21 days times two. But other than that I just want to say, I appreciate you coming here and I'll look forward to reading the EIS completely. But that really -- that 18 days left to comment, wow, that's going to be very difficult. Thank you.	
Katherine Ellanak 1-1		Good evening, my name is Katherine Ellanak. I'm with the Sun'aq Tribe Environmental and Natural Resource Director here in Kodiak. And although your EIS came in -- sent out dated December 2, we only received the EIS last week. And this January 25 deadline is not fair. There are other deadlines that we need to work with here in Kodiak.	The Draft EIS/OEIS was sent via Federal Express to the Sun'aq Tribe on Dec 9th 2009, and delivery records from Federal Express indicate that it was delivered on Dec 11th, 2009 at 1:02 pm and was signed for by P. Hester.
Katherine Ellanak 1-2		But out of respect for this time, and consideration for the fisherman, and the sea life whatever's happening there -- I saw -- I skimmed through that and there are a lot of fish in that area that you want to be training in. And that is not only affecting Kodiak fisherman and subsistence and sports. It goes all the way through the coast of Alaska up to my people in the Bering Sea areas.	There are no proposed activities taking place in the Bering Sea. All training activities at sea will take place in the Temporary Maritime Activities Area as depicted on Figure ES-1. The proposed training activities should not have an impact on populations of fish. While individual fish may be harmed if they co-occur with some activities that use explosives, this should not have any impact on the overall population. Please see Section 3.6.2 for potential impact discussion for Fish.
Katherine Ellanak 1-3		And the seals -- we don't know how nomadic our animals are from the sea, the (indiscernible) and the fish, and the whales, the seals, the birds -- they have no boundaries. Even if you make a boundary there they're going to be coming in and out of there.	As presented in Section 3.8, the Navy is aware of the presence and movement of animals in the proposed training area. Specifically regarding seals, Section 3.8.2.1 describes the means by which Navy derived marine mammal (including seal) densities for calculation of potential impacts.
Katherine Ellanak 1-4		And the fish, the sea's abundance, it's crucial right now because fishing is very critical right now. It's starting to be hard to be a fisherman anymore because of the prices. And we know nationwide that Alaska fish is like gold for anywhere in the world.	This comment is duly noted. The proposed training activities should not have an impact on populations of fish. While individual fish may be harmed if they co-occur with some activities that use explosives, this should not have any impact on the overall population. Please see Section 3.6.2 for potential impact discussion for Fish.
Katherine Ellanak 1-5		The other thing is when you guys do that April to October, 21 days, that's crucial time also for anything, fishing and the rearing of the babies from the seas.	In Section 2.3.2.3 of the Draft EIS/OEIS, the alternative of training during alternate time frames in the GOA TMAA was considered. Unstable winter weather conditions in the Gulf of Alaska create unsafe conditions for Navy training and such alternatives were considered infeasible and were not evaluated further.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Kodiak			
Katherine Ellanak 1-6		And the amount of lead, cadmium, and everything else is going to be used and exposing to our seas is detrimental.	The Final EIS/OEIS thoroughly analyzes the impacts of expended materials used during Navy training activities. As shown in Table 3.2-18 and 3.2-19, an estimated 352,000 lb (176 tons) of material would be expended during the training activities proposed under Alternative 2, with less than 3 percent of that material (about 5 tons) considered to be hazardous. Section 3.2 of the EIS/OEIS describes the impacts from the perspective of potentially hazardous materials such as explosives constituents. Section 3.3 describes the impacts of expended materials in terms of water and sediment quality. In addition, the existing discussion on the breakdown of hazardous materials in Environmental Consequences of Section 3.2.2, Expended Materials has been reviewed and, as appropriate, expanded. The analysis in the EIS/OEIS concludes that Expended and hazardous materials under the Proposed Action would not have a substantial effect on the marine environment.
Katherine Ellanak 1-7		And I just would like to see that you guys can extend this January 25 deadline into something more appropriate for us to really review the EIS document. And we had a meeting yesterday with our tribe and it's -- you know, like I said, we just received that EIS last week and today's Thursday. And then there's no time for me and my Environmental Committee to meet with the Tribal Council and have a good meeting about this. Quiana.	Public comments are very important to the NEPA process. The Draft EIS/OEIS was released to the public for a 45-day comment period. During this 45-day period, the Navy made extensive efforts to conduct outreach based on what was learned during the scoping period and public feedback. There were ample opportunities, as well as a wide variety of options, to comment on the Gulf of Alaska Draft EIS/OEIS. The public provided comments via mail, online comments via the Gulf of Alaska EIS/OEIS website; or attendance at one of five public hearings in the state of Alaska in January 2010. At the public meetings, the public had an opportunity to publicly or privately comment in front of a court reporter or fill out a comment form, and turn it in. The Navy considered your request for an extension of the 45-day comment period. After further evaluation of the request, and the outreach efforts conducted by the Navy for the Draft EIS/OEIS, the Navy felt it was not necessary to extend the public comment period for review of the Draft EIS/OEIS.
Theresa Peterson 1-1		Good evening and thank you for coming to Kodiak and giving us the opportunity to talk about this proposed action off our island home here. My name is Theresa Peterson. I'm a member of a long time fishing family and I work with Alaska Marine Conservation Council. The Alaska Marine Conservation Council is a community based organization	Please note that as presented in Section 4.8.3, there are many sources of human generated noise in the Gulf of Alaska for which the proposed Navy training would only be a small and transitory contribution. Also be aware that sonar use outside the Navy is common in the Gulf of Alaska including, for example, fathometers, fish-finders, and NOAA research

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Kodiak			
		dedicated to protect the integrity of Alaska's marine ecosystem. And AMCC is concerned about the potential increases in Navy training activities in the Gulf of Alaska. Particularly of concern are the effects of underwater noise on living marine resources, especially noise resulting from the use of SONAR in this productive and important marine environment. We support the no action alternative, which would maintain current training activities and does not involve the use of SONAR. The alternatives listed in the analysis are inadequate to explore a range of options to consider anything else at this juncture. Overall the proposed action would result in dramatic changes in the acoustic marine environment inside and adjacent to the operating area that could have significant impacts on the marine mammals inhabiting these waters. Critical habitat for the North Pacific right whale, the worlds most endangered whale is located directly adjacent to the training area.	involving acoustic trawl surveys for fishery resources. In Navy training ranges in Southern California, Hawaii, and the East Coast where training involving sonar use has been occurring for decades, there are no indications of impacts to the marine environment and these areas support healthy fisheries and abundant marine mammal populations. Please also note that the designated right whale Critical Habitat is not directly adjacent to the training area, but is in fact located 16 nautical miles from the corner of the training area.
Theresa Peterson 1-2		The draft EIS is lacking a robust analysis regarding potential impacts to the halibut and the halibut fishery. It includes no discussion or maps showing the major halibut regulatory area that directly overlaps the training area. Nor does it discuss halibut habitat in the area. This information needs to be added.	As detailed in Section 3.6, the Navy does not believe the proposed activities will have any impact on populations of fish or any fishery in the Gulf of Alaska. Regarding the newly established charter fishing regulatory area for halibut, since the Navy is not engaged in sport charter fishing, the regulatory area does not apply to Navy. The regulatory areas were established because (according to NOAA Fisheries), charter halibut fishing in the Gulf of Alaska has been growing steadily and exceeding harvest levels set to protect halibut. Charter halibut businesses have to obtain a permit from NOAA (planned to begin as of early February 2010) to be able to have clients legally catching halibut in the Gulf of Alaska (see http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/newsreleases/2010/charterhalibut010410.htm). A map showing the Sport Charter Halibut Fishing Regulatory Area was reviewed but was not added. The TMAA overlaps with International Pacific Halibut Commission statistical areas 240, 250, 260, 270, and a small portion of 230. Please note that a map showing this overlap, as well as an analysis to halibut and the fishery, has been added to the FEIS/OEIS in Section 3.6.1.1.
Theresa Peterson 1-3		The draft EIS does not include an adequate discussion of salmon migratory routes in the Gulf of Alaska, and therefore lacks a robust analysis of impacts to migrating salmon species in the region.	Life history information, including migratory routes, for salmon are discussed in Section 3.6.1.3. While studies have indicated that the TMAA is part of the migratory route for some salmon species, the details are still lacking. Given the relatively short

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Kodiak			
			<p>duration of Navy activities, over a relatively small area, there is a low probability of Navy activities coinciding with migration of salmon species (described in Section 3.6.1 3). The ocean migrations of salmonids was defined by Pearcy (1992) as 1) the coastal phase of juveniles, 2) the oceanic feeding phase, 3) the return of maturing fish from oceanic to coastal waters, and 4) coastal migrations of adults that terminate in freshwater. The distance traveled and the time spent in each of these phases vary greatly within and among species. Pacific salmon smolts generally move up and around the West Coast of North America following the continental shelf. Juveniles were found to remain over the continental shelf until the start of the Aleutians before moving offshore.</p> <p>The Navy is aware of the diverse biological presence in the area and has conducted a thorough analysis of potential effects given the best available scientific data in Chapter 3 of the Final EIS/OEIS.</p>
Theresa Peterson 1-4		There is not a thorough assessment of the overlap with fishing areas, and the conclusion that there will be no socioeconomic impacts from the proposed action, including fishing is impossible to predict without comprehensive answers to the above mentioned comments.	As detailed in Sections 3.6 and 3.12.2.3, the proposed training activities should not have an impact on populations of fish or the health of the fisheries and socioeconomics in Alaska. Also see Section 4.1.2.1 regarding cumulative impacts to fishing.
Theresa Peterson 1-5		It is probable that the Navy under estimates the number of marine mammals and fish that will be harassed, injured, and killed because it simply does not have the density estimates needed in order to accurately make this determination. There is no reliable estimates for current or historical abundance numbers for many of the affected marine mammals in the Gulf of Alaska.	Section 3.8.2 in the FEIS/OEIS discusses the density estimates, as well as Appendix E. In April 2009, the Navy funded and NMFS conducted the Gulf of Alaska Line-Transect Survey (GOALS) to address the data needs for density analysis (Rone et al. 2009). Line-transect survey visual data to support distance sampling statistics and acoustic data were collected over a 10-day period both within and outside the TMAA. Please see Section 3.8.2.1 for full discussion on the survey. Based on the current approved acoustic impact modeling, the density estimation method, not reducing impacts as a result of mitigation, and previous determinations by National Marine Fisheries Service, it is more likely Navy actually overestimates impacts to marine mammals with these estimates.
Theresa Peterson 1-6		And finally, I know firsthand there are not adequate measures to mitigate the harmful affects of SONAR. The proposed mitigation measures are basically safety zones. And from what I'm understanding, visual sighting of whales. And having fished in that area for over 25 years and having	As detailed in Chapter 5 of the FEIS/OEIS, the mitigation measures involve much more than a sonar "safety zone", making use of all available observers such as those in aircraft in addition to observers on vessels, and use all available sensors such as passive acoustic hydrophones. The mitigation

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Kodiak			
		spent sometimes days looking for a buoy in the adverse weather conditions that we have out in the Gulf of Alaska, probably 80 or 90 percent of the time. I do not have confidence that visual sightings is an adequate mitigating measure.	<p>measures presented in the EIS/OEIS were developed in coordination with NMFS biologists and scientists to determine which mitigation measures would be both effective and still allow the Navy to meet the operational needs for realistic training. The Navy's mitigation measures are designed to minimize impacts. It is recognized that not all marine mammals will be present at the surface and/or detected visually and not all marine mammals will be vocalizing and thus detectable by passive acoustics. The mitigation measures are effective at limiting some marine mammals exposures to high levels of sound in close proximity to the source, just as they were designed to do.</p> <p>Please note that Naval vessels have a higher height of eye than most fishing vessels as well as having multiple vessels over a very wide area, communicated sharing of observations, and operating in a coordinated manner in combination with aircraft that are also observing the water space.</p> <p>The Navy does not expect 100% of the animals present in the vicinity of training events will be detected and the acoustic impact modeling quantification is not reduced as a result of mitigation effectiveness. However, mitigation measures based on detection of marine mammals by exercise participants anywhere in the exercise area will result in the mitigation of some potential impacts. Monitoring reports from exercises since 2006 have demonstrated the ability to detect marine mammals, the success of these mitigation measures, and a lack of observable impacts to marine species as a result of Navy training events. As part of the Integrated Comprehensive Monitoring Program, research to measure the ability of Navy observers to detect marine mammals is also underway.</p>
Theresa Peterson 1-7		And finally in closing, I would very much suggest that you extend the comment period an additional 45 days in order to allow people adequate time. And again, thank you for coming.	Please see response to Katherine Ellanak 1-7.
Amanda Barnette		My name is Amanda Barnette. I'd also like to thank you for coming to Kodiak and listening to our comments. I think the Navy should establish minimum visibility requirements while training, especially while training with active SONAR, so that the lookouts may identify marine mammals in the immediate area. Thanks.	Please see response to Theresa Peterson 1-6
Katherine		Katherine Ellanak with the Sun'aq Tribe of Kodiak. The other	This comment is duly noted. Please note that the Exxon

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Kodiak			
Ellanak 2-1		thing is we already have visual and historical history about what Exxon oil spill did. And it shows what the current is going to be like. And the red tide that happens and years of evolutionary natural disasters that there used to be abundance of fish here of all kinds. But after the '64 earthquake, right over there in Yuzhni where there used to be herring and everything else. The fish that used to be there are no longer there and the fish that we have presently here are in danger of other disasters that are going on. And you know, Bligh Reef is hit again and even the Arctic Slope with the BP having their pipeline problems, I mean even if it's far and beyond us, it's helping to come down here from the pipeline. And things of that kind of disaster, we need to consider those before the fish is going to be depleted.	Valdez oil spill was addressed within the affected environmental baseline descriptions for the GOA area.
Katherine Ellanak 2-2		It's -- I cannot name and I'm not a scientist to see when I was scanning through the EIS -- it's unfathomable to me to try to determine what all else is going to be affected by all the chemicals and toxins and hazardous materials that are going to be expended into the sea.	Please refer to your previous comment and response in Katherine Ellanak 1-6.
Carolyn Heitman 2		I'm sorry, it's Carolyn Heitman. When the Navy did the Environmental Impact Statement for Hawaii, the west coast, Gulf of Mexico, and the entire east coast of the United States they got a permit from NOAA to -- and this is something that I had mentioned in my comments in a -- the last time. They got a permit from NOAA to incidently take two million marine mammals per year for the next five years. And I would like to have you include in the final if that permit will extend to the Gulf of Alaska. And if not will you be requesting a new permit for incidental takes and for how many marine mammals?	Sections 3.8.7.7, 3.8.7.8, and 3.8.7.9 describe the number of estimated takes by species for each of the alternatives. The Navy has requested a Letter of Authorization permit from NOAA for training activities in the TMAA based on the estimated take of marine mammals under the Preferred Alternative; the permit will be specific to the proposed actions in the Gulf of Alaska. Please note that of the approximately 425,000 exposures under the Preferred Alternative, which are estimated without consideration of the Navy's protective measures, only <u>one</u> is expected to be a Level A harassment. The remainder are non-injurious Level B exposures. No marine mammal deaths are expected as a result of the proposed training activities.
Theresa Peterson 2-1		Thank you. Theresa Peterson again. I have two brief comments. In reflecting on what Katherine was saying, I feel strongly that we have a lot of unknowns that are approaching our waters in the Gulf of Alaska and this northern climate -- and worldwide, in particular the ocean acidification and the changing ocean environment.	Ocean acidification and climate change, as they apply to GOA, are addressed in Section 4.2.1.2 of the FEIS.
Theresa Peterson 2-2		But also in reflecting about commercial fishing off of that edge which has been -- like I said, I've spend decades out there doing that. And I've noticed a change in the whales	This comment is duly noted.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Kodiak			
		<p>habits when you're long lining halibut and primarily black cod. The sperm whales and the killer whales -- we're kind of like dinner bells out there. They recognize a boat out on the edge, they hear you. You turn on the hydraulics, they come charging up to the boat. The whales in the Gulf just -- primarily over these last 10 years are getting habituated to associating the sound of a fishing vessel to a feeding opportunity. And so in thinking about this, when there's Navy operations going on and the other boats have been requested to leave the area, I would think there's going to be a natural tendency for the boat -- the whales to actually approach a vessel and explore to see what they're doing. Because they have been doing that. And I just wanted to share that thought. Thank you.</p>	
Richard Courtney		<p>My name is Richard Courtney and I'm here representing myself. I'm also representing myself as a 20 year Navy veteran. I served on two aircraft carriers, a helicopter carrier, and a -- one of those large ones that you see right over there. I've ridden smaller destroyers and LST's. I find it absolutely critical for the U.S. Navy to practice in an area such as the Gulf of Alaska. I am an expert on meteorology and oceanography. I'm also an expert on the American sailor running around on a ship. And if you haven't figured it out, I'm still a little nervous here. One of the things we don't recognize very much is what it is to be out there on a ship doing the good deed, that's defending your nation. You cannot go down to Hawaii in the middle of the summertime, run through a five to an eight foot sea state with a 20 knot trade wind and say, hey I know what it's going to be like to be up here in the Gulf of Alaska. It's a different environment. You walk out through your front door, you put a coat on, you put a hat on. You don't run out there bare chested in Kodiak in January. So it's absolutely necessary for us to understand that we have to work in other environments. That's what this is all about. Now back when I was in they didn't have these, or they were greatly reduced. And this is a great thing, it's an honest effort to try and make sure we don't screw something up. But bare in mind that the United States Navy has been around 200 -- more than 200 years actually. We still have fish out there, we still have whales. I have not in the time I road on aircraft carriers, looking for submarines -- yes, I did that. I didn't see any dead whales wash up behind</p>	This comment is duly noted.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Kodiak			
		my ship. I never saw the Navy go out of it's way to try and hurt anything in the ocean. They are very, very studious about watching out for things. I was directly involved in that. I'm not here because I think I owe the Navy something. I'm hear about my own personal interest. I'm not here for every man and woman that is out there on a ship right now that does not know what it's like to get beat up out there. All of you that claim that you've got fishing boats out there, would you take a nice 23 foot skiff and go running through the Bering Sea this time of the year, to go from St. Paul to Dutch Harbor? No, you wouldn't. You'd pick the biggest boat that you can, they one that rides the best and most comfortable. And that's what we're doing with ships. We're training people how to survive an environment. And there's only one way to do that, there's only on way to survive combat. Train like you fight and fight like you train. That comes right out of the Navy. Thank you for putting up with me.	
Geneneiea Pearson 1		My name is Geneneiea Pearson. I've lived in Kodiak since 1941 and have observed the whales since that time. But what I'd like to say is, that I'm disappointed in this meeting in that you did not have an open meeting so that we could hear your answers to questions. I think that would have been helpful and we could hear what -- other peoples concerns are more than just these comments. Because a lot of people are shy about talking, like me.	From past experience, the Navy has concluded that the public hearing format used during the public hearings is the most conducive to effective dialogue. Additionally, all five public hearings held in Alaska exceeded NEPA requirements. Adequate time was given during the open house portion of each meeting to ask questions of a number of subject matter experts.
Geneneiea Pearson 2		The other suggestion I would like to make is that you have a civilian observer, maybe one or two on each of these carriers to observe for the public as to what goes on. So that there's an honest assessment of what happens. If you can come up with something out there, I know it's hard because of the ocean, you can't really tell what's going on.	Please refer to Sections 5.2.1.3 and 5.2.1.4 regarding monitoring during training events to help determine if there are any unforeseen impacts resulting from Navy training activities.
Geneneiea Pearson 3		But I'm very concerned for the fisherman that are being replace -- displaced during the period that the exercises will be taking place.	Because the Navy has no exclusive "right of way" when conducting training activities on the ocean, Navy ships and aircraft intentionally seek areas clear of all other vessel traffic, thereby reducing the likelihood of negatively affecting fishing and tourism industries. In addition, long-range advance notice of scheduled activities and times will be made available to the public and the commercial fishing industry via the Internet. The local 17th District U.S. Coast Guard Notices to Mariners may be found at: http://www.navcen.uscg.gov/lnm/d17/ . This site provides the public notice that the military will be operating in a

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Kodiak			
			specific area and will allow you to plan activities accordingly to avoid potential conflicts. The training events will not preclude fishermen from using any portion of the Gulf of Alaska. Please see Chapter 3, Section 3.14 of the Final EIS/OEIS for the description and analysis and potential effects.
Geneneiea Pearson 4		<p>And I'm very concerned for the marine mammals that will be out there and will be attracted to the boats. Because I know the whales now a days come up to the boats. I have fished myself for many, many years. I know that they're trusting us now, which they didn't used to during the years ago. When they were slaughtering them out here, when the Russians were right off shore out here, slaughtering whales. We could see the fleet at night, I looked like a city out there. But I know that at -- after that slaughter was over the whales were very skiddiest. If they saw us they were gone. We only saw then once. Whereas now they aren't afraid of boats and they come right up to the boats sometimes. So I'm very concerned about this whole process and I wish the Navy figure out another way of working their ideas out for antisubmarine warfare.</p> <p>I wish they would go somewhere else to do it. Thank you.</p>	Please see Chapters 1 and 2 regarding the purpose and need for anti-submarine training in the Gulf of Alaska.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Kodiak			
Richard Courtney 2		Hi, this is Richard Courtney. I live in Kodiak, Alaska. I'd also like to add on to my statement that I made earlier. And one of the biggest reasons I feel it's critical to come up here and learn, as a sailor is exposure to the harsh weather conditions that are up here. At one point in my Navy career, I was up off the coast of Norway and I had 70 knots of wind and 35 foot seas. There was millions of dollars of damage done to five amphibious warfare ships and a destroyer. We had no exposure up there and very few people ever got a chance to work up there. And by learning to come up here and work in these harsher conditions, you have a better understanding of what it takes to survive. Especially in a combat situation. You don't have to look back any farther than World War II, and look at some of the actions of what ships had gone through and how much better they would have been prepared if they actually practiced in foul weather instead of practicing in the calm waters off of Hawaii. So that's why I think it's critical to come up here. I don't expect a complete understanding of everything, but I think it's real critical for the military to come to work as a team up in rough weather. And that's about -- basically all I've got to say.	This comment is duly noted.

1 **I.8.2 ANCHORAGE**

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Anchorage			
Paul Kendall 1-1		<p>My name is Paul, middle initial D, Kendall. I'm an Anchorage, Alaska citizen. And I just came in for the first time to see what you had. It's my first time to be at one of these and I found it to be efficient, professional, entertaining, and amenable. And all you people have been very congenial and professional. Because you're in what they call the Gulf of Alaska up around Cordova, Kodiak and the entry to Cook Inlet, I'd really like to see you bring some type of studies on the tidal. I think it's a high tidal area and there are only so many tidal areas around the world. And I'm of particular interest between Cordova and the Cook Inlet. And when I look at the resources that you're going to bring into the inlet like that, the ships and all of those monitoring devices. I'd like to have you make your data available to the local communities in the event that they move to some type of tidal generation for energy for our residential sectors. And when you consider the fact that a pound of water weights about 62 [sic] pounds, and you put that into a ten foot by ten foot by ten foot cube, which is equal to something along the lines of a UPS delivery van. That content of that van equals about 31 tons or 62,000 pounds. And if you were to bring that poundage on board a ship, in essence you could use that weight on just one van, which is a ten by ten by ten cube of water. You could use that as a counter weight to move down to push gears. And then if you release that water you can actually have crawler or water wheel turn to make electricity as you move the water out. And as you move that water out back into the ocean through a pipe, what will happen is you can displace the air that's in the pipe, and that air will push turbines. And if you close off the back of that pipe as you release the water from the front end of it, you can also as the water runs out it draws the air the other way into a vacuum and those air reversals will turn turbines. So, you in essence have a ship that can generate energy onboard, especially with the tides. And when you begin to look at those ten foot cubic capacities of movement in tide, the numbers are huge and astronomical. So, if you're going to come into an area like that, around Cordova and Kodiak and the Cook Inlet, I would think that there would be some type of a participation. And I think they're getting</p>	<p>The proposed area where the training will occur will not include any of Cook Inlet and the nearest portion of the Temporary Maritime Activities Area (TMAA) is over 25 nautical miles from Cook Inlet. Please see Figure ES-1 in the Final EIS/OEIS for the location of the TMAA. Additionally, no tidal energy projects are considered as part of the proposed action.</p>

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Anchorage			
		ready to start the meeting, so I think I'm going to -- no. So, what I'm saying, when I look at the resources and the competency of your people who come into this area, I think you could bring to the people maybe a ship. And you could bring that in -- into the communities of Kodiak and Cordova and Seward, and maybe bring us a couple of extra ships and we could use those ships as power plants and the community could learn about waves and tidal capacity for generating electricity, which is clearly our next future. Other than that I think that's about it.	
Paul Kendall 1-2		Except well there's one more thing. I do think you should have a video webcam here. And that this gentleman which is -- gosh, I have to get my glasses -- the gentleman who's taking this testimony, Clyde E. Pasterski, I think you should furnish him with the money to have a webcam. And the way that should be done is that an individual should be escorted over here and asked if they'd like to make a video or a video and audio, or if they'd like to have a video from a distance and let them sit down and perhaps make their own little video. Because the writing is just too onerous. And I think that the children would like to do that. You get more involvement from the public and it's much more easy. And even if the communication were to go on at length, I think it could still be monitored and curtailed at appropriate times such as we have coming up now. Because I think they're getting ready to have a presentation. Thank you very much for what you're doing. And I love my America and I want it back the way old American values. Thank you.	This comment is duly noted. The Navy is in the process of developing a webcam feature for public hearings.
Wade Willis 1-1		Thank you very much and I appreciate -- first I want to say I appreciate very much the Navy coming up to Alaska and allowing us to speak. We're a State that is very supportive of the military and we are very appreciative of your coming up here to talk. My name is Wade Willis, I'm a biologist for the State. Been up here for 20 years. I have worked extensively in Prince William Sound and worked as a biologist in the Gulf of Alaska, so I know the country pretty well.	This comment is duly noted.
Wade Willis 1-2		Some of the concerns I have are that the operation area is being conducted in shallow areas and shallow shelf areas. And certainly those are areas that are very critical habitat for our resources -- our fisheries resources in Alaska.	Please see Section 3.6 with regard to an analysis of impacts to fish and fish habitat and Section 3.12.1.1 for an analysis of impacts to fishing. The Navy is aware of the importance of the fisheries at Portlock Bank and adjacent shallow water areas.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Anchorage			
Wade Willis 1-3		And I've very -- also very concerned that the operation area is in the middle of critical for migrating whales. I don't really know if it's an appropriate operation area for the military to be conducting more -- it's more aggressive SONAR operations. I would hope there would be areas of the country where we could identify for SONAR work that would not put such a risk to a lot of unknowns with our migrating whales. Several are endangered that move through this area. And using visual sightings of whales is notoriously quite you know, inaccurate. And a lot of the whales like blue whales can be underwater for very long extended periods of time.	Navy lookouts undergo extensive training to include on-the job instruction under supervision of an experienced lookout followed by completion of Personnel Qualification Standard Program. NMFS-approved Marine Species Awareness Training is required before every sonar exercise. Chapter 5.0 of the EIS/OEIS, Mitigation Measures, presents the U.S. Navy's protective measures, outlining steps that would be implemented to protect marine mammals and Federally listed species during training events. While the Navy is very confident in its well-trained lookouts, it does not expect that all animals present in the vicinity of training events will be detected. The acoustic impact modeling estimates provided in the EIS/OEIS are not reduced as a result of mitigation effectiveness, even though many marine mammals will be detected and sonar exposures will be avoided.
Wade Willis 1-4		So, I'm very, very concerned that the military is proposing 42 days in the summer. And as a guide I can tell you there's 90 days in the summer up there. And that's you know, about half of the summer you're proposing of possibility being out there conducting SONAR operations. That's a real concern of mine. I would hope that possible high use times for migrating whales could be avoided. And that possibility SONAR operations could be minimized as much as possible for the Alaska operation area due to the potential risk.	The Navy cares very much about the ocean environment, as it is an environment where we live and work as well. The Navy's protective measures are effective at mitigating, not eliminating, risk to marine mammals. Based on the analysis included in this EIS/OEIS, including the Navy's history of operating sonar in the Pacific Ocean with no recorded evidence of harm to marine mammals, the Navy feels its protective measures are adequate. Please see Section 2.3.2.3 regarding a discussion for why an alternative time of year was rejected from further consideration.
Wade Willis 1-5		I'm also very concerned with the amount of toxins, the hazardous waste that's being proposed -- 10,300 pounds. I, particularly am very concerned with persistent organic pollutants which are really going through the roof in Alaska due to multiple sources. Our fisheries, our halibut, and long lived fishes like rockfish and lingcod are being limited in our ability to eat now because of persistent organic pollutants. And our marine mammals are showing extremely high levels of persistent organic pollutants. So, I wasn't able to figure out how much of the 10,300 pounds would be POP's, but I would encourage the Navy to try to mitigate any POP discharge. Thank you.	The Navy always strives to reduce any impacts to the environment when conducting operations. The only known source of key POPs (agreed to in the Stockholm Convention) from Navy training activities would be PCBs. Under the Proposed Action, PCBs would only be found in vessels used in a SINKEX event. Vessels are cleaned according to standards set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to remove all PCB and other potentially problematic materials to the maximum extent practicable. Based on the 1999 SINKEX Letter of Agreement between the Navy and EPA, approximately 100 lb of PCBs are typically left on board each vessel used for SINKEX events. These PCBs are found in materials that cannot be removed without comprising the integrity of the vessel. Text describing removal of PCBs and other materials from SINKEX vessels has been added to

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Anchorage			
			Section 3.2.2.2 of the Final EIS. Also, the estimated amount of PCBs (200 lb annually) has been included for the estimation of hazardous materials under Alternative 2 (Section 3.2.2.6).
Tom Lakosh 1		My name is Tom Lakosh, I'm an Anchorage -- Anchorage resident. But I've long been user of Prince William Sound resources and we appreciate your service, but find that some of the responses to my earlier inquires quite distressing. First of all with respect to mitigation methods, I fell it's wholly inappropriate to use the standard of impairment -- hearing impairment of whales as the necessary triggering standard for abating operations. Clearly the standard should be, and adverse behavioral impacts upon marine mammals and should be the standard to cease operations and for avoidance of those oper -- of those species.	As described in Chapter 5, the mitigation distances are based on more than the onset of hearing impairment. At approximately 1,000 yards from the most powerful surface ship sonar proposed for use (see Table 3.8-5), the received level of sound should not exceed approximately 175 dB (re 1 μ Pa) whereas the onset of the first measurable and temporary hearing impairment (TTS) has been established at 195 dB (re 1 μ Pa). This TTS threshold would likely not occur outside the 200 yard shut-down distance.
Tom Lakosh 2		And when I inquired as to why we wouldn't schedule the training sessions for periods outside the migration of whales, towards winter obviously. And outside of the migration paths, I was told that, oh well stuff breaks in Alaska winters. Well, we know that. We're out there, I've been a fisherman in the wintertime. You know, freezing spray, et cetera, et cetera. And if you guys don't want to build equipment to protect your 49th state, you might as well just take your stuff elsewhere. You know, bring up stuff that will work, do it in the wintertime outside of the migration seasons, and outside of their migration path.	In Section 2.3.2.3 of the Draft and Final EIS/OEIS, the alternative of training during winter in the GOA TMAA was considered. Unstable winter weather conditions in the Gulf of Alaska create unsafe conditions for Navy training and such alternatives were considered infeasible and were not evaluated further.
Tom Lakosh 3		Establish a standard of avoidance of populations based on impacting behavioral standard of practices of the marine mammals. Set up a preliminary observations both with passive SONAR that is sensitive to the vocalizations of the whales, to find out where they are. Conduct your operations away from them to the greatest extent possible. We realize you need areas to train -- designated areas to train to keep out other commercial activities and vessels and so forth. But that area should be large enough so that you can avoid populations, take adequate time to you know, preliminary you know, pre-scanning of the areas where you plan to train and make concerted effort to avoid population densities to the greatest extend practicable.	Please see Section 5.2.1.6 which includes a discussion why the measures suggested in your comment were considered but eliminated from further consideration. In previous documents NMFS has indicated that seasonal or geographic limitations are a direct and effective means of reducing adverse impacts to marine mammals. However, the concept of geographical and seasonal (or temporal) limitations is inconsistent with the Title 10 responsibilities of Department of Defense to assure a fully trained and ready military force in regards to training activities in the GOA. Such restrictions would not be appropriate in the GOA. It is important that any measures are used carefully at times and places where their effects are relatively well known. For example, if there is credible evidence that concentrations of marine mammals are known to be high at a specific place or during a specific time of

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Anchorage			
			<p>the year, or that certain areas are selectively used for important life functions like breeding or feeding, then these types of seasonal or geographic exclusions or limitations can be effective. However, if marine mammals are only known to prefer certain types of areas (as opposed to specific areas) for certain functions (such as beaked whales use of seamounts or marine mammal use of productive areas like fronts), which means that they may or may not be present at any specific time, it may be less effective to require avoidance or limited use of that type of area all of the time.</p> <p>Additionally, as detailed in Section 5.2.16 of the EIS/OEIS, the mitigation measures involve much more than visual observers on ships, make use of those in aircraft, in addition to use of all available sensors such as passive acoustic hydrophones. The mitigation measures presented in the EIS/OEIS were developed in coordination with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) biologists and scientists to determine which mitigation measures would be both effective and still allows for the Navy to meet the operational needs for realistic training.</p>
Tom Lakosh 4		<p>One other method that is -- that Alaskan's have learned is that you can also call some of these species you know, particularly pilot whales and orcas to your presence by just fishing for black cod and halibut. So, you can call those species out of your test area by hiring a licensed commercial fisheries, ones that have had particular problems in the past, given that the marine -- the whales recognize their hydraulic sounds. And bring the whales out of harms way. Pay the fisherman to feed the whales while you happily ping away out in the Gulf. There are a number of methods here that you haven't fairly considered, you haven't done your job. You could do a better job, you could bring better equipment to operate outside of our peak summer migration and commercial fishing seasons.</p>	<p>As described in Chapter 2, the proposed activities are not a "test" and do not take place in a "test area". As described in Section 5.2.1.6, it is not practical to clear the area where training will occur because Navy training activities are often not scripted and cover hundreds of square miles. In addition, the purposeful feeding of marine mammals would require authorization under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and in some cases, the Endangered Species Act as well, and these activities are not considered as a part of the proposed action due to these concerns.</p>
Tom Lakosh 5		<p>And you know, and a much less impact on our resources. You're here to protect us, not only our hides but our resources. When you talk about Alaskan's, our resources are apart of us. We live in subsistence, we live in tourism, we live in commercial fishing. That's our livelihoods, and that's why a lot of us come here to Alaska is to experience the wild, an undisturbed wild. And we don't need you know, disturbances that we clearly know are going to harm our</p>	<p>Socioeconomic impacts in regard to the fishing industry, tourism, and recreation have been analyzed in the EIS/OEIS in Section 3.12 - Socioeconomics. To help manage competing demands and maintain public access in the GOA, the Navy conducts its offshore activities, which are limited in time and scope, in a manner that minimizes limitations to recreation and commercial activities. Furthermore, no closure or restricted areas are proposed associated with the Navy's proposed</p>

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Anchorage			
		interests. We want you to protect us as whole people, not just part of us. And we want you to bring the proper equipment, make the proper preparations, and accordingly appreciate the resources and particularly marine mammals the way we do. Thank you for this opportunity.	action. Please note that there is no indication, in any area where the Navy trains, that training activities have a negative impact on the health of the marine environment. As such, the Navy is confident in our analysis, the Final EIS, which concludes that there are no significant impacts to any resources from Navy activities.
Paul Kendall 2-1		My name is Paul, middle initial D, Kendall and I'm an energy activist. And as far as credentials go, I'm neither accomplished, degreed, or published. And I came here primarily out of curiosity and because of my -- I love the Navy, and I love the military, and our services and I think they're one of the few groups in our society that is being taught to represent us all as one society, America. But I'd like to make some suggestions to you. These will most likely be outside the scope of your EIS, but I'm really not sure what the scope is. In my world anything that contributes to a better society is a good thing and should be considered. So, I came here because I'd like to have you consider having some type of assigned energy -- an energy science technology officer, team, or department that travels with these fleets or groups of vessels. And I'd really like to see an actual vessel itself as designated as an energy science technology with each group of ships or vessels. And I'd like to see you gathering a tremendous amount of data in realtime, ice, tidal, temperature, wave, content, body contents, currents, et cetera. I just made a brief list of the things that you could do to contribute to our society. I think that you come to. I'd also like to see you, because you're in such a high tidal impact area, and there's so few tides I think around the world. I'd like to see you check your mothball fleet to see if you couldn't bring some type of a vessel to Homer, Kodiak, Seward, and Cordova. Something that has been mothballed that the community might be able to use. I'd like to see you come up in the winter so that we can get some ice data. And I'd like to see you -- let's see, consolidate your -- I forgot what that was about. My premise this, I'm convinced that we're going to be moving very, very quickly into water partnerships. And that there is no such thing as water ladies and gentleman. It's all hydrogen compounds, or contaminates, or particulates, or partnerships. And if I'm not wrong about this, we're about to see a whole new era of energy. And that energy is going to	This comment is duly noted. Please note that the Navy is engaged in numerous scientific endeavors and continues to make available to the public releasable information through papers, conferences, and manuscripts. Much of the Navy's research details can be found through the Office of Naval Research. However, your proposals are outside the scope of the Navy's proposed action of the GOA EIS/OEIS.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Anchorage			
		revolve around magnetic fields and the hydrogen atoms. And when I see these bodies, these vessels of tremendous capacity, intellectual and data rich with being able -- technology, with gathering -- data gathering rich devices, it would seem to me that it would be more interactive in those bodies of water for multiple reasons. I don't see how we could disconnect energy from anything. I have come to conclusion later in my life that most of the things you see are manifestations of energy. And our children within the next decade are about to learn that connectivity and with that comes responsibility for our balance and our in harmony. And that cast is huge, and the Navy has, I think has a fundamental fiduciary obligation to those creatures in that ocean and those communities along the way. And in closing, I'm coming to an end here, I'm opposed to the War in Iraq and I'd like to see all of my troop and all of my people come back to America and begin to rebuild our values that we all share in common and quality of lifestyles and family lives. Thank you.	
Wade Willis 2-1		Thank you again, my name is Wade Willis. And I want to impress upon the Navy the opportunity they have to help the scientific community acquire baseline data. It is a critical, critical component to our long term stability as a nation and as a State that we understand, as best as possible the current populations of animals that we have, the migration routes, things like that. This is an incredibly good opportunity for the Navy to address that and to support the scientific community in ways maybe beyond the EIS evaluation. But to say you know, if we're going to have MOA we're also going to support some science research beyond this EIS listing, you know. Just to say that that's an important national strategic point as well. That you know, in exchange for our maybe degrading the environment a bit, we're going to help the State and the scientific community know more for the long term benefit, overall benefit may be far greater from the science we learn than the small amount of environment degradation that occurs due to our operations out there for 16 to 41 days a year. So I really hope the Navy will look really hard in helping the scientific community which is dramatically under funded, to acquire some of that baseline data. Especially in the areas that you're getting ready to operate. You know, the Gulf of Alaska is some of	<p>Please see Section 5.2.1.4 regarding research planned as part of the monitoring associated with Navy training events in the Gulf of Alaska.</p> <p>The U.S. Navy has developed a GOA TMAA Monitoring Plan to provide marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring as required under the MMPA of 1972 and the ESA of 1973. The GOA TMAA Monitoring Plan proposes monitoring goals for marine mammals that are unique with regard to their breadth as well as their focus on potential impacts of mid-frequency active sonar (MFAS) and underwater explosions on marine mammals and sea turtles.</p> <p>Additionally, to develop additional baseline data for the Gulf of Alaska, in April 2009, the Navy funded and NMFS conducted the Gulf of Alaska Line-Transect Survey (GOALS) to address the data needs for this analysis. Line-transect survey visual data to support distance sampling statistics and acoustic data were collected over a 10-day period both within and outside the TMAA.</p> <p>The Navy shares your concern for marine life and is very concerned about the environment. As such, the Navy is a leading sponsor of marine mammal research and provides a significant amount of funding and support to marine research.</p>

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Anchorage			
		the most difficult areas for the scientific community to get funding for. So that's mainly what I wanted to say on my second round. Thank a lot you guys.	In the past five years the agency funded over \$100 million (\$26 million in FY08 alone) to universities, research institutions, federal laboratories, private companies, and independent researchers around the world to study marine mammals.
Paul Kendall 3-1		Oh, my name is Paul, middle initial D, Kendall. I think these moments are very, very special that we gather. And the reason that they are is it allows us a collective view of diverse opinions and unknown moments of not really going where everyone's at and allows us to reflect on our own values and ideas. And I wanted to thank you for your ability to come around again. In today's world we're seeing a tremendous repression of the ability to collectively communicate in some unhurried fashion. Some contemplated mode, the more complex our problems become in coming back to some greater understanding of balance is going to require a slower thought process due to the complexity to find a resolution. In having you allow a person to get up and have a fair share of time and then to come back around and circle, I think that's admirable and appreciative thing that deserves recognition. And I just can't stress enough that you should have these moments on camera, on video to share with the rest of the world. So that you can set the bar and show other people. It's very important, I think that all of our data be videoed on the internet. Something that's very magnificent that's happening there. And the reason I actually came up here was to -- I hope that you'll chose Kodiak, and Homer, and Seward, and Cordova, and those places to come in with a couple of ships. There is something magnificent and inspirational about those ships and the men and women that represent some of our more fundamental values that created this great country, that I think are immeasurable in the long term. And naturally you won't forget the energy science technology designated vessel to share with the community. And if I might -- one more thing real quick. To give you and idea of why I'm here to give you -- there are things moving very, very quickly sweeping across the, I think the entire plant, but especially America. There are over 40 manufactures of electric vehicles that are reaching in the next three years. In addition to that the Chinese have announced they are going all electric bicycles. And when you look at things like that, within three years every seven year old child in India, China,	This comment is duly noted. In response to concerns over climate change, Department of the Navy leadership has initiated broad programs to reduce energy consumption and shift energy demand to renewable and alternative fuels to the extent consistent with its national security mission, thereby reducing emissions of CO ₂ and other GHG. The Navy has implemented a number of shore installation and fleet programs that have substantially reduced the generation of GHG, primarily through conservation of fossil fuels and electricity. Ashore, the Navy has aggressively encouraged its installations to reduce energy costs, both through facility competitions and through investments in solar, wind, and geothermal technologies. Energy conservation aboard Navy vessels at sea also has achieved substantial reductions in fuel consumption, and thus emissions of GHG. For further detail, please refer to Section 4.2.1.2 of the FEIS/OEIS.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Anchorage			
		and Asia is going to know more about the lithium ion battery and electron (indiscernible) they ever learned. And when you put that into the internet on such a worldwide scale the bookends of those impacts, then pour tens of the times we have never seen before, like an industrial revolution. This new sense of awareness that is now coming through energy, responsible energy management. It not only brings us a new individual freedom and will which we've never seen before. Because it's heading home and transportation. But they pour tons of new degrees of awareness. So, when I see these fleets that represent large amounts of energy in partnershiping and transitioning with the water bodies, the great water bodies. Which are really hydrogen. I think these are moments that I hope that you'll discuss amongst yourself -- maybe more than you are. And thank you again.	
Paul Kendall 3-2		Well, my name is Paul, middle initial D, Kendall. This is like my fourth time I think here on giving testimony. It's my first time to be at one of these. And I just wanted to note for the record that your people have been very accommodating and professional and amiable. And they've made me feel very comfortable. And sometime those little moments in our everyday events go unnoticed and I just wanted to give notice to that. And also your presentation allowing the individuals to come back up after a second comment, I think that really needs to be recognized. These meetings where we gather as a community, as a collective group are very important. They need to be unhurried and plenty of time. But more importantly sometimes when you take testimony from such a diverse gathering, you will actually learn things onsite in multiple orders or reviewing your thoughts. And it's important, I think to allow that person to have a second opportunity to come back up and reflect on a prior position of change or some new insight. And I thought that was really wonderful of being able to have that little nuance. Other than that you might have a little time clock up there with a large six or ten inch LED that -- where a person can see their time, and that way a person can have the dignity to shut themselves down when they're talking, which gives them more -- it empowers the individual to have more capacity to develop their personality and knowing the responsibility of time limit -- time limitations on talking. Anyway, thank you very much. That's it.	This comment is duly noted. The Navy appreciates your suggestions for these meetings and is working on implementing some of them for future Navy public meetings.

1 **I.8.3 HOMER**

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
Paul Seaton 1		Commented as follows: Well thank you. I am Paul Seaton, I'm the State Representative for District 35, covering Homer, Seward, and the outer Kenai Peninsula. I received comments of concern from constituents at the initiation of the last training exercise. These concerns were mainly centered on the potential effects of new -- frequency SONAR on whales.	The Navy shares your concern for marine life and is very concerned about the environment. As such, the Navy is a leading sponsor of marine mammal research and provides a significant amount of funding and support to marine research. In the past five years the agency funded over \$100 million (\$26 million in FY08 alone) to universities, research institutions, federal laboratories, private companies, and independent researchers around the world to study marine mammals. The Navy fully analyzed potential impacts to marine life from sonar, including whales in section 3.8 (Marine Mammals) of the EIS/OEIS. The analysis concludes that there is no significant impact to populations of marine mammals in the GOA.
Paul Seaton 2		I thank the Navy for scheduling this meeting here in Homer for the convenience of our local residents and I really appreciate it. Alaskan's are concerned about the effects of copper in fresh water and marine environments, especially on fish. This includes education of copper used in bottom paints in our fishing fleets, and also we're currently undergoing a review this month of -- by the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation on the aquatic life standards for copper. As those have been seen -- the current standards have been seen not be adequate to protect juvenile salmon for their homing and responses to avoiding predation. So, I'm concerned that on table 3.2-22 on page 3.2-32, that the sonobuoys that are going to be used will increase the amount of copper discharge from the current level of 38.1 pounds to 2520 pounds under -- that's Alternative 2 versus the No Action Alternative. And the increase of copper from eight pounds to 540 pounds. And that first was copper thiocyanate, and so I would like to request that the Navy look at analyzing the use of a explosive charge to destroy those sonobuoys that does not incorporate those amounts of copper that would discharge into the Gulf of Alaska.	The Navy has studied the release of copper thiocyanate from sonobuoy seawater batteries, and determined that it would achieve a peak concentration of about 0.015 microgram/liter (Department of the Navy 1993). Text describing the anticipated maximum concentration and environmental fate of copper thiocyanate from sonobuoys in the marine environment has been added to Section 3.2.2.4, 3.2.2.5, and 3.2.2.6.
Paul Seaton 3		And so I appreciate that, I appreciate the fact that you are looking at the affect of mid-range SONAR on the whales, as that is a prime concern by my constituents. I don't have -- although I have a degree in biology, whale interaction was	With regard to sonar use, the Navy fully analyzed potential impacts to marine life, including whales in section 3.8 (Marine Mammals) of the EIS/OEIS. The analysis concludes that there is no significant impact to populations of marine mammals.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
		not that -- my expertise. So, I would appreciate you continuing to look at that. And thank you again for having this meeting here in Homer."	Please note that the U.S. Navy has conducted active sonar activities for decades at the training ranges in Southern California and Hawaii with no indications of broad-scale impacts that are either injurious or of significant biological impact to marine mammals at those locations. The Navy's analysis indicates and this history indicates there is little relative risk to marine mammal populations from sonar training exercises as proposed in the EIS/OEIS.
Roberta Highland 1		Hi, I'm Roberta Highland. And I just found out about this meeting by reading the Homer News on Thursday. And I've always got issues when such a large amount of effort is put into having public meetings, that the people that are putting it together -- probably one idea is to contact any City Clerk office in the area that you're holding and they can give you the times, because really what would have been helpful was to have had this in the Homer News the week before because it's Saturday. And I just saw it on Thursday. It's just one way because of the cost and the work that goes into it. So, that would be my suggestion.	<p>In order to contact as many people as possible and coordinate the logistics, public hearing locations and dates necessarily were identified in advance. With regard to public notification in Homer, three series of display advertisements were placed in the Peninsula Clarion. The first series of newspaper advertisements occurred after the NOA/NOPH was published in the Federal Register and ran for three consecutive days in the Peninsula Clarion. The second series of newspaper advertisements was published a week and a half prior to the public hearings dates. The third series of newspaper advertisements was published three days prior to the public hearing dates, including the day of the public hearings. Those dates were: 14 December 2009, 15 December 2009, 16 December 2009, 28 December 2009, 30 December 2009, 6 January 2010, 7 January 2010, and 8 January 2010.</p> <p>- In addition, two news releases were distributed by the Commander, Navy Region Northwest Environmental Public Affairs Officer (CNRNW EPAO) to media outlets, elected officials, and other potentially interested parties. The first news release was distributed on 11 December 2009, and announced the availability of the Draft EIS/OEIS. This news release included details on the Proposed Action, public hearings dates, locations, times and comment information. A second news release was distributed by the CNRNW EPAO on 31 December 2009, and announced the Navy's upcoming public hearings. This news release, meant to encourage the public to attend the open houses and presentation/oral comment sessions, provided detailed information on the location, dates, and times of the public hearings, in addition to comment information and details on the Proposed Action.</p> <p>- A public service announcement was distributed twice by CNRNW EPAO (31 December 2009, and 4 January 2010), announcing the public hearing locations, dates, time, close of</p>

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
			comment period, and project Web site. - Postcards announcing the availability of the Draft EIS/OEIS, comment information, and the public hearing dates, times, and locations were sent out to 691 individuals on the project mailing list on 23 December 2009. - Fliers announcing the public open houses and presentation/oral comment sessions for each of the five public hearings locations were distributed to 45 locations.
Roberta Highland 2		I always like to ask people to pretend that you're a whale, or a bird, or a fish, or other mammals when any of these decisions are being made. And just take it from that perspective so we're not doing it from our frequent human ideal and so anyhow that's just one of my ideas. Is really take that -- it sounds silly, but kind of take it seriously. And there are the decisions maybe change because of that.	This comment is duly noted.
Roberta Highland 3		And active SONAR sounds a little problematic, for sure. Underwater explosives sound problematic, and birds and fish dying sound problematic. I understand that you are doing a really good job on making sure that the least amount of environmental damage is done. But it's one of those consequences that happens no matter what.	Please see Sections 3.5 to 3.9 regarding an analysis of impacts to birds, fish, and marine mammals with regard to sonar and at-sea explosions. Additionally, please see response to Seaton – 3.
Roberta Highland 4		I'm also wanting the carbon footprint and pollution considered. And I don't know if that's being given the amount of consideration that it needs to be. Because every time a ship goes, an airplane takes off, any of the things that will occur, there is a carbon footprint and there is pollution that happens with that. And that needs to be something we really strongly take into consideration these days.	Carbon footprint and air pollution concerns including greenhouse gas emissions have been discussed in Section 3.1, Air Quality, and in Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts. Additionally, the anticipated carbon dioxide emissions of the Proposed Action (the "carbon footprint") are quantitatively described under Cumulative Impacts in Chapter 4.2.1.
Roberta Highland 5		And I'm always wondering if there's not a way of doing it more frequently in a -- I'm trying to think of the word, where you are pretending you are doing it.	You are referring to "simulated" training. It should be noted that Navy and Marine Corps training exercises already use, to a large extent, computer-simulated training and conduct command and control exercises without operational forces (constructive training) whenever possible. However, as described in Section 2.3.2.4 of the EIS/OEIS, "Unlike live training, simulated training does not provide the requisite level of realism necessary to attain combat readiness, and cannot replicate the high-stress environment encountered during combat operations." This section and Section 1.2.1 - "Why The Navy Trains," goes further to explain the importance of live training and the current limitations of simulated training.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
Roberta Highland 6		And I know that -- oh, 30 seconds, okay. I'm wondering about the time of year. Summer is when the mammals, and fish, and bird activity is highest and that seems to be a poor choice of time for these exercises. And I'll quit because my time is up. Thank you.	In Section 2.3.2.3 of the Final EIS/OEIS, the alternative of training during winter in the GOA TMAA was considered. The 'Alternative Locations' discussion explains why a change of locations does not meet Navy's purpose and need for the proposed action. Unstable winter weather conditions in the Gulf of Alaska create unsafe conditions for Navy training and such alternatives were considered infeasible and were not evaluated further.
Robert Archibald 1		Good evening and thank you for coming down. Even though it was short notice, we're happy to see you here. And I'd just like to reiterate on what Paul said, that we've had a big battle going here with the androus fish stocks and the effects of copper on them. And it's proving that they are kind of dizzying their navigational systems.	The Navy is very aware of concerns from fishing fleets and fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska. As described in the EIS/OEIS, the Navy is confident that its training activities will not impact fisheries, fish populations, or the livelihood of fishermen in the Gulf of Alaska. In fact, there is no indication, in any area where the Navy trains, that training activities have a negative impact on the health of fish populations. With regard to copper, the Navy has studied the release of copper thiocyanate from sonobuoy seawater batteries, and determined that it would achieve a peak concentration of about 0.015 microgram/liter (Department of the Navy 1993). Text describing the anticipated maximum concentration and environmental fate of copper thiocyanate from sonobuoys in the marine environment has been added to Section 3.2.2.4, 3.2.2.5, and 3.2.2.6.
Robert Archibald 2		So, the timing of these exercises -- if they're -- you know, if they're going to be at the same time that we're having fish stocks coming back into this Gulf of Alaska and heading up to the Bering Sea and Bristol Bay. And if this has any significant impact or increases any kind of chemicals in the water, copper be what it is, I don't know what you're using for munitions these days. I would have some problems with that at that particular time of the year.	This comment is duly noted. Please note that the Navy is very aware of concerns from fishing fleets and fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska. As such, the Navy conducted a thorough analysis of impacts from its proposed activities to fish in Section 3.6. As described in the Final EIS/OEIS, the Navy is confident that its training activities will not impact fisheries, fish populations or the livelihood of fishermen in the Gulf of Alaska, and therefore will not impact fish stocks returning to Bristol Bay or the Bering Sea. In fact, there is no indication, in any area where the Navy trains, that training activities have a negative impact on the health of fish populations.
Robert Archibald 3		I would hope that if they doubled the length of these exercises they would take into account the time of year for migrations. And I would certainly hope that NMFS and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would have a significant impact on that, as far as giving the Navy adequate information on that. Because I've sailed in and out of Prince William Sound a lot and it's going to be an area where there	As detailed in Section 3.8, migration patterns have been considered for all species throughout the Final EIS/OEIS. In addition, the U.S. Navy is consulting as required under regulations including the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act which are administered by the National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Please note that none of the proposed actions involve

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
		is an awful lot of mammal interactions. I so I just hope you sharpened your pencil on that one. And we don't want to see a whole lot of destruction out there with our fish stocks. So, thanks for coming.	Prince William Sound or the areas leading into and out of the sound, which is approximately 60 nm from the TMAA.
Olga von Ziegesar 1-1		Hi, my name is Olga von Ziegesar. I am the Director of Eye of Whale, a nonprofit research group here in Alaska. Our mission is to study and protect the humpback whale and to educate people of the status and the health of the species. We've been documenting the population of humpback whales in Prince William Sound and the north gulf coast of Alaska for 30 years. In 1966 the humpback whale was put on the endangered species list and protected and protected by the Marine Mammal Protection Act. In the 30 years of my study I have seen the population of the North Pacific humpback whale go from 3000 to 20,000. About 5,000 of these whales migrate up into the north Gulf of Alaska to feed. This area includes the Cook Inlet, Kodiak, the Barren Islands, Kenai Fjords, and Prince William Sound, and the waters in between.	This comment is duly noted.
Olga von Ziegesar 1-2		It is known that military SONAR testing is very damaging to the soft tissue in the marine mammal skulls and organs. These effects can cause brain hemorrhages, mass stranding, and even death. Mid-frequency SONAR has been proved to be very destructive to whales diving and feeding behavior. They will avoid the intense sounds by surfacing too quickly and causing conditions similar to the bends. Now you may think that the military tests would be harmless if they were done in the winter or slightly off season, and not during the summer months when the whales are definitely most abundant in these areas. We are now finding that many whales stay in the northern waters during the winter to continue their feeding. Hydro phone arrays hung from buoys in the Gulf of Alaska have recorded whale songs and calls during every month of the year. You will say that your plan is to have observers aboard to watch for whales. When they are present the testing will be ceased. Marine mammals can hear for many miles underwater. And from the deck of a ship a whale blow can only be seen if it is within a couple of miles. For these reasons it will be impossible to avoid effecting the whales and other marine mammals during any time of the year in the Gulf of Alaska.	<p>The Draft and Final EIS/OEISs use the most current, relevant scientific information to develop the analysis on sonar training and potential impacts to marine mammals. Please see Section 3.8 regarding what is known with regard to sonar impacts to marine mammals. As detailed in Section 3.8, Navy is aware of acoustic monitoring results indicating the presence of many species year-round in the Gulf of Alaska.</p> <p>As explained in Section 2.3.2.1 of the Final EIS/OEIS, a rescheduling of training activities outside the summer months would not support the Navy's Purpose and Need and was therefore eliminated from further consideration.</p> <p>The Navy's protective measures are effective at mitigating, not eliminating, risk to marine mammals. Based on the analysis included in this EIS/OEIS, including the Navy's history of operating sonar in the Pacific Ocean with no recorded evidence of harm to marine mammals, the Navy feels its protective measures are adequate.</p> <p>Navy lookouts undergo extensive training to include on-the job instruction under supervision of an experienced lookout followed by completion of Personnel Qualification Standard Program. NMFS-approved Marine Species Awareness Training is required before every sonar exercise. Chapter 5.0</p>

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
			of the EIS/OEIS, Mitigation Measures, presents the U.S. Navy's protective measures, outlining steps that would be implemented to protect marine mammals and Federally listed species during training events. While the Navy is very confident in its well-trained lookouts, it does not expect that all animals present in the vicinity of training events will be detected. The acoustic impact modeling estimates provided in the EIS/OEIS are not reduced as a result of mitigation effectiveness, even though many marine mammals will be detected and sonar exposures will be avoided.
Olga von Ziegesar 1-3		Finally, the humpback whale population is recovering to healthy numbers. And now the Navy proposes to endanger them with intensive SONAR and explosives. It seems to me that we must change something if protecting our country means sacrificing the whales. Thank you.	The U.S. Navy has conducted training using mid-frequency active sonar without incident for decades in Hawaii without any apparent impacts to humpback whales, including within the designated humpback whale sanctuary. There is no evidence of broad-scale impacts that are either injurious or of significant biological impact to any marine mammals from those locations. The Navy conducted a thorough analysis of sonar and at sea explosions in the EIS/OEIS, using the most current and best available science, and with cooperation from the National Marine Fisheries Service, which is responsible for the protection of marine species. Because there is no indication from areas where the Navy routinely trains that training activities have a negative impact on the health of the marine environment, the Navy is confident that there is little relative risk to marine mammal populations from active sonar training or any other training events.
Sue Christiansen 1		I to want to thank you so much for this public process. I thank you for your service to the United States and all of you in your professional roles, your expertise, your commitment to science, and research. I just found out about this today as I was flying in on Era on the same flight as all you guys. So, I'm glad I was able to be here.	This comment is duly noted.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
Sue Christiansen 2		<p>And what I remember, I think it was about five years ago the Navy was doing research off the coast of New Zealand on SONAR -- on new acoustics. And maybe you guys - - are you familiar with that? I heard about this from NPR and I've thought about it after I got off the plane this morning. But there was like a hundred whales that breached [sic], and it -- you know, it started out with about 20 and they tried to figure out what was causing the problem. And it turned out after several years that it was demonstrated or proven that it was the new acoustic SONAR research that was going on that was effecting them. And I just don't want to see that happen here. And I know that everyone involved with the Navy or no one in the Navy wants any of our marine animals to be injured in any way or you have a good intention as well, and that you are doing the best of your -- to your abilities to protect our nation. And have the highest good in mind for all species. And I would just say, my feeling at this time is I think it's a little early for us to be doing this kind of research - - or you know, the games or the activities that you've presented happen here.</p>	<p>Please see the full analysis of marine mammal strandings in Appendix F of the EIS/OEIS -- Cetacean Stranding Report. The report discusses the various stranding incidents around the world. Please note the Proposed Action includes no testing of new weapons, but rather the training of Navy personnel with established sensor and weapons systems. Additionally, the Navy fully analyzed potential impacts to marine life from sonar, including whales in Section 3.8 (Marine Mammals) of the EIS/OEIS. The analysis concludes that there is no significant impact to populations of marine mammals.</p>
Sue Christiansen 3		<p>And I support no action alternative at this point. And I'm not sure I support the research for SONAR, if it has the effects of breaching [sic] whales or that kind of thing. Okay, that's it.</p>	<p>As explained in Section 1.4 of the EIS/OEIS, the decision on which alternative the Navy will pursue will be made in light of the Purpose and Need by Navy representatives following the review of all relevant facts, impact analyses, and comments received via the EIS/OEIS public participation process.</p> <p>As stated earlier, the Proposed Action includes no testing of new weapons, but rather the training of Navy personnel with established sensors and weapons systems.</p> <p>Also stated above, please see the full analysis of marine mammal strandings in Appendix F of the EIS/OEIS -- Cetacean Stranding Report. The report discusses the various stranding situations across the world.</p>
Amy Christiansen 1		<p>My name is Amy Christiansen, I've lived in Homer -- in and out of Homer for years. But I have some real questions for you guys that don't seem to be addressed, as in how far does the SONAR blast travel? How loud is it 10 miles away? How loud is it 200 miles away? What happens when it comes in contact with some shelf or something? I mean that kind of information, I don't think we really have.</p>	<p>Information of this general nature was presented in Table 3.8-5 with regard to Navy's most powerful surface ship mid-frequency sonar. As that table shows, if the conditions were perfect for sound to be conducted across the entire distance (which is not likely to happen), a sonar ping at 3.5 kHz beginning with a source level of 235 dB was modeled as traveling a maximum of 105 km (approximately 57 nautical miles) in a homogenous water column by the time it had undergone transmission loss resulting in a level of 120 dB at</p>

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
			that distance. How "loud" the sound would be perceived at that distance underwater is, again, subject to many variables since some marine mammals (like blue whale) likely cannot hear a sonar at a frequency of 3.5 kHz so there is no means to accurately answer the question. At 10 miles from the same source, dependent on the conditions such as the presence of a distinct temperature layer at depth and the depth of the receiver in the water column, it is possible the sound could not even be present at all.
Amy Christiansen 2		I heard a couple people state that we don't really know that much about marine mammals. We really don't. And for me, just from my heart SONAR -- just discharging SONAR for -- I mean, I would really want to know better reasons what science you're really trying to determine here. Or what is the whole weaponry involvement? I haven't heard a link there. I mean it's nice -- the posters are nice and I do appreciate the chance to talk about it. But I don't feel that it's worthwhile if you really don't know what we're studying yet to harm any marine mammals.	Sonar is a sensor not a weapons system and active sonar in fathometers and fish finders are used by many vessels at sea. The Navy is proposing to use active sonar in Anti-Submarine Warfare training events; there is no testing involved in the proposed training. The EIS/OEIS uses the most current, relevant scientific information to develop the analysis on sonar training and potential impacts to marine mammals. This analysis (in Section 3.8) was completed in cooperation with the National Marine Fisheries Service, which is responsible for the protection of marine species. The Navy will continue to provide a significant amount of funding and support to marine research. In the past five years the agency funded over \$100 million (\$26 million in FY08 alone) to universities, research institutions, federal laboratories, private companies, and independent researchers around the world to study marine mammals. In addition, as described in Section 5.2.1.3, there will be marine environment monitoring for the purpose of determining any detectable impacts as a result of the training events proposed.
Amy Christiansen 3		I also wonder if there's a lot of this training and stuff going on in California -- I know California and Alaska are different, and waters are different. But I always wonder why -- or I feel like, they can't get away with it in California, so they might be coming up to get away with it in Alaska. And I would really like that issue addressed. Because there's more population in California - - I mean, that part is real for me. And it might be ridiculous because it is different ocean you know, waves or whatever. But some part of that is real for me. That I would like that addressed.	The Navy has been, and is still, conducting similar activities off the coast of California, in the Pacific Northwest, off the coast of Hawaii, on the east coast and in various other places around the world for decades with no indications of broad-scale impacts that are either injurious or of significant biological impact to marine mammals at those locations. The Navy is also conducting similar analysis and environmental planning at each Navy range complex. As explained in Chapter 1 of the EIS/OEIS, part of the selection criteria for choosing Alaska as a training location is whether the proposed action meets the Navy's purpose and need. As described in Section 2.3.2.1, the Navy considered, but rejected, alternatives that included moving this exercise to

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
			other locations. Such alternatives fail to meet the purpose of and need for the proposed action.
Amy Christiansen 4		And more notice would have been nice. And what else did I think? Oh, like in the book -- science is always a little bit lagging is what I found. If you take sea otters, which are mentioned in your environmental impact study, they are now listed, they are now -- critical habitat has been named. And that's not included in your thick book. And I'm sure that thick book took a long time to put together, but that's something too that is apparent to me. So, okay thanks.	Sea otters are discussed in Section 3.8 of the EIS/OEIS. Additional text has been provided in Section 3.8.1. Please note that since the TMAA is far offshore and well beyond the sea otter Critical Habitat, sea otters are not likely to occur within the TMAA because of two factors: foraging diving depth limitations (ranging from 2 to 75 meters [6.5 to 246 feet]) and the bathymetry of the TMAA (typically deeper than 100 meters [328 feet]).
Whitney Lowe 1		My name is Whitney Lowe, I'm here from Homer, Alaska. And as with everybody else I'd like to thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to be able to comment this evening on this issue. The Navy has a history of poor environmental stewardship including dumping high volumes of garbage into the ocean as well as toxic materials from explosive ordinance. And consequently it is difficult to believe what they might say about being responsible for the environmental impacts of these actions.	The Navy is very concerned about the environment and actually has an excellent record of stewardship. For more information in this regard, see the Navy's Currents Magazine at [http://www.facebook.com/pages/Washington-DC/US-Navy-Currents-magazine/112833481868]. Shipboard waste-handling procedures governing the discharge of nonhazardous waste streams have been established for commercial and Navy vessels. These categories of wastes include solids (garbage) and liquids such as "black water" (sewage), "gray water" (water from deck drains, showers, dishwashers, laundries, etc.), and oily wastes (oil-water mixtures). See Section 3.3.1.2 of the FEIS/OEIS for further details.
Whitney Lowe 2		And I can understand in these times of international terrorism, it's easy to throw out the fear card and say, that all these training exercises are necessary to keep our country safe. But trumping up peoples fears has routinely led to trading off the health and safety of human and other animal habitats because supposedly it was going to make us safer. At some point it would be great that we might learn that the answer to making us safer doesn't result from bigger and more powerfully destructive weapons, nor from destroying our surroundings in the pursuit of those weapons.	This comment is duly noted.
Whitney Lowe 3		At the present moment we have a situation of drastic concern with our worldwide fisheries and marine environment. A November 2006 article in the Journal of Science suggested that there will be virtually nothing left to fish from the seas by the middle of this century if the current trends of catastrophic fish populations declines continue. The primary culprits in this involve over fishing, pollution, and other environmental factors.	This comment is duly noted.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
Whitney Lowe 4		In the face of these issues it's totally irresponsible to increase military training, which involves toxic dumping and tactics known to kill and injure marine life.	The Navy shares your concern for marine life and the health of the ocean and the Navy does not dispose of toxic waste by dumping it at sea. Furthermore, the Navy has conducted a thorough analysis of potential effects from its proposed activities in Chapter 3 of the EIS/OEIS. Because there is no indication, in the area where the Navy trains, that training activities have a negative impact on the health of the marine environment, the Navy is confident that there is little relative risk to the marine environment from active sonar use or other training events.
Whitney Lowe 5		We should be going to great lengths to do anything we can, not only to mitigate the current practices that are causing precipitous decline, but to reverse this trend. To engage further military exercise in this region that is extremely rich in sensitive marine life is a blunder of epic proportions and represents incredibility poor judgement.	This comment is duly noted. Please see Chapter 5 of the EIS/OEIS, Mitigation Measures, which presents the Navy's protective measures, outlining steps that would be implemented to protect marine mammals and Federally listed species during training events.
Whitney Lowe 6		Our children and decedents in who's hands we are going to leave this incredibility injured world will be asking us, what were they thinking? We can afford to participate in this process, as it represents the epitome of irresponsibility and drastically poor judgement. Thank you.	This comment is duly noted.
Don Lane 1		Thank you for this opportunity -- thank you for this opportunity to speak. This nation's security is a big and the Navy has always played a large role in the safety and security of this country. It's a large part of the success that we all enjoy, and the freedoms that we all enjoy. Having said that, I also understand the taxpayers investment in the tools of that security, it's important to practice. And it's important to understand those tools and it space and it takes time to practice.	This comment is duly noted.
Don Lane 2		Having said that, this map -- the western boundary of the practice area or the football field, as it described to me goes up on the shelf in the Gulf of Alaska. When it goes from dark to light is right around 150 fathom break. Now to the west of that break and over to the edge of the yellow line, that is some of the richest bio-diversity in marine fish as you'll find any place in Alaska. I have spent years out there fishing, long lining, pulling pots and from Montague Island down to off of Kodiak. There are sharks, they are skates, there are halibut, there's grey cod, they are fish there that have air bladders, they are fish there that don't have air bladders.	The Navy is very aware of concerns from fishing fleets and fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska. As described in the EIS/OEIS, analysis of impacts to fish, including those with swim bladders, are found in Section 3.6. The shallow water shelf area including Portlock Bank referenced in the comment is too close to the borders of the TMAA and would unnecessarily constrain maneuverability. As such is not a likely operating area where at sea explosions would be occurring.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
		There's this huge bio-diverse population that are -- fish that are there year round. My concern is; is that some of that water that's up on that shelf, it doesn't show on that picture, is 150 to 180 feet deep. It's not very deep, there are -- Portlock Bank area up there that's 35 fathoms, off of Montague Island, sticking south of that island there's an area -- it's all less than -- some area of it are less than 200 feet deep. And imagine a huge explosion on that wall and you're over here. And you're a fish on the bottom. That's about the distance between the surface and the fish if there was an explosion. So what I would like to see, while I know you need the area to practice.	
Don Lane 3		There was the comment about the sinking of the ship, as the target would be in 1000 fathoms. I think it's important to consider any ordnance or major explosions that were to occur during the practice should be off of that ledge into 1000 fathoms. It's not that far to move off that shelf to deep water. It's an area of maybe five miles to break from 180 fathoms down to over 1000 fathoms. And the difference between being that wall to this wall in a major explosion and all those fish that are laying on the bottom and 1000 fathoms is a mile. So, that would be my only is; is that western -- that western shelf there is -- when you talk about environmental impact, there's a lot of environment there. And some of it is not very far down. And if it was considered -- you know, you could drop a bomb there in any of that area, that would be a mistake in some of those areas, because it's not that deep.	The vessel used for SINKEK is placed in a specific location that is greater than 50 nm (93 km) out to sea and in water depths greater than 6,000 ft (1,830 m) (40 C.F.R. § 229.2) so that when it sinks it will not be a navigation hazard to marine traffic. These parameters would not allow for any activities to occur on the continental shelf due to the distance and depth requirements. See Figure 2-7, "Possible locations of a SINKEK within the TMAA", for a graphic representation of the areas that meet SINKEK requirements.
Elise Wolf 1-1		My name is Elise Wolf. I'm on the Board of Directors for the Kachemak Bay Conservation Society. Thank you for being here. And I'll ditto what everyone else has said. While we appreciate you coming to Homer, I have some issues. And I'm surprised that you're not in Seward because as you can see this map shows -- there's a few tourism operators, whale watching companies that probably would have something to say to you that probably wouldn't be very nice. And I think you missed them in your environmental impact statement. You also missed Glacier Bay, I mean if we're going to mimic the French like they do bombing Tahiti, why not hit Glacier Bay too? I mean you picked two -- one of the second most important areas for tourism in Alaska other than Glacier Bay for whale tourism. So, I'm just wondering	Public hearing locations were determined based on the location of potential or perceived impacts to the human environment. Because of the large geographic area of the GOA ATA's, it would be an imprudent use of taxpayer funding to conduct public hearings where there are limited or no potential impacts. As such, the Navy chose locations that would enable it to contact as many people as possible without imprudent use of taxpayer funding to conduct public hearings. Three locations were originally chosen for public scoping meetings. Based on feedback from the public scoping meetings, the Navy added two additional public hearing locations for a total of five in Alaska: Anchorage, Cordova, Homer, Juneau, and Kodiak.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
		why we're not in Glacier Bay as well?	
Elise Wolf 1-2		Now the only reason that you can say that there's no significant impacts on whales is because you deny the impacts from seismic sound on whales. You have been sued over this. The Navy has been sued, and you're going to be sued again. Not by our little company or little group down here in Homer. But by the other big environmental groups, which don't bother to come to these because they are already planning suing you. So, we can just expect that. But that's why. And the only reason that you can deny impacts on whales is because you're getting your legal advice from the tobacco industry or some other company that -- lawyers that tell you that if you wait 50 years and say that there's no correlation long enough, then everyone will start to believe it, until the suits finally start coming in, and the death toll is high that you can't deny it.	There is no use of seismic sound sources proposed in this EIS/OEIS. The science of sound in the water and its effects on marine life is evolving. The Navy conducted a thorough analysis of sonar and at sea explosions in the EIS/OEIS, using the most current and best available science, as required by NEPA. This analysis was completed in cooperation with the National Marine Fisheries Service, which is responsible for the protection of marine species. Please see Section 3.8 for a full discussion of potential impacts on marine mammals including whales.
Elise Wolf 1-3		Now there is one antidotal evidence and antidotal evidence that shows that beaching occurs with whales and all the other things Olga said. There are science professors around the world that testify on this all over the globe. So, this is something that you just simply are choosing to ignore. There's no evidence to the contrary.	A complete analysis of marine mammal strandings is in Appendix F of the EIS/OEIS – Cetacean Stranding Report. The report discusses the various stranding situations across the world. In addition, there are discussions specific to species presented in Section 3.8. The best available science is considered in preparation of this EIS/OEIS. As a general matter, the Navy shows consideration of the best available science when we ensure the scientific integrity of the discussions and analyses in the GOA TMAA. Specifically, this EIS/OEIS identifies methods used, references reliable scientific sources, discusses responsible opposing views, and discloses incomplete or unavailable information, scientific uncertainty, and risk (See 40 CFR,1502.9 (b),1502.22,1502.24).
Elise Wolf 1-4		The other issue that you have is -- well your timings bad. But as Olga says, maybe there is no good timing.	In Section 2.3.2.3 of the Final EIS/OEIS, the alternative of training during winter in the GOA TMAA was considered. Unstable winter weather conditions in the Gulf of Alaska create unsafe conditions for Navy training and such alternatives were considered infeasible and were not evaluated further.
Elise Wolf 1-5		Your mitigation is inadequate.	Please see response to Olga von Ziegesar 1-2.
Elise Wolf 1-6		Your cumulative impacts are inadequate.	The cumulative impacts analysis addresses the environmental impacts that result from the incremental impact of Navy activities when added to the past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions that affect the same resources. Table 4-1 succinctly depicts the categories of past, present,

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
			and reasonably foreseeable future actions that affect marine populations. Identifying such activities and in fact comparing them for relative impacts is an appropriate approach to cumulative impacts analysis. The EIS/OEIS analyzes in detail the effects of Navy actions on specific resources, and places those in the context of other sources of impacts.
Elise Wolf 1-7		Climate change shows that Ph changes are proving to increase the conduction of sound in our oceans. That's completely absent in your environmental impact statement. So, you are -- your cumulative impacts, which would include climate changes and the impacts thereof, and these pH changes that we now have evidence of are completely absent in your document. And I'm going to go ahead and wait until my time is up. Thank you.	Climate Change and Ocean Acidification are addressed in Section 4.2.1.2 of the EIS/OEIS. Please note that while current literature supports the hypothesis that acidification will increase the propagation of sound, most models and calculations show the effects to be limited to lower frequencies (~ 1–3 kHz and below). The current literature indicates that sound travels farther due to changes in the amounts of pH-dependent species such as dissolved borate and carbonate ions, which absorb acoustic waves. The effect of changing pH on mid and high-frequency sound propagation is currently being explored.
Mako Haggerty		Hi, my name is Mako Haggerty. I run a water taxi here, but I think for this event I'll be an assemblyman, which I was just recently elected to assembly. So, I'll speak from that standpoint. So, I want to thank you for coming here. And the displays here are very informative and I really appreciate that. I learned a lot tonight. I think this openness that we have here is really important. And what I seen on the -- not this slide here but the one that had the deadline for the comments to the EIS is January 25th, which gives the impression that the communication is going to stop between the coastal communities here and the Navy on the 25th. And I would hope and ask you, to please keep the communication open between the coastal communities beyond that deadline. Because there's going to be things that we learn and there's going to be things that you learn, and I would think that a healthy exchange of that information needs to continue beyond that deadline. And you're all real nice people. And I understand why they sent you here, because you are nice people. And we like to you know, sometimes we can be confrontational and you've -- and there's a reason for that. Is because we get the nice people and then you go on and do what you're going to do anyway. And a lot of times those of us that live in these coastal communities get a little tired of that. And so, I guess the	This comment is duly noted. The Navy is always looking for ways to better improve its public outreach capabilities and processes. The Navy has kept the website up and open during the entire EIS/OEIS process to keep the lines of communication open. The Navy complied with NEPA requirements in the development and consideration of alternatives. This FEIS/OEIS analyzes all alternatives in Section 2.3 and explains why the Navy has considered but eliminated alternatives in Section 2.3.2. The decision on which alternative to pursue has been considered by Navy representatives following the review of all relevant facts, impact analyses, and comments received via the EIS/OEIS public participation process.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
		main point is let's please keep the communication open. If there's going to be things that are going to impact the various communities in this area, we would like to be made aware of that in a timely fashion. And also if you learn anything, please let us know what that is. We like to learn things here too. Anything about the whales or the environment and we learn things and maybe you'd listen to us too. Thank you.	
Todd Hoppe 1		Thank you. My name is Todd Hoppe, commercial fisherman here in Homer and appreciate you gentlemen coming and giving me the opportunity of speak. I don't -- actually could you go back to that map please. I also am concerned about the continental shelf also. I make a large part of my living along there, and I'm concerned that DON explaining of activity along there.	The Navy is very aware of concerns from fishing fleets and fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska. The majority of the TMAA is located off the continental shelf and in deeper water of the Gulf. Impacts to fish under the proposed action from explosions would be possible, but these elements of the action are not expected to have measurable or detectable impacts to fish given the vast area encompassing the TMAA (42,146 nm ² [144,557 km ²]). In addition, please note that long-range advance notice of scheduled activities and times are made available to the public and the commercial fishing industry via the Internet. The local 17th District U.S. Coast Guard Notices to Mariners may be found at: http://www.navcen.uscg.gov/lnm/d17/ . These sites provide the public notice that the military will be operating in a specific area and will allow you to plan activities accordingly to avoid potential conflicts.
Todd Hoppe 2		And you know, if say there was going to be some impact with whales and it did -- it wasn't learned until later on down the line from your things.	Monitoring reports from exercises since 2006 have demonstrated the ability to detect marine mammals, the success of these mitigation measures, and a lack of observable impacts to marine species as a result of Navy training events. (Please see the recent results supporting this as presented in training ranges monitoring reports "Marine Mammal Monitoring for the U.S. Navy's Hawaii Range Complex (HRC) and Southern California Range Complex (SOCAL)" available at http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/permits/hrc_socal_report.pdf). An integrated monitoring plan for the activities in the TMAA is also planned as presented in Section 5.2.1.4 of the EIS/OEIS.
Todd Hoppe 3		The commercial fisherman will be the one's that are targeted first. You'll come up and do your test for 14 or 21 days, and go and what not. And down the line if something does happen it will be the commercial fisherman that are blamed	As described in Section 5, monitoring associated with the training events is planned in addition to a stranding protocol should something unexpected occur. Taking into consideration that there is no indication, in any area where the Navy trains,

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
		for it first. In my opinion and in my experience in what we seen happen with steller sea lions and what was proven scientifically afterwards.	that training activities have a negative impact on the health of the marine environment, the Navy is confident, and the analysis indicates, that its training activities will not impact the marine environment off the Gulf of Alaska.
Todd Hoppe 4		And I'm also was here to make a comment on a comment - - public comment you had in Kodiak that your staff was maybe aware of, that there was a suggestion that you could hire some boats to do a fair amount of fishing to try to get the sperm whales to congregate in an area outside your boundary area. And that possibility could work. But what wasn't considered in that is who's going to be -- how do I want to word that -- there's not going to be anybody responsible for the quota. That's not going to come off the quota. It will be -- I'm not wording that right, I've got a fart in my train there. The fish will not be accounted for. Right now we're in a quota system, every fish -- every pound that's caught is accounted for. If you have boats fishing black cod to try to pull the sperm whales out of your area -- your test area, those fish aren't really going to be eaten and not accounted for out of the quota. And that's a reverse -- negative impact on the quota. So, thank you very much for your time.	Because it would be considered a behavioral harassment under the Marine Mammals Protection Act and would affect an Endangered Species, the Navy does not intend to implement mitigation measures that attempt to relocate sperm whales by fishing for black cod. Proposed mitigation measures to be implemented have been discussed in Chapter 5 of the EIS/OEIS. Section 5.2.1.6 which discusses other alternative protective measures that have been considered but eliminated for implementation.
Brenda Dulma		I just wanted to share -- I'm Brenda Dulma. And I just wanted to share what my daughter said when I just said that there was potentially going to be testing in the area. And this was her one response, how can we think about this when we have genetically unique species in our area. And that was her concern. So, I just want to share that and that may have been addressed, but -- and since I'm late, I was spending time with my child. So, I just wanted to share that. That we need to consider the bio-diversity that we have in this area, it's very unique. And that needs to be seriously considered before you make any final decisions. Thank you.	The Navy is aware of the diverse biological presence in the area and has conducted a thorough analysis of potential effects in Chapter 3 of the EIS/OEIS. The Navy is not proposing to conduct any testing, but is proposing to continue conducting training as have in the past with the proposed addition of some new activities as described in Chapter 2. Please see Chapter 3 of the EIS/OEIS for the description and analysis of potential effects. Chapter 4 includes cumulative analysis of all past, present, and reasonably foreseen future projects by the Navy and non-Navy activities.
Stephanie Zuniga 1		My name is Stephanie Zuniga and I am a teacher, third through sixth grade as well as I used to be sea bird biologist for Fish and Wildlife Service. And I also just heard of this last minute through a friend. And I wish I would have heard about it before because our kids right now are studying currents. And involved with that are current events and currents in our oceans. And last quarter we studied communication. So this is a perfect -- I'd love for them to	Please see response to Highland -- 1.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
		have been here tonight. And if you want to stick around until Monday to come into the schools. So I would love to share this with my students because it's -- this is their playground, this is their home, this is where they are going to grow up and fish, be fisherman and fisher women, be tour guides, be scientists, biologists. And this matters to them and they need to be involved in this process of public comment as well.	
Stephanie Zuniga 2		When I was a biologist I worked in the Gulf of Alaska on the Barren Islands. And that area -- it's highlighted, is within breeding grounds of sea lions, within the main feeding grounds of sea birds and humpback whales. I mean I remember standing on -- or sitting on cliffs watching our sea birds and taking down data and looking out you know, for miles away and just seeing humpbacks feed. I mean, 20 humpbacks feeding. And you know, I'm looking just -- just in that area where that yellow is. And I'd be concerned, I'd be really concerned and I'd want to know more before just going in there and doing that. Especially that time of year. It was interesting to hear Olga's comments about that all times of year will effect these whales. But they are feeding, they are getting the bulk of their food in them before they head on south -- some of them. Thank you. Thanks for coming.	As per Chapters 1 and 2 of the EIS/OEIS, with the exception of Cape Cleare on Montague Island, the TMAA is located over 12 nm (22 km) from the northern point of the TMAA, the nearest shoreline (Kenai Peninsula) is located approximately 24 nm (44 km) north of the TMAA's northern boundary. The approximate middle of the TMAA is located 140 nm (259 km) offshore; the location of the TMAA has been chosen as a location adequate for training and for the least possible effects to critical habitats.
Elise Wolf 2-1		My name is Elsie Wolf and I'm on the Board of Directors for Kachemak Bay Conservation Society. This is a continuation of comments previously started. For the audience, there is significant research done by Natural Resources Defense Council on SONAR and seismic testing. So this is a good website to start going in and looking at links. Don't read the environmental impact statement and expect that to be completely fully disclosed information about seismic testing and impact on whales or fish. This is highly concerning.	Please note that seismic testing is not part of the Proposed Action. Because of the differences in sound characteristic and sound propagation (impulsive versus continuous noise), the analysis of each noise source (seismic and sonar) and their effects are independently evaluated.
Elise Wolf 2-2		And so let's talk about mitigation for a minutes. Because your mitigation suggests that you're going to power down and shut off your engines. Well we know from what's going on in the Arctic -- seismic testing right for oil and gas development, that it's highly expensive -- very expensive for a vessel of that -- of these sizes to power down. It's extremely costly. So what happens is in the mitigation plans, note p-l-a-n-s, plan, it says that you'll power down. But in reality, Shell for example has yet to power down, because	The power down directives in Navy mitigation measures are related to sonar power downs and not engine power downs. Potential impact from engine noise is also discussed within respective biological resource sections. As stated in the above response, seismic testing is not part of the Proposed Action. Additionally, sonar is just one of many sensor systems onboard Navy vessels. As such, powering down or even shutting down sonar would not prevent the continuation of overall training. These mitigation measures have been used

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
		it's too expensive. So they come back a year later when they do their reports to the National Marine Fisheries Service and have in an armful or basketful of excuses as to why they couldn't power down.	since 2006 and Navy has implemented these measures during training, which has been reported to NMFS as required. It should be noted that the U.S. Navy in conjunction with NMFS and USFWS is best suited to determine what mitigation it can effectively use during its training and testing activities to mitigate harm to marine mammals while still being able to meet its operational needs to train for real-world conditions it may face. Please refer to chapter 5 of the EIS/OEIS which presents the US Navy's protective measures, outlining steps that would be implemented to protect marine mammals and Federally listed species during training events.
Elise Wolf 2-3		And then let's talk about the people that are standing on your decks. These three people or however many. Are they going to be standing on the decks when you're out in 25 foot seas? How about eight foot seas? How about a cloudy day? How about the dark? How about five hours of daylight in the middle of the -- of you know, December 31st. These are unrealistic mitigation plans.	Navy lookouts undergo extensive training to include on-the job instruction under supervision of an experienced lookout followed by completion of Personnel Qualification Standard Program. NMFS-approved Marine Species Awareness training is required before every sonar exercise. In addition, as noted in the Final EIS/OEIS in Section 5.2.1.2, all Navy surface ships participating in anti-submarine warfare exercises will have two additional personnel on watch as lookouts. While the Navy is very confident in its well-trained lookouts, it does not expect that 100% of the animals present in the vicinity of training events will be detected, especially in conditions of limited visibility as described in the comment. The mitigation measures are designed to reduce potential impacts, not to guarantee they will not occur. Please note the proposed training would be scheduled for the summer months and would not take place in the winter timeframe (such as Dec 31). Please see chapter 5 for a complete discussion on the Navy's mitigation measures.
Elise Wolf 2-4		Now you're talking about this in the middle of summer, and this is probably why. Because you have 18 or 19 hours of daylight.	In Section 2.3.2.3 of the EIS/OEIS, the alternative of training during winter in the GOA TMAA was considered. Unstable winter weather conditions in the Gulf of Alaska create unsafe conditions for Navy training and such alternatives were considered infeasible and were not evaluated further.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
Elise Wolf 2-5		Still, we have experts in the Arctic Ocean right now, natives who cannot identify whales, and don't know the difference between a bearded seal and a ring seal. So, if Shell is having these problems and they're doing this all the time in these Arctic waters, then I'm not sure -- I don't -- I not -- I don't have any confidence that this is going to happen. National Marine Fisheries Service rubber stamps this stuff all the time.	Please see the response to your third comment above (Elise Wolf 2-3).
Elise Wolf 2-6		The fact that we are coming up with no significant impacts concerns me greatly. There's one final comment that I have to say, in that there is philosophical and spiritual and ethical proof if you want to call it, or cultural standards among most human societies that place some level of inherent of value. And what I mean by inherent value, that is the value of a being outside of the human want and desire. And that is completely absent in your plan. Thank you.	Your comment is duly noted.
Roberta Highland 2-1		My name is Roberta Highland and I didn't have time to prepare comments because I did just find out about this meeting. Now that I've heard the comments of people that really know what they're talking about in this area. I have become very alarmed. And I going to ask a question later. And what I would really like to see you do is don't go back to your stations, I would prefer that you take questions from the audience so we can all hear the answers. And I would really hope you will do that since you spent all the money and time to get here. That would be -- that's our usual preferred way of being able to communicate with you. So when we get to that point I am going to ask about ocean acidification. And I'm going to find out what the Navy is doing about ocean acidification.	From past experience, the Navy has concluded that the open house format used during the public hearings is the most conducive to effective dialogue and fosters a peaceful and non-confrontational setting for all involved. Additionally, all five public hearings held in Alaska exceeded NEPA requirements. Adequate time was given during each meeting to ask questions of a number of subject matter experts. All public concerns have been analyzed and addressed in the Final EIS/OEIS.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
Roberta Highland 2-2		And now that I've heard, and I should have figured that out, that this is really a rich area. It's incredibly rich. And what in heavens name are we thinking of even having allowed these types of activities to go on before? I am now feeling like this is a very poor place -- I don't know where a good place is. But this is not one. So, I'm going to be going on record saying, I don't what this activity going on in this area at all.	The Navy is aware of the abundant marine life in the area and has conducted a thorough analysis of potential effects in Sections 3.5 to 3.9 of the EIS/OEIS. However, to implement its Congressional mandates, the Navy needs to support and conduct current and emerging training activities in the GOA ATA's to enhance and sustain its training. These objectives are required to provide combat capable forces ready to deploy worldwide in accordance with U.S.C. Title 10, Section 5062. As described in Section 2.3.2.1, the Navy considered, but rejected, alternatives that included moving this exercise to other locations. Such alternatives fail to meet the purpose of and need for the proposed action.
Roberta Highland 2-3		And the other thing I'm going to bring is my four E's. And my four E's is something I would like to go national, state, worldwide when anything is brought up to make decisions on. Is economy, environment, energy, and ethics. And I am trying to get this being used as a template for every decision that gets made. And when I talk about ethics, I mean is it ethical for the animals, is it ethical for anything? Is it ethical for the worms? Of what we're planning on doing. But when you take into consideration economy, environment, and energy -- what the kind of energy use is being taken to do any of these things. And what the consequences are. I am trying to get that nation, worldwide and you could help. And I hope you think it's a good idea. Thank you.	This comment is duly noted.
Olga von Ziegesar 2-1		I also have not followed -- my name is Olga von Ziegesar. I'm from Eye of the Whale and I study humpback whales in Alaska, in the Gulf, and in Prince William Sound. And there are huge numbers that migrate along that shelf there. And we actually don't know exactly how they migrate out in the deeper waters, but there definitely been sightings of even Southeast Alaska humpbacks up there. So, they must circle somewhat before they go to their destinations to feed.	This comment is duly noted. Section 3.8 discusses the recognized presence of humpback whales and other marine mammals and includes an analysis of effects to marine mammals from the proposed Navy training activities. As presented in Section 3.8, the Navy does not anticipate any population level effect on humpback whales in the Gulf of Alaska from Navy training activities. The use of tracking data (for example as detailed in Section 3.8.3.3 for humpback whales) was used in determining the likely presence of marine mammals in the TMAA.
Olga von Ziegesar 2-2		I know that there have been a lot of studies on this SONAR. It's been going on for years off of Hawaii, off of New Zealand, off of California. The last Marine Mammal Conference there were lots of papers on the effects of the SONAR. It's hard for me to believe that we don't know more than you're saying. And I -- I'm afraid I haven't read	Please see response to Olga von Ziegesar 1-3

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
		everything on it. But, I would propose that there be no SONAR and no explosives. I can see -- I was told that it's important that the boats come in that close so that they can fly up into these interior areas. But, I still don't really see why we should take any chances with SONAR or explosives. Thank you.	
Stephanie Uniga 2-1		I just -- my name is Stephanie Zuniga. And I just want to -- and somebody made the comment of how ocean acidification or the change in pH in our oceans is changing the way that sound carries underwater. And I -- this is pretty new for a lot of us. And I just wanted to suggest to those involved in making these decisions with our communities to watch A Sea Change, which is a movie, a documentary that is going to be here in Homer on Tuesday night I believe. I hope everyone here gets a chance to go watch that. It's on ocean acidification and there is website, a sea change.com I think it's called. And I would suggest that that be viewed by our decision makers, as an educator. Thank you.	This comment is duly noted. Please note that ocean acidification is addressed in Section 4.2.1.2 of the EIS/OEIS.
Robert Archibald 2-1		My name is Robert Archibald again. And I'm looking in this booklet here, and I haven't had much of a chance to look at your EIS. But, one thing that caught my attention is when they would power down. Is that going to be active SONAR at 1000 feet or 1000 yards? And again, shut it off at 500. And I don't know if that -- I do know that at 1000 yards it's still a pretty strong signal. And I don't know the research that's gone on there. But in a high population of mammals it seems a little ridiculous to me to expect to be able to be able to provide a safe environment at 1000 feet when you're going to shut them off.	The mitigation measures detailed in Section 5.2.1.2 include the first power down of active sonar at 1,000 yards from a detected marine mammal, a second reduction at 500 yards, and shut down at 200 yards. These mitigation measures were developed to minimize exposing marine mammals to sound levels that could cause TTS or PTS as described beginning in Section 3.8.7.2. Implementation of the safety zones discussed above will prevent exposure to sound levels greater than 195 dB re 1µPa for animals sighted. Lookouts are responsible for monitoring a much larger area and are expected to report everything observable within 10,000 yards of the vessel.
Robert Archibald 2-2		And also, I'm a little disappointed in our State for not putting up a little more -- if we have industry come in with an operation like this, they would certainly be out there demanding a little bit better information to the public than what you people are providing. And I say that myself because I haven't had a chance to review that. And I don't think it's been out -- put out to the general public. And this operation that you're proposing, be it warranted for our national security, I think you know, I don't have a problem with that. I have a problem with the destruction with the environment. And I think everybody should have a little bit better knowledge of what's going here, so. And I think it	Prior to and during the development of the EIS/OEIS, the Navy contacted and consulted with numerous federal, state, and local agencies and representatives. For a complete listing, please see Appendix G "Public Participation".

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
		should be processed through the State also. And I haven't heard anything about the State being involved, so. Thank you.	
Linda Feiler 1		<p>Sorry, Linda Feiler. Before I came I didn't know about the inert bombs that were going to be dropped, the missiles, the gun shells, the small arms, the pyro flares, the dyes, the expended materials, the hazardous materials. I didn't know a lot of it, and most of the community doesn't know a lot about it because like everything else, you come into the community, bang-o we have these meetings. Nobody ever gets their questions answered. If we have questions and we want them answered, that's why a lot of us come here. You know, because you're the ones who has the answers. I wanted to know how many pounds, how many bombs, how much toxic material is going into the water.</p>	<p>In compliance with NEPA, the Navy has chosen to implement a forum for comments to be made to foster a peaceful and non-confrontational setting for all involved. All public concerns and comments have been analyzed and addressed in the Final EIS/OEIS.</p> <p>The Final EIS/OEIS thoroughly analyzes the impacts of expended materials used during Navy training activities. As shown in Table 3.2-18 and 3.2-19, an estimated 352,000 lb (176 tons) of material would be expended during the training activities proposed under Alternative 2, with less than 3 percent of that material (about 5 tons) considered to be hazardous. Section 3.2 of the EIS/OEIS describes the impacts from the perspective of potentially hazardous materials such as explosives constituents. Section 3.3 describes the impacts of expended materials in terms of water and sediment quality. In addition, the existing discussion on the breakdown of hazardous materials in Environmental Consequences of Section 3.2.2, Expended Materials has been reviewed and, as appropriate, expanded. The analysis in the EIS/OEIS concludes that Expended and hazardous materials under the Proposed Action would not have a substantial effect on the marine environment.</p>
Linda Feiler 2		<p>You've done this for 40 year for 14 days, 40 years you've done it in various parts all over the United States. And I think most of us want to know where we call to get an answer because it's going to be in the newspaper. And we're going to have a dialog with ourselves through the radio station and we want to know where we call and where we get answers. Who's going to answer our questions before the 25th?</p> <p>MS. HIGHLAND: A phone number, that's what I want is a phone number. MS. FEILER: Yeah. A phone number, a name -- someone who's actually going to be there. And it probably should be 20 or 30 people there.....</p> <p>MS. FIELER: No. Because we already that. We already looked through the IRS [sic] and found out -- sitting with the expert here, that the answers were not in there. It doesn't say. I've asked all -- every single one of you already, how many, how many pounds, what are they made of, what are</p>	<p>Your request for a phone number is duly noted and multiple points of contacts were provided via many methods: the Federal Register, Navy Notice of Public Hearings, press releases, newspaper ads and articles, and in person at the public meetings.</p>

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
		the bombs made of? I want -- we what, I'm sure because I know there's at least 10 of us here who believe the same thing. We just want answers, that's all. And we want to know how we can get answers. And if we know that we're not going to be given answers, that is going to be highly publicized. So, please let us know who will answer any questions we have before the 25th. Thank you. MS. HIGHLAND: And a phone number.	
Brenda Dulma 2-1		I'm Brenda Dulma, very concerned citizen. I pick up this beautiful image of a sea anemone on the front cover. And I heard an amazing story at our museum the other day. We had a -- so my question is, what is the impact of this testing on the oceans invertebrates? The story I heard was in our own museum we had a sea anemone that hasn't opened up for four months because one fish is harassing it. So, if this is the response to an invertebrate in a very safe environment, that a fish is harassing it. What are the studies on all invertebrates with this kind of testing? So, my questions is, how are the invertebrates responding and other micro-organisms that we have no impact in this web of life? So, my question is, for my third time, what are the impacts on the invertebrates and micro-organisms in the ocean habitat from the testing? Thank you.	The Proposed Action includes no testing of new weapons, but rather the training of Navy personnel with established weapons systems. The Navy has conducted a thorough analysis of marine invertebrates in the EIS/OEIS, using the most current and best available science, as required by NEPA. The effects of underwater explosions on invertebrates are described in Section 3.5, Marine Plants and Invertebrates. Most expended materials are inert and dense and readily sink deep into existing sediments or become covered with sediment over time. These materials would also become encrusted by chemical processes or by marine organisms that further isolates them from the environment. Once deposited, the materials would not pose a hazard to benthic communities. Because high quality habitat occupies only a small portion of the benthic environment, there is a small potential for the communities to be affected by initial impact of expended materials. However, localized impacts to bottom-dwelling organisms could occur if struck but population level effects are not anticipated.
Whitney Lowe 2-1		My name is Whitney Lowe. And just a one other -- couple other things I want to add in addition to my earlier comments. I want to mention you know, it was brought up too that there's been a good bit of research done with seismic testing in some of the marine environments around here. And the oil companies have actually found that there's a possibility of residence for seismic testing up to 500 miles in some areas. And I know a lot of the focus has been on what's going on with certain marine mammals, such as the effects on whales.	Please see response to Elise Wolf 2-1.
Whitney Lowe 2-2		But the other thing I would ask you to really think about is that nobody is also taking about -- the whales aren't the only creatures in the ocean and we don't know how this might	Please see Sections 3.5 through 3.9 of the EIS/OEIS for the description and analysis of potential effects to all marine species. The Navy is aware of the diverse biological presence

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
		effect sharks, fish, other animals that are not coming up and beaching themselves that are likely to be affected by this as well. So, while there's a lot study on certain marine mammals, like whales the very fact that we know this is killing a number of marine mammals, would ask us to think, maybe this is also having other damaging effects on other marine life that we really don't know about it. Is this really a good idea to engage in it. Thank you.	in the area and has conducted a thorough analysis of potential effects in Chapter 3 of the EIS/OEIS using the best available science as required by NEPA. Potential effects on all marine species have been discussed within the marine resources sections of Chapter 3.
Robert Highland 3-1		I just have to wonder you know, I was talking to everyone presenting and I think that we have come a long way. And that people just don't throw their trash in the ocean anymore they used to, hopefully. I think the Navy's probably come a long way, and they've hired scientists and they've hired environmentally conscientious people. But I still say, we are moving to fast at this point to just keep going. At some point the environmental impact has got to be totally important to each of us. And most important. So, I'm glad that there are better things happening all over the place. But I'm also worried -- what is your munition? What are you throwing into the ocean? I think I have a right to know. I mean is that a question of defense? Because if I know then some Arab might find out? To bad, I want to know what you're throwing in the ocean. And I have a right to know.	Please see response to Linda Feiler 1.
Robert Highland 3-2		What the difference between D-U and agent orange? Okay. That's it.	DU is the acronym for Depleted Uranium, which is the byproduct of enrichment of U-235. It is no longer used in munitions fired by Navy vessels. Agent Orange is the name for a herbicide and defoliant used by the U.S. during Vietnam and is not part of the proposed action.
Geneva Craig		[Ms. Craig was seated next to Ms. Feiler] Comments read by Linda Feiler: Okay. I'm speaking for Geneva Craig, who is 91 years old. And this is what she has to say: I believe in life. I do not believe in killing any living creature. The oceans are full of life. My reason for being a long time vegetarian is to avoid having any creature killed on my behalf. How could you practice bombing and not kill? I am strongly against any practice that will harm, stress, or kill in the ocean or on the land. I once supported the military because I believed it would prevent death. But now I have seen that we need to mend our ways and negotiate or learn ways to have peace. That was from Geneva Craig, who lives in Homer.....	This comment is duly noted.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Homer			
Linda Feiler 2-1	and my name is Linda Feiler, and I live in Anchor Point. Unfortunately my brother has brain cancer and I told him I was coming to the meeting, and he wished me luck and said, it's pathetic that we even have to comment on issues like this. I believe that we've done enough damage to our food sources and enough damage to our environment, enough damage to our seas and land. And that I don't believe that it's necessary for anyone to practice harming something else, killing our food sources, or killing our wildlife in the name of the military. If you need to kill in order to help us, what good does it do? Thank you very much.	This comment is duly noted.
Jaspar Kigar		My name is Jasper Kigar, I live and work in Homer, Alaska. I'm very impressed with the U.S. Navy's presentation and importance that they're placing on protecting marine animals. And I'm confident that the U.S. Navy is doing it's best to protect marine animals in the area in any of its activities. I understand after today that the U.S. Navy uses local fishing fleets and boat fleets in its war games as decoys and targets or for other purposes. And I would encourage the U.S. Navy to continue to use these fleets and to use more local Alaskan vessels in its activities in order to stimulate the local economy. Thank you	This comment is duly noted. The Navy strives to involve local entities when possible.

1 **I.8.4 JUNEAU**

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
Greg Brown 1		Okay. My name is Greg Brown. I have no military experience, but I am a licensed commercial pilot. I'm also a licensed boat captain. And I've operated a little bit in Alaska. Live here in Juneau. And although I'm opposed to this exercise -- I'm not comfortable at all with the analysis regarding the air pollution	Carbon footprint and air pollution concerns including greenhouse gas emissions have been discussed in Section 3.1, Air Quality and in Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts.
Greg Brown 2		and the water pollution associated with it.	The Final EIS/OEIS thoroughly analyzes the impacts of expended materials used during Navy training activities. As shown in Table 3.2-18 and 3.2-19, an estimated 352,000 lb (176 tons) of material would be expended during the training activities proposed under Alternative 2, with less than 3 percent of that material (about 5 tons) considered to be hazardous. Section 3.2 of the EIS/OEIS describes the impacts from the perspective of potentially hazardous materials such as explosives constituents. Section 3.3 describes the impacts of expended materials in terms of water and sediment quality. In addition, the existing discussion on the breakdown of hazardous materials in Environmental Consequences of Section 3.2.2, Expended Materials has been reviewed and, as appropriate, expanded. The analysis in the EIS/OEIS concludes that Expended and hazardous materials under the Proposed Action would not have a substantial effect on the marine environment.
Greg Brown 3		My biggest issues is the Navy SONAR activity. I found it pretty questionable when I asked why this had to be done in one of the richest areas in the world for marine mammals and fish activity.	The purpose and need and the activities proposed are presented in Chapters 1 and 2 of the Final EIS/OEIS; See pages ES-9 and ES-10 for a summary. The complex bathymetric and oceanographic conditions, including a continental shelf, submarine canyons, numerous seamounts, and fresh water infusions from multiple sources, create a challenging environment in which to search for and detect submarines in ASW training activities. Please see Section 3.6 for sonar impacts on fish and 3.8 for sonar impacts on marine mammals.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
Greg Brown 4		And why it had to be done in May and June. And the response was, well for safety sake we -- that's the most calm weather for us to do that. And anybody -- all of us in Alaska, we go out in weather in November, December, and January. We seem to be able to get through it okay. So, I think that was a pretty -- that's not a very good comment in opinion.	In Section 2.3.2.3 of the Final EIS/OEIS, the alternative of training during winter in the GOA TMAA was considered. Unstable winter weather conditions in the Gulf of Alaska create unsafe conditions for Navy training and such alternatives were considered infeasible and were not evaluated further. Additionally, the season during which Navy training is proposed is during the April to October timeframe.
Greg Brown 5		I am very concerned about the whales. I make -- I do whale watching in addition to other activities here in Juneau. And I'm not at all comfortable that we really know what the effect of this -- the SONAR, this high intensity SONAR will do. Thank you very much for your comments and thank you very much for letting us make these comments.	Please see Section 3.8 of the Final EIS/OEIS for a discussion of sonar impacts to marine mammals. This analysis was completed in cooperation with the National Marine Fisheries Service, which is responsible for the protection of marine species. Please note that the Navy has conducted training using mid-frequency active sonar for decades in the Pacific ocean at training ranges in Southern California and Hawaii. There is no evidence of broad-scale impacts that are either injurious or of significant biological impact to marine mammals from those locations.
Lynn Wilbur 1		I'm Lynn Wilbur. I just want it on the record I came from Sitka. There's quite a few concerned folks over in Sitka as well, couldn't make it due to the short notice. I have quite a few concerns. Air quality is supposed to be 123 fold increase of emissions, including green house gas emissions. There's only going to be a 3000 foot window and then you're not going to consider. You think that these emissions, pollutants will disbursed through precipitation or dealt with.	Carbon footprint and air pollution concerns including greenhouse gas emissions have been discussed in Section 3.1, Air Quality and in Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts. As indicated in Table 3.1-5 on page 3.1-12 of the DEIS/OEIS, air pollutant emissions under Alternative 2 would be 69 percent greater than under the No Action Alternative. Greenhouse gases are discussed in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS/OEIS. The 3,000-foot limit was only with regard to estimating ground-level air pollutant impacts, in accordance with USEPA recommendations. With regard to greenhouse gas emissions and other air quality issues, all air pollutant emissions from the Proposed Action are taken into account. Dispersal of air pollutants by atmospheric processes and scavenging of air pollutants by precipitation are well-established processes that must be considered in the air quality analysis.
Lynn Wilbur 2		No mitigation plan. I'm sorry, I support the no action alternative on that one.	As described in Sections 3.1.2.4 and 3.1.2.6, annual emissions of criteria and hazardous air pollutants produced by the Proposed Action are well below a level that could degrade regional air quality. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required to reduce the impacts on the environment of air emissions from the Preferred Alternative, Alternative 1 or the No Action Alternative.
Lynn Wilbur 3		Expended materials, the pollutants involved in that are heavy metals, tungsten, which is toxic to marine life.	Please see response to Greg Brown 2.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
		Fluoride compounds, which is toxic. One hundred and fifty times the safe level of hydrogen cyanide, these are all from bombs, and sonobuoys and other training materials	
Lynn Wilbur 4		also plastics. I'm hoping people are following the issue we're having in the ocean right now with plastics building up in gyre, and taking pretty much over the Pacific. That's a problem to me and I don't see that you've got much of a mitigation plan for that. I think you're 360 percent increase on that one, in your alternative two. So, I support the no action alternative on that as well.	<p>The Navy is a seagoing force, which means that many of our environmental initiatives focus on ocean stewardship and seek opportunities to control our "ecological footprint" in relation to marine life, coastal impacts, and water quality. We have installed technology aboard our ships to keep plastics out of the ocean and safely manage our biodegradable waste stream.</p> <p>Shipboard waste-handling procedures governing the discharge of nonhazardous waste streams have been established for commercial and Navy vessels. These categories of wastes include solids (garbage) and liquids such as "black water" (sewage), "gray water" (water from deck drains, showers, dishwashers, laundries, etc.), and oily wastes (oil-water mixtures). See Section 3.3.1.2 of the FEIS/OEIS for further details.</p>
Lynn Wilbur 5		On fish you agree that there's not a lot of studies done with sound. There's a lot of disagreement exactly on how to approach, using controls. You mentioned Grey literature, yet you reference your own documents, and letters, and impact statements invalidating your -- no basically not much of mitigation as far as fish are concerned. And I can go into more detail later, because I'm going to run out of time. But I'm going to support the no action alternative where fish are concerned.	<p>There have been very few studies on the effects that human-generated sound may have on fish; these have been reviewed in a number of places (e.g., NRC, 1994, 2003; Popper 2003; Popper et al. 2004; Hastings and Popper 2005; Popper 2008), and some more recent experimental studies have provided additional insight into the issues. Many of these investigations such as Gray literature (non peer-reviewed reports) have not been used for analysis due to critical reviews of this material.</p> <p>No additional mitigation measures are proposed or warranted because no significant effects on fish or fish habitats have been identified.</p>
Lynn Wilbur 6		And marine mammals, this is probably where it's going to hit home for a lot of people. I too, am concerned about SONAR. Beaked whales are the most vulnerable because they're deep divers. And in the Bahamas in 2000 there were some expert witnesses that can attest to what happened there.	<p>The Navy conducted a thorough analysis of sonar and at sea explosions in Section 3.8 of the Final EIS/OEIS, using the most current and best available science, and with cooperation from the National Marine Fisheries Service, which is responsible for the protection of marine species. The Navy's analysis indicates there is little relative risk to populations of marine mammals from sonar training exercises. The Navy's protective measures are effective at mitigating, not eliminating, risk to marine mammals. Therefore, mitigation and monitoring are implemented to further reduce impacts. Also, note that the U.S. Navy has conducted active sonar activities for decades at the training ranges in Southern California and Hawaii with no</p>

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
			<p>indications of broad-scale impacts that cause adverse biological impact to marine mammal population stocks at those locations. Because there is no indication from areas where the Navy routinely trains that training activities have a negative impact on the health of the marine environment, the Navy is confident that there is little relative risk to marine mammal populations from active sonar training or any other training events.</p> <p>Please see Appendix F, Cetacean Stranding Report, for additional information regarding whale stranding and a discussion regarding the circumstances surrounding the Bahamas incident. The Bahamas incident is specifically discussed in Section F.1.6.1. In addition, there is new evidence from controlled exposure experiments on beaked whales in the Bahamas documenting that beaked whale exposure to mid frequency sonar is not, in all cases and maybe most cases, going to result in strandings or injury to those animals (Tyack 2009).</p>
Lynn Wilbur 7		<p>I just don't think that in the Gulf of Alaska your Beaufort 3 conditions are going to be not be really good for spotting whales. Whale experts have made the comments that you really can't spot whales very well in anything over a Beaufort 1 in the Gulf of Alaska. So, the use of onboard spotters, and you mentioned maybe possibility aerial craft if the conditions are right and if they have time, is how I interrupted your mitigation on that. I just don't think that's suffice. So, again I'm supporting the no action alternative.</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 5 for a discussion of the Navy's proposed mitigation measures. While the Navy is very confident in its well-trained lookouts' ability to detect marine mammals at the surface in reasonable conditions, it does not expect that 100% of the animals present in the vicinity of training events will be detected visually by lookouts aboard ships, in aircraft, or by passive acoustics in all cases. One of the primary jobs of Navy lookouts is to detect and report on any anomalies in the water and therefore their purpose and training is very different from that of biologists and they are positioned with a height of eye above that of most research and fishing vessels. While Navy lookouts are not expected to identify marine mammals to the species level as some biologists could, it is not a necessary component for implementation of the mitigation measures (except for the case of bow-riding dolphins). Additionally, effective training in the TMAA dictates that ship, submarine, and aircraft participants utilize their sensors to their optimum capabilities as required by the mission, which increases the detectability of whales in the vicinity of training activities.</p>
Lynn Wilbur 8		<p>It seems like you've dismissed a lot of recommended mitigation's. You've got a series of them, you've got a lot of them you've dismissed. Including recommendations from NOAA. And I can go into that in a little more detail if we get</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 5 for all mitigation measures that have been implemented and Section 5.2.1.6 which discusses all alternatives that have been considered but eliminated for implementation. Additionally, please note that the U.S. Navy,</p>

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
		to a second round. But I'm running out of time. So, again I support the no action alternative. Thank you.	in conjunction with NMFS and USFWS, are best suited to determine what mitigation it can effectively use during its training and testing activities to mitigate harm to marine mammals while still being able to meet its operational needs to train for real-world conditions it may face. Both the Navy and NMFS agree that no significant harm to marine mammal species will result from the Navy's proposed activities. The decision on which alternative to pursue will be considered by Navy representatives following the review of all relevant facts, impact analyses, and comments received via the EIS/OEIS public participation process.
Alex Simon 1		Thanks for the opportunity to speak. So my name is Alex Simon. I did have a chance to speak with some of you before and one of the things that impressed me, you seemed like well intentioned individuals. I think the reason why I'm supporting the no action alternative. Well there's several reasons. But one of the things, if we look at the history of the military in the United States, there's a long history of very well intentioned people concerned with national defense. Implementing programs that result in long term environmental health. And so, before I lived in Alaska I lived in Utah. And some of you might be familiar with down winders. These are victims of above ground atomic testing in the 1950's. And so there's still people alive today who -- and I've met many of these individuals, who suffer from cancers and other effects. And I think you know, if you look back then we were facing you know, the Soviet Union. An adversary that was using weapons that were pretty much comparable to what we had, as far as technology. And that - I think that was a case of well intentioned individuals, very concerned about national defense, like yourselves. And I worry about those mistakes being repeated. Particularly, back then we were dealing with concerns of human life. I assume the bar is set lower for your concerns about marine life.	This comment is duly noted.
Alex Simon 2		A second point is I think that geo-politics have changed substantially since then. Military realities that we're facing, really our main adversary at this point at least, I realize there are potential for others to come along. But, is Al-Queda, Al-Queda doesn't have a Navy. That -- none of our adversary's really have advanced Navy's. You know, I mean if we look	This comment is duly noted.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
		at you know, Iran, et cetera. That we're spending as much now on the Military as all the nations combined. I really, I know, the case could be made better back in the 1950's that it was critical that such tests be conducted. I don't really think this is critical for national defense.	
Alex Simon 3		A third point that I would like to make. If we look at the local fisheries. There's many thing --unfortunately whether or not this testing is done, the fisheries, the aquatic life, they're already under a lot of stress. And so locally, of course the lands rising faster than the oceans, is that many of the local salmon runs apparently go extinct due to global warming. That there's already all kinds of problems. I think to step in and exacerbate those problems seems unwise. Okay. That's all I have to say. Thank you for your time and consideration.	As detailed in Section 3.6, the Navy is very aware of concerns from fishing fleets and fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska. As described in the EIS/OEIS, the Navy is confident that its training activities will not impact fisheries, fish populations, or the livelihood of fishermen in the Gulf of Alaska. Socioeconomic impacts in regard to the fishing industry have been analyzed in the EIS/OEIS in Section 3.12 - Socioeconomics.
Andrea Doll 1		Well thank you -- thank you for giving me the opportunity. I am not a member of the military, although I've been a military dependent wife for over 30 years. My husband was a DESERON Commander that did exercises in the Gulf for as long as I can remember. And then I had the opportunity to serve the public as a legislator and was on the Military Affairs Committee.	This comment is duly noted.
Andrea Doll 2		So, I'm very interested in what's going on here tonight. And my suspicion is that this huge military machine is moving forward and it's going to take an awful lot to stop it. We have been in that no action alternative for some time, not using SONAR up here. But now the Navy wishes to go not only to one, but they want to go to two. And I am not quite sure just what kind of testimony you're going to hear tonight that will change this machine that's moving forward, to stop that moving and go back to the no action alternative. I am very interested in hearing comments on that from the military and to see exactly what kind of effect this will have -- our testimony here tonight, on you. I think that is fairly much what I wanted to say on this.	This comment is duly noted. The decision on which alternative to pursue will be considered by Navy representatives following the review of all relevant facts, impact analyses, and comments received via the EIS/OEIS public participation process.
Andrea Doll 3		I did want to point out that while I was in the Capital I was mailed those circular things that you turn around and you can see what kind of whale you're looking at. When you tell me that the Navy is going to be trained on these watches, where they stand on the destroyer and they look out and they see some movement, and then twirl that little card around and say, I want to get to -- let me get to the control	The "circular things" that you refer to are called "whale wheels" and are more or less a public outreach tool rather than a training device. A full discussion of the actual mitigation measures is presented in Chapter 5 and does not involve use of the whale wheel. Please note that Navy lookouts undergo extensive training to include on-the job instruction under supervision of an experienced lookout followed by completion

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
		tower here and talk to you about this -- you know, I mean it's really pretty laughable actually.	of Personnel Qualification Standard Program and the NMFS-approved Marine Species Awareness Training.
Andrea Doll 4		So, I am hoping that by this testimony you will be able to show us what areas we will be able to have a real effect on when you start these exercises. I know there are some things the Navy must do, they have to do. And there's no give or take. But there are areas that there are give and take. How can we effect those areas, how can we really have that impact? That is what I would like to know and would like to get some kind of response on. Thank you very much.	This comment is duly noted. Please note that all public comments and concerns on the training activities and the EIS/OEIS document itself are equally weighted under the Navy NEPA process, and are all taken into consideration by Navy decision makers in the preparation of the Final EIS/OEIS document.
Jan Crichton 1		Hi. Alaska already has a long standing problem and history.....a pretty long standing problem with leftovers from the military. All kinds of health and environmental issues where the military has been real eager to go in and do exciting new things. And then left and dumped problems and toxins for future decades to have to deal with. And the cost has been really high to all of us.	Please see response to Lynn Wilbur - 4.
Jan Crichton 2		Also, Alaska is one of the last places that has a really viable, healthy marine mammal population. But they're stressed out. They're going to start experiencing problems, some of them already are. The pinipeds and marine mammals are already going down in population, and we don't even know why. I think it's unwise to start shooting off active SONAR in their home waters.	Please see response above to Greg Brown 5. In addition, please note that sonar use outside the Navy is common in the Gulf of Alaska including, for example, fathometers, fish-finders, and NOAA research involving acoustic trawl surveys for fishery resources.
Jan Crichton 3		Especially during the summer months, which are very critical to them for feeding and everything. We have a short summer, they need that. They need to be uninterrupted. I would have to support the no action alternative simply because it does not include any active SONAR, and that's the thing that concerns me the most. We know that it has already caused problems off California and I don't think the negative impacts that have been happening there have even been researched. It's not a time for us to turn around and start doing this in Alaska waters. I think the problem of potential impacts on marine mammals is not acceptable or reasonable given the perceived need to these repeated active SONAR exercises when I don't really see any good reason to do it. That's basically it.	Your support of the No Action Alternative is noted, however, it is incorrect that there have been "problems" ("negative impacts") resulting from sonar use in California since there have been no stranding incidents or other indications of impact to marine mammals or other marine life over decades of sonar use history at the Southern California Range Complex. Please see Chapters 1 and 2 of the Final EIS/OEIS for the reasons why this training is essential. With regard to sonar and at sea explosions, please refer to response in Lynn Wilbur 6.
Mark Anderson 1		Yeah. My name is Mark Anderson and I am also in support of the no action alternative. I find the analysis has	Your support of the No Action Alternative is noted. Federal mandates include provisions of NEPA and Sections 106 and

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
		overlooked, and I think made some incorrect conclusions. Cultural resources, native people, and actually all people of Alaska consider our wildlife a cultural resource. So, I think if you are having an effect on wildlife you are effecting cultural resources.	110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and their implementing regulations at 40 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) 1500 and 36 C.F.R. 800, respectively. As described in Section 3.10 and as required in these regulations, the Navy has complied with the requirements for using the NEPA process to achieve Section 106 compliance. Groups that have been formally notified about the project include affected Alaska Native tribes and the Alaska SHPO. As stated in Section 3.10.1.5, on 18 May, 2010, the Alaska SHPO signed a letter indicating concurrence with the Navy's analysis that the Proposed Action would not affect submerged cultural resources (see correspondence in Appendix C). The Navy also has undertaken public involvement activities throughout development of this EIS/OEIS.
Mark Anderson 2		Socioeconomics, a large developing industry in Alaska is marine mammal observation.	Socioeconomic impacts have been analyzed in the EIS/OEIS in Section 3.12, Socioeconomics. Please note that the proposed activities will take place in the Temporary Maritime Activities Area far out to sea which is not a location where whale watching generally occurs. Please also see Chapter 3 of the EIS/OEIS for the description and analysis and potential effects. Specifically, analysis to marine life in Sections 3.5 through 3.9. Because the Navy has no exclusive "right of way" when conducting training activities on the ocean, Navy ships and aircraft intentionally seek areas clear of all other vessel traffic, thereby reducing the likelihood of negatively affecting fishing and tourism industries.
Mark Anderson 3		Also, bird observation. I don't think you've done a good enough analysis on effects to birds, of which there are millions and millions of sea birds out there in this area at this time. May and June is a critical time for them. A lot of them have flown from the Southern Hemisphere to get here. We have very large migration routes and if something upsets them along the migration route. We've been having some serious problems.	Section 3.9 of the Final EIS/OEIS provides a thorough analysis of potential impacts to birds, including migratory birds as mentioned in your comment. This analysis concluded that the Navy's activities would have no significant impacts to migratory birds.
Mark Anderson 4		I don't think you've done enough research on what happens to fish. Most fish have an air bladder that is going to be negatively affected by a sound blast. We know that sound does have an effect of fish, and I don't think you've actually studied that enough to know what is going to happen to the fish. Alaska has a long history of cooperative management between the State and the Federal government. And that's	Please see Section 3.6.2.2 and 3.6.2.3 with regard to an analysis of potential impacts on fish, including a review of research involving the potential to affect the air bladder in fish from exposure to sound. Section 3.6.2.4 presents the most recent science available on effects of SONAR on fish. The limited information currently available suggests that populations of fish are unlikely to be affected by the projected

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
		why we still do have marine mammals and fish here. But, they are stressed.	rates and areas of use of military sonar. Most fish species would be able to detect mid-frequency sonar at the lower end of its range. Short-term behavioral responses such as startle and avoidance may occur, but are not likely to adversely affect indigenous fish communities.
Mark Anderson 5		We have several endangered species that we're talking about here. And I think that the Endangered Species Act has been really overlooked in your analysis as well.	All ESA species have been included and analyzed in the Final EIS/OEIS in Sections 3.5 through 3.9. Additionally, the U.S. Navy is engaged in consultation with the USFWS and NMFS under the Endangered Species Act. The USFWS has concurred with the Navy's analysis of species under their jurisdiction, concurred with the Navy's "may affect, not likely to adversely affect" determination.
Mark Anderson 6		I guess that's really all the comments I have. I think -- I'm not sure you're going to hear a lot of people supporting alternative one or two here tonight. I think that the current level of operations in Alaska is acceptable. And I think you may just be moving to Alaska because you think that you can get it done -- you can do it here where you've had quite a bit of public opposition to doing it down south and in other areas where you've tried this before. So, those are my comments. Thank you.	Your support of the No Action Alternative is noted. As explained in Section 1.4 of the Draft and Final EIS/OEIS, the decision on which alternative the Navy will pursue will be made in light of the Purpose and Need by Navy representatives following the review of all relevant facts, impact analyses, and comments received via the EIS/OEIS public participation process. The Navy has not been blocked from training with active sonar in any areas of the ocean and is seeking to continue joint training in the waters of the proposed TMAA because an alternate location for Navy training in the ATA that meets the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action does not exist. The proposed area for Navy training in the TMAA is based on the mission of Alaska Command to support the needs of military forces within Alaska and forces deploying through Alaska.
Victoria Dance 1		Victoria Dance. And I'm wondering if this process is genuine in it's intent. Because I know that you went through the process in -- or the Navy went through the process in Southern California when you used the SONAR. And there was a protest, and one of the outcomes of that protest was a lawsuit that banned the use of the SONAR. But then the courts lifted the ban, and they went ahead -- the Navy went ahead and used the SONAR that they're wanting to use up here. That was in August. Two weeks later three great blue whales were reported as floating dead in that area, the	The U.S. Supreme Court upheld the Navy's continued use of sonar during training activities in the Southern California Range Complex last year. These activities have been occurring for decades in that location and the EIS/OEIS was developed (in part) so Navy could seek authorization under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act for the continuance of those activities. The necropsy on the 3 blue whales referenced were found to be victims of ship strikes in the commercial shipping channels and not related to SONAR activities. The Biological Opinion

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
		localized area. And then October 2nd another was found dead off of Big Sir. And then another washed on shore in Fort Bragg.	prepared by the National Marine Fisheries Service for the Southern California Range Complex indicated that in the event blue whales are exposed to mid-frequency sonar, they are not likely to hear those mid-frequency sounds since their hearing is centered on lower frequency sound (see http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/permits/socal_biop.pdf , page 204).
Victoria Dance 2		So, when there's talk about protective measures and those protective measures being to localize. What we see in -- and of course we can't prove, that those whales were damaged by the SONAR. But there's a migration pattern you know, how can you localize it? I mean you can really localize it. So, that as a protective measure, I don't think that's realistic.	Over decades of sonar use in California there have been no stranding incidents or other indications of impact to marine mammals or other marine life over decades of sonar use history at the Southern California Range Complex. For further information on the analysis of sonar, please see response to Lynn Wilbur 6.
Victoria Dance 3		And then the other protective measure mentioned was about minimal impact. So, I guess I'd want to know what the definition of minimal is, because those are three -- those were instances that became visible. But the unfortunate thing about the ocean is that there's so much that is invisible. And that was referred to very nicely by some previous comments about what we can see that has happened in the Navy's training to birds, and environment, above -- in the air.	Please see response above to Lynn Wilbur 7.
Victoria Dance 4		And so, I'd have to say I question the genuine intent of the Navy stewarding the environment. And I'm really kind of offended that you use it. I'm questioning this process that feels like a charade when we see what happened in Southern California. And I forget the fellows name who mentioned that he felt like it was -- or Jan -- well, I'm sorry that I can refer back to some wonderful comments. But I can refer to Andrea's suspicion that this is a machine that is going to be difficult to stop. And then also, Jan's comment on not enough adequate research. It's only been a year since these events happened in Southern California. And here you're wanting to go again without really understanding what you're doing. Thank you very much.	The Navy provides reports to NMFS as part of the MMPA permit and those reports are available to the public via NMFS's website. Please note that monitoring reports from exercises since 2006 have demonstrated the ability to detect marine mammals, the success of these mitigation measures, and a lack of observable impacts to marine species as a result of Navy training events. (Please see the recent results supporting this as presented in training ranges monitoring reports "Marine Mammal Monitoring for the U.S. Navy's Hawaii Range Complex (HRC) and Southern California Range Complex (SOCAL)" available at http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/permits/hrc_socal_report.pdf). An integrated monitoring plan for the activities in the TMAA is also planned as presented in Section 5.2.1.4 of the EIS/OEIS.
James Voelckers 1		Hello, my name is James Voelckers. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I want to express my gratitude first off to the Navy for keeping us well defended, and other military institutions. However, I believe there are a number of points	Please see Chapters 1 and 2 for a discussion of the purpose and need. Specifically, Section 2.2.2 details why training with sonar is required.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
		that they have not considered or that are getting overlooked. You mentioned realistic training a number of times. Yet, as was brought up before we don't really have any enemies with naval capabilities. It seems like the terrorists certainly don't. So that leaves China or Russia. With the proliferation of spy satellites it seems very unlikely that they would be able to attack us with any sort of sizable surface craft, which brings me to submarine detection. Which is what I think many of us are here for, with the SONAR, active SONAR. That seems like -- the only use for it if we know that they're there. And if we know that they're there, then I mean, they're not doing what submarines are supposed to do. Which is, I believe initiate a first strike. There are way to few ships to prevent such a first strike, so this seem to me to be a moot point. We can find them if we know they're there.	
James Voelckers 2		Secondly, I would wonder why exactly why we are doing this here. This was just brought up, it happened in California, to much public outcry. Which is why I think perhaps, you'll try here for a lighter population density so, less protest. However, Alaskan waters are some of the most -- most fertile in the entire world. Especially this area which is very pristine. And as you said, that you were only going to be doing this in the summer months, that that's when I believe most marine mammals are feeding in these fertile waters. They go to Hawaii, I believe in the winter. So, why would our enemies, if we have them, be they China or Russia, not attack us in the winter when you haven't trained, or during a storm. It seems like it's a sunny day situation to be running a lot of naval exercises on sunny days and good weather in the Gulf. Whereas, if somebody actually did have harmful intent, it seems like they would want to hit us when a, we could be least likely to respond. So, I would question why you were not using the winter weather to be fully prepared and fully trained.	Please see Section 2.3.2.3, describing why the Navy considered but rejected an alternative timeframe such as holding the training in the winter. Additionally, please see response to second part of Mark Anderson 6.
James Voelckers 3		And so in conclusion, I believe I would ask that some of these activities could not be carried out instead in the deep waters of perhaps the Hawaiian coast or other Pacific where they wouldn't, as adversely effect the ocean. I realize you will probably do whatever you have to do. Which is your job. But here perhaps is not the best location. Thank you.	As described in Section 2.3.2.1, the Navy considered, but rejected, alternatives that included moving this exercise to other locations. Such alternatives fail to meet the purpose of and need for the proposed action.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
Tina Brown 1		I'm Tina Brown. I support the no action alternative also. The other alternatives pose to many air and sea pollution problems.	Your support of the No Action Alternative is noted.
Tina Brown 2		And the Navy SONAR testing endangers marine wildlife. We've listed birds, fish, turtles, whales of course, all marine mammals. Not even the Navy knows all of the behavioral and physiological effects of SONAR testing on marine life. Clearly the Navy needs to train.	There is no testing of sonar proposed. The proposed activities include use of active sonar and other sensors during anti-submarine warfare training. Please see Chapter 2 for a description of the proposed activities.
Tina Brown 3		But choosing some of the most prolific marine wildlife areas in the United States, if not the world, particularly at a time when migrating marine life is there is irresponsible. This is not the place to practice. And the time you chose is not the time to practice there. Not the place and not the time. Thank you.	In Section 2.3.2.3 of the Final EIS/OEIS, the alternative of training during winter in the GOA TMAA was considered. Unstable winter weather conditions in the Gulf of Alaska create unsafe conditions for Navy training and such alternatives were considered infeasible and were not evaluated further.
Dixie Belcher 1		My name is Dixie Belcher, I'm with Turning the Tides in Juneau. Turning the Tides raises awareness about what is happening to the ocean and the effect it has on human health. I want to speak especially to the 360 degree increase in water pollution	Impacts on water resources under each of the alternatives would be below thresholds that could result in long-term degradation of water resources or affect water quality. Please see section 3.3 for a full analysis of water quality.
Dixie Belcher 2		and the 123 fold increase in air pollution.	Air pollutant emissions from training activities would be released to the environment in a remote area with good circulation and few other existing sources of air pollutants. Training emissions would be rapidly dispersed over a large ocean area where few if any individuals would be exposed to them. Residual air pollutant effects during the large portion of the year when training was not being conducted would be negligible. Based on the estimated levels of air pollutant emissions presented in Table 3.1-5, no substantial air pollutant effects are expected under any alternatives. Also, please see response to Lynn Wilbur - 1.
Dixie Belcher 3		The ocean is 71 percent of our planet. It provides food, and according to Dr. Sylvia Earle, up to 85 percent of the worlds oxygen. We cannot live without the ocean. We have dumped millions of tons of poisons, chemicals, radioactive waste, and other garbage into the ocean. Some whales and other sea mammals can now be legally classified as toxic dumps. We have thousands of dead zones where nothing grows. The largest 1000's of square miles. We are finding fish with cancer. What are we thinking? The ocean is in fragile health. Ocean scientists often refer to their work now as, documenting the decline. If we are to survive we must	This comment is duly noted. Please note that ocean dumping in general and the dumping of hazardous materials at sea is not conducted by Navy ships. Please see Section 3.2.1.2.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
		stop contributing to the demise of the ocean. We must stop using the sea's and the life within them as toxic dumps to do with as we please. I believe the greatest threat to the United States and to the planet is irretrievably damaged ocean.	
Dixie Belcher 4		Please consider if SONAR testing and military dumping are contributing to the health of the ocean or furthering its demise. If it's impossible to stop SONAR and additional poisoning of air and water from military exercises, please use the no action alternative. Thank you.	The Navy is aware of the diverse biological presence in the area and has conducted a thorough analysis of potential sonar and air/water pollution effects in Chapter 3 of the Final EIS/OEIS. The Navy does not dump toxic pollutants into the oceans. With regard to sonar, please see response to Lynn Wilbur 6. Your support of the No Action Alternative is noted.
Frank Bergstrom		Gentlemen, lady I would -- I've got very brief comments here. Not particularly well prepared for them. But it's surprising to say, I would like to thank the Navy for fulfilling its mission. I would like to thank you for training for that mission. I would like to thank you for training all the young sailors and aviators, daughters and sons that come from our communities to join the Navy to protect this country. You do a great job. And I appreciate it very much. I would like to thank you for a careful analysis of this issue. I can't think of another nations military in the world that would go to such efforts to do their job and to take care of the environment at the same time. I would like to thank you for coming to Alaska to fulfill that mission. I would only ask that when you do, you might stop into Juneau, buy some gas, get a burger or two, and spend some time. Thank you very much. [MR. MICHAELSON: Mr. Bergstrom, I just need to ask you -- if you could just say your name for the record.] MR. BERGSTROM: My name is Frank Bergstrom from Juneau.	This comment is duly noted.
Henry Larsen		Gunalcheesh. Ya'x gu 'oo, my English name is Henry Larsen, L-a-r-s-e-n. I too am opposed to against the -- what was that? (Mr. Larsen conferred with Ms. Wilbur) I too support the no action alternative. I think you need to -- the Navy needs to do more studies on the fish and the marine life you know, too. I think they need to do that because, I was talking to somebody earlier, and I too am a captain. I have a 200 ton license. And I've traveled from Sitka to Seward and I've seen fur seal -- fur seal and sea otter 22 hours offshore. And that's in that yellow area you guys were thinking about testing. That's all I have to say. Thank you.	Your support of the No Action Alternative is noted. Please see Sections 3.5 through 3.8 of the Final EIS/OEIS with regard to marine life and specifically 3.7 with regard to a review of the available studies involving fish. As presented in Section 3.8.5.4, Navy is aware of the possible presence of fur seals in the Temporary Maritime Activities Area (TMAA). With regard to the sea otter located far offshore and potentially in the TMAA, all available published information indicates that sea otters normally remain near-shore as presented in Section 3.8.1, although at another public hearing location, the Navy heard a similar yet off-the-record account of a sea otter interacting with a fishing boat located far out to sea. The

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
			potential use of or migration through offshore areas by sea otters would be interesting future research to attempt to determine if these two reported sightings were anomalies or if they reflect a normal yet previously unknown and rare portion of the sea otter range in the Gulf of Alaska. In the interim, the analysis of impacts to the sea otter in the EIS/OEIS will remain based on the best available science indicating that the sea otter should not be in the TMAA during the proposed training events.
Murray Walsh		<p>Murray Walsh. I would extend my compli -- first of all welcome to Juneau. I guess I don't think anybody's said that to you yet. You may not feel all that welcome right now. But I should say that people who do get up and speak in setting like this show a little more courage than those that don't. And I have to admire that even if I disagree with almost everything I heard. But if you want a test a public speaking, go back to 1974 when the Navy was not doing any of this kind of environment work. I was an employee of the State of Washington, and I had to be the one to tell the Admiral there in Seattle that before they could build the Bangor Submarine Base, they were going to have to talk to the State of Washington first. You talk about public speaking. I guess I'd offer a little perspective. The actual amount of activity that the Navy is proposing to do in the Gulf is insignificant compared to the other human maritime activity that is already there. You've got a season coming where you're going to be operating at the no action alternative. Maybe make some notes about what happened, how many times you did change an exercise because you saw whale or whatever it is. And come back and tell us about that. Then go a head and go to alternative two and keep track of it. And reevaluate -- if you are killing whales right and left, then it's time to go back to something else. But we don't even know. And so -- and this is a decision that you get to make every year. So, it's important to pay attention to the environmental matters. I admire you for doing it. And Al-Queda does have a Navy. It's housed in Iran right now and North Korea. Those countries both use the Kilo submarine, the quietest submersible fighting ship in the world. Yeah, I want you guys to be able to find them. Thanks.</p>	Please see response to Victoria Dance 4.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
Dan Holt 1		Thanks for coming. My name is Dan Holt. I applaud you guys for coming and actually doing this. Because most of the time, as far as the military is concerned we hear about it afterwards, after it's done. So, this is great that we have this ability to comment. And I guess if -- if it's true that the SONAR is actually killing off whales, such as the one lady said -- gave a good illustration about Southern California.	This comment is duly noted. Please see response above to Greg Brown 5.
Dan Holt 2		Then I think that's a good idea to do the -- to oppose it. But otherwise, I'm all for alternative one. Getting in there and learning more and keeping our best interest at heart, and keeping on the cutting edge of research and development.	This comment is duly noted.
Dan Holt 3		That being said, I'm also with the Civil Air Patrol here in Juneau, Alaska. And I wondering if there's any way our group, as far as the Civil Air Patrol can help out with your exercise, so. And I've actually put that on my card. Thanks.	The proposed action does not necessitate the use of the CAP but thank you for your offer.
Lynn Wilber 2-1		I'm Lynn Wilber. I've heard some interesting comments. One of the things that I wanted to fit into my comment was the left over materials from the military. Anybody who's hiked around Sitka knows that we step in stuff from World War II all the time. Bins of oil, weird liquids, I have no idea what they are. And its been a tradition of the military to not deal with the mess that they've made. I appreciate our military, I really do. I appreciate the work you do. And I appreciate that you're training and preparing. But the lack of a mitigation plan is just astounding to me. And the overwhelming opposition you've received in every training range, it doesn't seem that you've taken these public comments to heart.	Clearly the way refuse was disposed of during WWII is very different than is standard practices today over 65 years later. Please see Chapter 5.0 of the Final EIS/OEIS, Mitigation Measures, which presents the U.S. Navy's procedures for dealing with oily waste, hazardous materials and discharges.
Lynn Wilber 2-2		One other thing I want to make clear is the Navy is undergoing or going through the NEPA process because they were court ordered to. They were taken to court and the court ordered you to do this. So they've been training, in fact the Atlantic Fleet Training Range is operating on a no action alternative, which is similar. There are other alternatives -- toning down the exercises and not using SONAR. And they did that and they didn't go through the process, from my understanding from reading the news and following the time line. There's a lot of information, available congressional reports, things on the internet that you can read. I like to enter into these types of debates with an objective mind. And I've heard other people who are -- whether they're experts, whale biologists, scientists, ex-	Please see Chapters 1 and 2 with regard to the purpose and need for undertaking this environmental analysis. This EIS/OEIS is not being prepared pursuant to any litigation or court order. Navy has taken a programmatic approach to the GOA EIS/OEIS in accordance with the Secretary of Navy's At-Sea Policy of 28 December 2000 directing Fleet commanders to develop programmatic approaches to environmental compliance for ranges and operating areas.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Juneau			
		military say that they wanted to go into this objectively.	
Lynn Wilber 2-3		And just couldn't because of the gross negligence, the lack of mitigation. Some of the measures that have been recommended to you for decreasing the chance of harassments or takes on marine mammals have been dismissed. I'd said I was going to try to get back to that. You talk about in the impact statement, you talk about an unusual stranding event. Where NMFS gets involved and tries to recover if there's a dead animal or a mass stranding. They apparently don't have and nor do you have in place yet a stranding response or communication response. And I'm sorry, I actually thought I had a little more time than the three minutes. But this is just not acceptable. Thanks again.	Please refer to chapter 5 of the Final EIS/OEIS which presents the US Navy's protective measures, outlining steps that would be implemented to protect marine mammals and Federally listed species during training events. Please also Section 5.2.1.6 which discusses mitigation measures that have been considered but eliminated for implementation. Please see Section 5.2.1.5 regarding the Stranding Response Plan for Navy training events in the Gulf of Alaska.
Mark Anderson 2		Yeah. This is Mark Anderson. I guess the thing that occurred to me as I was sitting and listening to some other comments is, you have three alternatives here. And I don't think that is a reasonable amount of alternatives to really have. I think there are a number of others. You don't have any alternatives that have increased science, increased -- you don't even mention any alternatives where you would be doing some studies before you actually go do your testing. So, I think that you need to go back to the draft EIS and develop some more alternatives that do take into account more scientific study, a slower approach. You may be able to get to a higher alternative in your mind by actually doing these things first. Otherwise, I think you're probably going to be running into another problem with litigation. Thanks.	See Section 2.3.2 regarding other alternatives considered but eliminated resulting in the three alternatives carried forward in the document. Please be aware that there is no "testing" proposed in any of the alternatives. As presented in Chapter 2, the Navy is proposing to conduct Navy training activities, which does not involve testing of untried systems or devices.
Tina Brown 2		I'm Tina Brown again. And I just want emphasize the obvious. Once an animal is dead, it's dead. And going back to see why it died doesn't bring it back to life.	This comment is duly noted.

1 **I.8.5 CORDOVA**

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Cordova			
Rosemary McGuire 1		Okay. Sorry to call you guys all back like this. I sort of didn't quite understand how this was going to work out. But I do think it was important that we all get a chance to hear some of what, we as a community -- some our concerns might be. Personally, I listened carefully and looked at the posters and stuff like that. It seems to me that there is a good deal of uncertainty about why, when, and how often marine mammals such as whales are impacted by SONAR. But it's very clear that it does sometimes cause mass strandings and it can cause mortalities. And it seems to me that since we don't know why, we ought to be very careful about using it. I would prefer not to have active SONAR used in the Gulf of Alaska.	Please be aware that sonar use outside the Navy is common in the Gulf of Alaska including, for example, fathometers, fish-finders, and NOAA research involving acoustic trawl surveys for fishery resources. Regarding the uncertainty with regard to Navy use of sonar during training, the Navy has been conducting active sonar activities at the training ranges in Southern California and Hawaii with no indications of broad-scale impacts that are either injurious or of significant biological impact to marine mammals and other species for decades. Therefore, it is not likely that any additional risk posed by the proposed activities will have any significant impact on species in the TMAA.
Rosemary McGuire 2		Our livelihoods do depend on having a working ecosystem out there. And I'd really appreciate it if you guys would consider going with the same level of activity that you're doing now, which does not include active SONAR. So, thank you for your time.	The Navy's analysis demonstrates there is little relative risk to marine life from sonar use as proposed in the EIS/OEIS. Additionally, as explained in Section 1.4 of the EIS/OEIS, the decision on which alternative the Navy will pursue will be made in light of the Purpose and Need by Navy representatives following the review of all relevant facts, impact analyses, and comments received via the EIS/OEIS public participation process.
Charles Weaverling 1		My name is Charles Weaverling. I'm the former mayor of Cordova. I organized and operated the wildlife rescue fleet during the EXXON VALDEZ oil spill, and I'm a former Navy submariner. Qualified in diesel electric and FBM's. I'm very concerned about this proposed increase in training activity. And I'm not reassured by the posters and the comments I've seen here tonight. I do not think that it would be a positive impact on wildlife and fisheries to increase the training. I don't think it's a positive impact given the training that's used now. But active SONAR, especially the newer SONAR's that are available, are certainly more effective than SONAR's that were used in the past. I don't think it would be a neutral impact on the wildlife and the fishery.	Please see the response to McGuire-1 above. In addition, please be aware that the basic sonar systems proposed for use in the Gulf of Alaska have been in use since the 1970's. While the processing of the received sonar echo has improved due to the increase in computing power, the output of sound into the water from the system has remained basically the same.
Charles Weaverling 2		This area has not yet recovered from the EXXON VALDEZ oil spill. I think it would be a negative impact on the fishery, the marine mammals, and the wildlife in the proposed area.	Please see Figure ES-1 for the location of the area where the proposed activities will occur. While it is understood that marine life is seldom restricted to a single area, none of the proposed activities will take place in or around Prince William Sound or coastal areas directly impacted by the Exxon Valdez

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Cordova			
			oil spill. For the area where the training activities will occur, Chapter 4 presents the cumulative impacts analysis addressing the environmental impacts that result from the incremental impact of Navy activities when added to the past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions that affect the same resources. Table 4-1 succinctly depicts the categories of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions that affect cetacean populations. Identifying such activities and in fact comparing them for relative impacts is an appropriate approach to cumulative impacts analysis. The Final EIS/OEIS analyzes in detail the effects of Navy actions on specific resources, and places those in the context of other sources of impacts.
Charles Weaverling 3		This is a very rich biological area. And we depend on a healthy marine environment for our livelihood here. Activity in the wintertime, though I'm not a biologist, I understand is less productive during -- is less productive for -- is less used by marine mammals and fish during the wintertime. But even given that, basically I would prefer to see the level stay at it's current level or reduced. Thank you very much. I'd be happy to answer any questions, but I guess this is not a discussion. Thank you.	In Section 2.3.2.3 of the Final EIS/OEIS, the alternative of training during winter in the GOA TMAA was considered. Unstable winter weather conditions in the Gulf of Alaska create unsafe conditions for Navy training and such alternatives were considered infeasible and were not evaluated further. Regarding the level of training and the alternative that will be selected, please see response to McGuire – 2.
Ellen Americus 1		Hi, my name is Ellen Americus and I'm just a resident of Cordova. I used to live a Hatcher Pass and there was a lot of air activity over Hatcher Pass, in a pristine environment. And socially I think it really upset a lot of people who recreated there. And I see that the Gulf of Alaska is a wild place, and that area in particular. And I think that bombs and missiles in that area and a lot of aircraft would be upsetting to citizens and wildlife.	The GOA Final EIS/OEIS deals with Navy training in the Temporary Maritime Activities Area and therefore did not analyze impacts to inland areas. Analysis of overflight noise can be found within the Air Force and Army documents listed in the Final EIS/OEIS and available on the GOA EIS website. Additionally, because sound-generating events in the TMAA are intermittent, occur in remote areas or off-limits areas, and do not expose the public to high noise levels, no sensitive receptors are likely to be exposed to sound from military activities.
Ellen Americus 2		And I'm especially concerned about when the missiles and the bombs breakdown in the water, and so there's like lead, and heavy metals, and when that stuff goes through the food chain and bio-cumulates. And you know, it's going to effect these people. And you know, I don't have -- we've learned a lot about plastics and how harmful plastics are in the food chain. And heavy metals, that's even scarier to me. So, anyway thank you.	The bioaccumulation process is discussed in this EIS/OEIS in Section 3.8 and Section 4.2.8.2. A detailed species by species analysis of bioaccumulation potential for all possible contaminants is not possible with the best available scientific data at this time. Impacts from bioaccumulation present a large and complex set of variables, including marine mammal and fish occurrence in the TMAA, population size, toxicity to each individual species, and habitat types and characteristics of the TMAA. An analysis of this magnitude would overwhelm the

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Cordova			
			reader with details and scientific data, without adding substantial value to the overall analysis conclusions. Due to the short-term duration and impacts of Navy training activities in the GOA, bioaccumulation impacts are not significant
Kristin Smith 1		Hi, I'm Kristin Smith. And I'm here speaking on my own behalf. My day job is working as a nonprofit director for the Copper River Water Shed Project, which is committed to sustainable economic development. And so I have a lot of interaction with fisherman and folks in this area, and what I often tell people is that what we have in this region, both down here in Cordova and up river, is a wild salmon economy. We have a commercial salmon economy, we have a subsistence salmon economy, both here and up river. And we have a sport fish salmon economy. And all that's happening because those fish are rearing and growing to adulthood out in the Gulf of Alaska and in the Pacific Ocean. That is where they live. And that is where this town's livelihood comes from. And I'm only repeating what everybody else has already said, but we do not want to see SONAR in this region because of the effect that it could have on fish and wildlife. And I admittedly took a very quick, cursory look through there on the posters, but I saw words like anticipated. We anticipate this won't have very much effect. That's not good enough for a whole town full of people, both here and up river that depend on fish for their livelihood. And I think it doesn't just Cordova, it effects other towns in the sound and Yakutat, and other areas along the coast. So, I think it's critical that the Navy think very, very hard about the effects that this has on wildlife.	As detailed in Section 3.6, the best available science indicates that salmon cannot hear within the frequency range of the sonar proposed for use in the Gulf of Alaska. Please also be aware that sonar use outside the Navy is common in the Gulf of Alaska including, for example, fathometers, fish-finders, and NOAA research involving acoustic trawl surveys for fishery resources. In Navy training ranges in Southern California, Hawaii, and the East Coast where training involving sonar use has been occurring for decades, there are no indications of impacts to the marine environment and these areas continue to support healthy fisheries and abundant marine mammal populations.
Kristin Smith 2		And I think that when the Navy started, and maybe other entities started using SONAR, the effects weren't so well know. But we know a lot more now then we did 20 years ago. We know that it has harmful effects on marine mammals. And knowing that -- you know, I understand that you're probably thinking, hey we have a lot to do with -- we have to protect national security. Well, in my mind the national security issues are over in the Middle East today. And this money could be better spent doing other things and not adversely effecting our fish and wildlife. Thank you. And I just want to say thank you for doing this EIS. I understand that you haven't necessarily been doing them regularly over	Please see your previous comment regarding indications of impacts to the marine environment. Please see Section 3.6 with regard to an analysis of impacts to fish and fish habitat and Section 3.12.1.1 for an analysis of impacts to fishing. Additionally, please see Section 5.2.1.4 regarding research planned as part of the monitoring associated with Navy training events in the Gulf of Alaska. The U.S. Navy has developed a GOA TMAA Monitoring Plan to provide marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring as required under the MMPA of 1972 and the ESA of 1973. The GOA TMAA Monitoring Plan proposes monitoring goals for marine mammals that are unique with regard to their breadth as well as their focus on potential

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Cordova			
		the past few years. So, I appreciate that you are coming here and asking us for our comments. Thanks.	impacts of mid-frequency active sonar (MFAS) and underwater explosions on marine mammals and sea turtles.
Carolyn Roesbery		My name is Carolyn Roesbery. Any other information? Okay. I'm not convinced that activities -- Naval activities in the Gulf of Alaska won't contribute to the decimation of our fishery. We have one of the last wild salmon fisheries in the world. We have very rich, diverse environment. It is one of the biggest fresh water influxes in the world, here in Prince William Sound. We're just now finding out what our fish are doing when they're not in the spawning and where they're going. We just now have the technology and are researching that. And it is out there where you intend to be. And I'm not convinced that -- that you have all the science that you need. You may have acquired all the available science that is assessable to you, but I think you need to go further. I think it's very, very important. Thank you.	The Navy conducted a thorough analysis of sonar and at sea explosions in the EIS/OEIS, using the most current and best available science, and with cooperation from the National Marine Fisheries Service, which is responsible for the protection of marine species. Because there is no indication from areas where the Navy routinely trains that training activities have a negative impact on the health of the marine environment, the Navy is confident that there is little relative risk to marine mammal populations from active sonar training or any other training events.
Kris Ranney		I'm Kris Ranney, I'm in the Boy Scout Troop 624. And just to add on to what she just said. There's another species of fish that lives out there, the halibut. Most of them move in the summer to shallow waters, but some of the bigger fish stay out in the deep water. So, when you are bombing those boats and sinking them, and some of the bombs and guns might disrupt their habitat. And a lot of peoples livelihoods depend on the halibut too. So, that's just what I think. And it takes 25 years to -- for a halibut to get to 100 pounds, so -- and after that they're growth slows even more. So, if one of the ships hits a 600 pound halibut that would take 100's of years to replace. So, thanks for your time.	Thank you for participating in this public process. The activity where a ship or hull is sunk is called a SINKEX. This event, by regulation, must take place where the depth is over 1,000 fathoms (Section 2.6.1.1 of the Final EIS/OEIS, Figure 2-7). While it is possible a halibut could be off the bottom and in the water column where a SINKEX occurred, this would be a very unlikely co-occurrence and it is even less likely that the ship or hull would hit a halibut.

ID	Organization	Public Comment (Individual Oral Comment)	Navy Response
Cordova			
Danielle Bennett 1		Okay. My name is Danielle Bennett and I'm a resident of Cordova. From my perspective Alaska has one of the few functioning fisheries left in the world. From what I've seen of the EIS, the impact has been minimized to individuals, but many individual impacts amount to a cumulative negative effect. We know for a fact that SONAR does have a negative impact. And that is reason enough to not expand the activities, as far as I'm concerned.	As detailed in Section 3.6, most fish cannot hear in the frequency range of mid and high frequency sonar. While there may be a few species that can hear within this range, it is anticipated that the effects could range from no effect to physical damage and that it would be dependent on intensity and proximity (basically the list of potential effects that was provided in Section 3.6.2.2.3). Given the temporal and spatial nature of the activities, it is anticipated that any effect would be localized and not affect fish populations as a whole. Also note that sonar in the frequency range of that used by the Navy for Anti-submarine warfare is often used in acoustic trawl surveys by NOAA in fisheries research. It is not likely that sonar use by the Navy will have any impact, individual or cumulative, on fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska.
Danielle Bennett 2		What concerns me even more, however is -- are the things that we don't know. There are a number of uncertain statements. Anticipated effects, possible outcomes that are indicated. This ecosystem is important enough that those things should be addressed first before we have negative impacts that we don't even anticipate.	While additional research or further scientific advances may provide a more definitive analysis, a NEPA document is necessarily based on information available at the time the document is prepared, and the current state of the science. The Navy also acknowledges that it is impossible to know the exact impacts that Navy training activities will have on the ecosystem in the GOA in advance of these activities. Taking into consideration that there is no indication, in any area where the Navy trains, that training activities have a negative impact on the health of the marine environment, the Navy is confident, and the analysis indicates, that its training activities will not impact the marine environment off the Gulf of Alaska.
Danielle Bennett 3		Please find another habitat or an already dead zone in which to operate. Historically speaking, this region has little reason to trust in regulation. When I think of national security, I see protecting whatever is left of functioning ecosystems as of the most vital importance. I recommend proceeding with the no action alternative or reduce activity all together. Thank you.	As described in Section 2.3.2.1, the Navy considered, but rejected, alternatives that included moving this exercise to other locations. Such alternatives fail to meet the purpose of and need for the proposed action. Also, as explained in Section 2.3.2 of the EIS/OEIS, a reduction in levels of training within the GOA ATAs would not support the Navy's Purpose and Need and was therefore eliminated from further consideration. Finally, as explained in Section 1.4 of the EIS/OEIS, the decision on which alternative the Navy will pursue will be made in light of the Purpose and Need by Navy representatives following the review of all relevant facts, impact analyses, and comments received via the EIS/OEIS public participation process.

This page intentionally left blank.