

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**F PUBLIC SCOPING SUMMARY ..... F-1**

**F.1 GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE SCOPING PERIOD ..... F-1**

**F.2 AIR QUALITY ..... F-1**

**F.3 ALTERNATIVES ..... F-1**

**F.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – MARINE MAMMALS, FISH AND MARINE HABITAT ..... F-1**

**F.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—ONSHORE..... F-2**

**F.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES ..... F-2**

**F.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ..... F-2**

**F.8 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ..... F-2**

**F.9 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS..... F-2**

**F.10 HEALTH AND SAFETY ..... F-2**

**F.11 NOISE ..... F-2**

**F.12 MISCELLANEOUS ..... F-2**

**F.13 MITIGATION MEASURES ..... F-2**

**F.14 POLICY/NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT PROCESS..... F-3**

**F.15 RECREATION ..... F-3**

**F.16 SOCIOECONOMICS ..... F-3**

**F.17 SONAR AND UNDERWATER DETONATIONS ..... F-3**

**F.18 WATER RESOURCES ..... F-3**

**F.19 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ..... F-3**

**LIST OF FIGURES**

There are no figures in this section.

**LIST OF TABLES**

TABLE F-1: BREAKDOWN OF SCOPING COMMENTS BY RESOURCE AREA ..... F-4

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

## **F PUBLIC SCOPING SUMMARY**

### **F.1 GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE SCOPING PERIOD**

The scoping period for the Northwest Training Range Complex (NWTRC) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Overseas EIS (OEIS) began with publication of a Notice of Intent on July 31, 2007. The scoping period lasted 60 days, concluding on September 29, 2007. Five scoping meetings were held on September 10, 11, 12, 13, and 15 in the cities of: Oak Harbor, WA; Pacific Beach, WA; Grays Harbor, WA; Depoe Bay, OR; and Eureka, CA respectively. The scoping meetings were held in an open house format, presenting informational posters and written information and making Navy staff and project experts available to answer participants' questions. Additionally, a tape recorder was available to record participants' oral comments. The interaction during the information sessions was productive and helpful to the Navy.

Scoping participants could submit comments in five ways:

- Oral statements at the public meetings (as recorded by the tape recorder);
- Written comments at the public meetings;
- Written letters (received any time during the public comment period);
- Electronic mail (received any time during the public comment period); and
- Comments submitted directly on the project website (received any time during the public comment period).

In total, the Navy received comments from 50 individuals and groups. Because many of the comments addressed more than one issue, 191 total comments resulted. This summary provides an overview of comments received through these means during the scoping period. Comments are organized by issue area.

### **F.2 AIR QUALITY**

Comments in this category expressed concern about the effects of military activities on air quality, including off-shore emissions that may be transmitted ashore by onshore winds. The EIS/OEIS should discuss which areas are in nonattainment of National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

### **F.3 ALTERNATIVES**

Most comments regarding alternatives suggested that the Navy consider other sites to conduct its activities. Several comments expressed concern over potential impacts to the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (OCNMS).

### **F.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – MARINE MAMMALS, FISH AND MARINE HABITAT**

A significant number of comments received expressed concerns about impacts to marine life. Many of these comments specifically related to concerns about the effect of Navy sonar on marine life, such as marine mammals, fish, sea turtles, and sea invertebrates. Participants frequently requested that the EIS/OEIS consider alternative technologies to mid-frequency active (MFA) sonar. Several comments addressed protective and mitigation measures for marine mammals when sonar is used. Other comments identified specific policies that must be considered in the Navy's analysis, such as the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

## **F.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—ONSHORE**

Several comments addressed the protection of birds, including shorebirds, seabirds, and migratory birds. Potential stressors to birds mentioned in the comments included bird strikes and noise disturbance. Among other terrestrial issues mentioned were concerns about habitat fragmentation and potential damage to intertidal, inland, or upland resources.

## **F.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Participants commenting on cultural resources were primarily concerned with impacts to tribal access, and recreational and subsistence fishing. A few comments also addressed the issue of potential damage to historically or culturally significant sites.

## **F.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Comments in this category expressed concern about the overall impact of past and present military activity in the Pacific Northwest and requested that the Navy initiate cleanup activities. Specific mention was made of the cumulative nature of activities at Naval Magazine Indian Island and the Naval Undersea Warfare Center Keyport Range. Additional comments requested that the Navy study the impacts of other actions, such as placement of wave electrical generation equipment, wind generators on Bear Ridge, and activities at Coast Guard Station Humboldt Bay and Eureka/Arcata airport.

## **F.8 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE**

Commenters requested that the EIS/OEIS identify any disproportionate impacts to disempowered groups of people.

## **F.9 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Of the comments regarding hazardous materials, the primary concern was the effects of depleted uranium use on the environment in general.

## **F.10 HEALTH AND SAFETY**

One comment expressed concern about safety implications to commercial and recreational divers from MFA sonar. Another commenter was concerned about potential increases in aviation mishaps with increased unmanned aerial system use.

## **F.11 NOISE**

Several commenters expressed concern about any increase in airborne noise that could result from increased aircraft activity or offshore gun or bomb training.

## **F.12 MISCELLANEOUS**

Comments were received that requested that the EIS/OEIS consider the protection of surfing waves and for analysis of impact to research activities.

## **F.13 MITIGATION MEASURES**

Most comments regarding mitigation measures focused on marine mammals. For example, it was requested that the Navy employ better protective measures in future sonar exercises, such as conducting more monitoring and enforcing larger safety zones around ships. Several comments mentioned special mitigation measures in and around the OCNMS.

#### **F.14 POLICY/NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT PROCESS**

Comments on the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process included several that felt the information available during scoping was not adequate enough to generate comments. One commenter requested that the scoping period be extended beyond 60 days and that another scoping meeting be held in Seattle.

#### **F.15 RECREATION**

One comment expressed concern about closing navigable waters for military activities. Such closures would negatively impact recreational fishing, boating and diving.

#### **F.16 SOCIOECONOMICS**

Several comments regarding socioeconomic concerns included questions about the effects on commercial shipping, commercial diving and commercial fishing.

#### **F.17 SONAR AND UNDERWATER DETONATIONS**

Many comments mentioned concerns about the effect of Navy sonar on marine life, such as marine mammals, fish, sea turtles, and sea invertebrates. Participants frequently requested that the EIS/OEIS consider alternative technologies to MFA sonar. Several comments addressed protective and mitigation measures for marine mammals when sonar is used. Three comments specifically mentioned concerns about underwater detonations and their potential impact to the marine environment.

#### **F.18 WATER RESOURCES**

Comments regarding water resources included general concerns about the potential for water quality to be affected by military activities.

#### **F.19 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS**

Table F-1 provides a breakdown of areas of concern based on comments received during scoping.

**Table F-1: Breakdown of Scoping Comments by Resource Area**

<b>Resource Area</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Biological Resources - Marine Mammals	23	12.04%
Biological Resources - Fish & Marine Habitat	17	8.90%
Sonar Underwater Detonations	16	8.38%
Policy/NEPA	14	7.33%
Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary	12	6.28%
Other Navy EIS Studies and Unrelated Activities	12	6.28%
Water Resources	11	5.76%
Recreation	9	4.71%
Socioeconomics	9	4.71%
Cultural Resources	8	4.19%
Cumulative Impacts	7	3.66%
Health and Safety	7	3.66%
Threatened and Endangered Species	7	3.66%
Biological Resources - Onshore	6	3.14%
Mitigation	6	3.14%
Proposed Action	6	3.14%
Alternatives	5	2.62%
Noise	5	2.62%
Hazardous Materials / Hazardous Waste	4	2.09%
Miscellaneous	4	2.09%
Air Quality	2	1.05%
Environmental Justice	1	0.52%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>191</b>	