

TABLE OF CONTENTS

G PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.....G-1

G.1 PROJECT WEBSITEG-1

G.2 GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE SCOPING PERIODG-1

G.2.1 Public Scoping Notification..... G-1

G.2.1.1 Federal Register Notice..... G-2

G.2.1.2 Newspaper Display Advertisements G-2

G.2.1.3 Scoping Notification Letters G-2

G.2.2 Public Scoping Comments..... G-5

G.2.2.1 Air Quality G-5

G.2.2.2 Alternatives G-5

G.2.2.3 Biological Resources – Marine Mammals, Fish, Birds and Marine Habitat G-5

G.2.2.4 Biological Resources—Onshore G-6

G.2.2.5 Cultural Resources G-6

G.2.2.6 Cumulative Impacts G-6

G.2.2.7 Environmental Justice G-6

G.2.2.8 Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste..... G-7

G.2.2.9 Health and Safety G-7

G.2.2.10 Noise G-7

G.2.2.11 Miscellaneous G-7

G.2.2.12 Mitigation Measures G-7

G.2.2.13 Meetings/National Environmental Policy Act Process..... G-8

G.2.2.14 Recreation G-8

G.2.2.15 Socioeconomics G-8

G.2.2.16 Sonar and Underwater Detonations..... G-8

G.2.2.17 Water Resources G-8

G.2.2.18 Summary of Comments G-8

G.3 PUBLIC REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EIS/OEISG-9

G.3.1 Federal Register Notice..... G-9

G.3.2 Public Notification G-9

G.3.2.1 Project Website G-10

G.3.2.2 Newspaper Display Advertisements G-10

G.3.2.3 News Releases G-10

G.3.2.4 Public Service Announcement (PSA) G-11

G.3.2.5 Postcard Mailers..... G-11

G.3.2.6 Fliers G-11

G.3.2.7 Stake Holder Letters..... G-11

G.3.3 Public Hearings..... G-15

G.3.3.1 Public Hearing Comments G-15

LIST OF FIGURES

There are no figures in this section.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE G-1: BREAKDOWN OF SCOPING COMMENTS BY RESOURCE AREA G-9

This page intentionally left blank.

1 **G PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

2 This appendix includes information about the public's participation in the development of the Gulf of
3 Alaska (GOA) Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS).
4 The first part of this appendix summarizes the public scoping process that began with the publication of
5 the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the *Federal Register* in March 2008. The scoping period allowed a variety
6 of opportunities for the public to comment on the scope of the EIS/OEIS, and included three public
7 scoping meetings.

8 The second part of this appendix addresses the public's involvement in reviewing and commenting on the
9 Draft EIS/OEIS. This section includes a summary of the Navy's public involvement efforts, including
10 information about public hearings, media advertisements and notifications, letters to stakeholders, and
11 meeting flyers. As part of this phase of public involvement, the Navy received comments to the Draft
12 EIS/OEIS from individuals, agencies, elected officials, organizations, and tribes. These comments and the
13 Navy's response to them are addressed in Appendix I, *Public Comments and Responses*.

14 **G.1 PROJECT WEBSITE**

15 A public website was established specifically for this project, <http://www.gulfofalaskanavyeis.com/> and
16 went active on March 14th, 2008. This website address was published in the initial Notice of Intent and
17 has subsequently been re-printed in all newspaper advertisements, agency letters, and public postcards for
18 both the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environment Impact Statement and Notice of Availability of the
19 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Draft EIS/OEIS, Scoping Meeting Fact Sheets, and various
20 other materials have been available on the project website throughout the course of the project.

21 **G.2 GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE SCOPING PERIOD**

22 The scoping period for the Navy Training Activities in the GOA EIS/ OEIS began with publication of a
23 Notice of Intent in the Federal Register on 17 March 2008. The scoping period began on this date and
24 lasted 45 days, concluding on 30 April 2008. Three public scoping meetings were held on April 1, 2 and 3
25 in the cities of Kodiak, Anchorage, and Cordova, Alaska, respectively. The scoping meetings were held in
26 an open house format, with informational posters and written information provided to participants and
27 Navy staff and project experts were available to answer participants' questions. Additionally, a tape
28 recorder was available to record participants' oral comments. The interaction during the information
29 sessions was productive and helpful to the Navy.

30 Scoping participants could submit comments in five ways:

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

37 **G.2.1 Public Scoping Notification**

38 The Navy made significant efforts at notifying the public to ensure maximum public participation during
39 the scoping process. A summary of these efforts follows.

1 **G.2.1.1 Federal Register Notice**

2 A Notice of Intent and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings was published in the *Federal Register* on
3 March 17, 2008.

4 **G.2.1.2 Newspaper Display Advertisements**

5 Advertisements were made to announce the scoping meetings in the following newspapers on the dates
6 indicated below:

7 <i>Anchorage Daily News</i>	19 <i>Kodiak Daily Mirror</i>
8 Tuesday, March 18 th 2008	20 Tuesday, March 18 th 2008
9 Wednesday, March 19 th 2008	21 Wednesday, March 19 th 2008
10 Thursday, March 20 th 2008	22 Thursday, March 20 th 2008
11 Tuesday, April 1 st 2008	23 Monday, March 31 st 2008
12 Wednesday, April 2 nd 2008 (Day of Meeting)	24 Tuesday, April 1 st 2008 (Day of Meeting)
13 <i>Peninsula Clarion</i>	25 <i>Cordova Times</i>
14 Tuesday, March 18 th 2008	26 Tuesday, March 18 th 2008
15 Wednesday, March 19 th 2008	27 Wednesday, March 19 th 2008
16 Thursday, March 20 th 2008	28 Thursday, March 20 th 2008
17 Tuesday, April 1 st 2008	29 Thursday, March 27 th 2008
18 Wednesday, April 2 nd 2008 (Day of Meeting)	30 Thursday, April 3 rd 2008 (Day of Meeting)

1 **G.2.1.3 Scoping Notification Letters**

2 *Notice of Intent/Notice of Scoping Meeting Letters* were distributed on March 17, 2008 and included the
3 notice of intent to prepare an EIS/OEIS and notification of scoping meetings. Recipients included:

4 **Tribes and Nations**

- 5 • Kaguyak Village
- 6 • Lesnoi Village
- 7 • Native Village of Afognak
- 8 • Native Village of Chenega
- 9 • Native Village of Eyak
- 10 • Native Village of Old Harbor
- 11 • Native Village of Ouzinkie
- 12 • Native Village of Port Graham
- 13 • Native Village of Port Lions
- 14 • Native Village of Tatitlek
- 15 • Shoonaq Tribe of Kodiak
- 16 • Yakutat Tlingit Tribe

17 **Elected Officials**

18 **Federal:**

- 19 • U.S. Senator, Alaska
- 20 • U.S. Senator, Alaska
- 21 • U.S. Representative, Alaska

- 1 State:
- 2 • Governor of Alaska
 - 3 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District A
 - 4 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District B
 - 5 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District C
 - 6 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District D
 - 7 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District E
 - 8 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District F
 - 9 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District G
 - 10 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District H
 - 11 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District I
 - 12 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District J
 - 13 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District K
 - 14 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District L
 - 15 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District M
 - 16 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District N
 - 17 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District O
 - 18 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District P
 - 19 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District Q
 - 20 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District R
 - 21 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District S
 - 22 • Alaska State Senator, Alaska District T
 - 23 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 1
 - 24 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 2
 - 25 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 3
 - 26 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 4
 - 27 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 5
 - 28 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 6
 - 29 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 7
 - 30 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 8
 - 31 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 9
 - 32 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 10
 - 33 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 11
 - 34 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 12
 - 35 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 13
 - 36 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 14
 - 37 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 15
 - 38 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 16
 - 39 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 17
 - 40 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 18
 - 41 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 19
 - 42 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 20
 - 43 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 21
 - 44 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 22
 - 45 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 23
 - 46 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 24
 - 47 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 25
 - 48 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 26

- 1 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 27
- 2 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 28
- 3 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 29
- 4 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 30
- 5 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 31
- 6 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 32
- 7 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 33
- 8 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 34
- 9 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 35
- 10 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 36
- 11 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 37
- 12 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 38
- 13 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 39
- 14 • Alaska State Representative, Alaska District 40

15 Local:

- 16 • Mayor, Fairbanks North Star Borough
- 17 • Mayor, Kenai Peninsula Borough, Mayor
- 18 • Mayor, Kodiak Island Borough
- 19 • Mayor, Matanuska-Susitna Borough
- 20 • Mayor, Municipality of Anchorage
- 21 • Mayor, City of Cordova
- 22 • Mayor, City/Borough of Juneau

23 Federal Regulatory and Government Agencies

- 24 • Federal Aviation Administration
 - 25 • Washington D.C. headquarters
 - 26 • Alaska Region
 - 27 • Navy Liaison Officer
- 28 • Marine Mammal Commission
- 29 • National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
- 30 • National Marine Fisheries Service
 - 31 • Washington D.C. headquarters
 - 32 • Alaska Region
 - 33 • Office of Protected Resources
 - 34 • Habitat Conservation Division
 - 35 • Alaska Fisheries Science Center
- 36 • North Pacific Fisheries Management Council
- 37 • U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
 - 38 • Alaska District
- 39 • U.S. Department of the Air Force
- 40 • U.S. Department of the Army
 - 41 • Environmental Resources Division
- 42 • U.S. Coast Guard
 - 43 • Headquarters Office of Operating and Environmental Standards
 - 44 • District 17
- 45 • U.S. Department of the Interior
 - 46 • Bureau of Indian Affairs
 - 47 • Bureau of Land Management

- 1 • Environmental Policy & Compliance Department
- 2 • Minerals Management Service, Alaska Outer Continental Shelf Region
- 3 • National Park Service, Glacier Bay
- 4 • U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Alaska Region
- 5 • U.S. Geological Survey, Alaska Science Center and Western Fisheries Research Center
- 6 • U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- 7 • Washington D.C. headquarters
- 8 • Region X
- 9 • U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- 10 • U.S. Department of Agriculture
- 11 • U.S. Forest Service, Alaska Region
- 12 • U.S. Department of Commerce

13 **State Regulatory and Government Agencies**

- 14 • Alaska Department of Fish and Game
- 15 • Alaska Department of Natural Resources
- 16 • Alaska Department of Commerce and Economic Development
- 17 • Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
- 18 • Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities
- 19 • Alaska Office of History and Archaeology
- 20 • Regulatory Commission of Alaska
- 21 • Alaska Department of Military and Veterans Affairs

22 **G.2.2 Public Scoping Comments**

23 In total, the Navy received comments from 77 individuals or organizations. These comments included 52
24 comments via the website, 18 comments via mail, and 7 comments made in person during the public
25 scoping meetings. This summary gives an overview of comments received during the scoping period.
26 Comments are organized by issue area.

27 **G.2.2.1 Air Quality**

28 Comments in this category expressed concern about the effects of military activities on air quality,
29 specifically from carbon dioxide (CO₂) and greenhouse gases and their effects on global warming.
30 Additional commenters expressed concerns with black carbon exhaust emissions from Navy vessels and
31 their warming impact in the Arctic. Compliance with the Clean Air Act (CAA) was also mentioned.
32 Commenters noted that the EIS/OEIS should discuss which areas do not meet National Ambient Air
33 Quality Standards.

34 **G.2.2.2 Alternatives**

35 Comments regarding alternatives suggested that the Navy consider other sites to conduct its activities.
36 Several commenters expressed that, of the three alternatives, they could only support the No Action
37 Alternative. Additional comments expressed general disappointment with use of the term “No Action
38 Alternative” to refer to continuing activities at current levels.

39 **G.2.2.3 Biological Resources – Marine Mammals, Fish, Birds and Marine Habitat**

40 The majority of comments received in this focus area expressed concerns about impacts to marine life.
41 Many of these comments specifically raised concerns about the effect of Navy sonar on marine life, such
42 as marine mammals, fish, sea turtles, sea invertebrates and zooplankton. Numerous comments were made
43 about the number of endangered species in the GOA, particularly whales (seven whale species in total)
44 and the North Pacific Right Whale specifically, and the presence of North Pacific Right Whale critical

1 habitat in the GOA. Participants frequently requested that the EIS/OEIS consider alternative technologies
2 to mid-frequency active (MFA) sonar, while others stated that MFA and other forms of sonar are not
3 required for training and should not be used within the GOA based upon “common knowledge” of the
4 effects of sonar. Other commenters quoted previous EIS/OEIS’s such as the Hawaii Range Complex
5 Supplemental Draft EIS to state that the Navy, in this EIS, “...found that the use of MFA sonar and high-
6 frequency active (HFA) sonar was harassment to a variety of whale species which included the
7 endangered blue whale, fin whale, humpback and sperm, also Stellar Sea Lion.” Several comments
8 addressed protective and mitigation measures that are used now and that could be used for marine
9 mammals when sonar is in use. Still, other comments voiced concern over the effects of all forms of sonar
10 on migration patterns of whales, marine mammals, fish, and birds. A few comments expressed concern
11 about potential negative impacts from sonar, both short- and long-term, to fish and the developing
12 eggs/embryos of salmon and other commercial species (halibut, herring, haddock, pollock and crab).
13 Other comments concerned sonar effects on the marine mammal food chain, including fish and
14 zooplankton.

15 Several comments expressed general concern about Navy impacts, other than sonar, such as habitat
16 quality and water quality, on marine life, while others identified specific policies that must be considered
17 in the Navy’s analysis, such as the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, the
18 Coastal Zone Management Act, the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation Management Act, the
19 Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and Executive Order 13158.

20 **G.2.2.4 Biological Resources—Onshore**

21 A few comments suggested that the EIS/OEIS should also evaluate impacts on plant species and habitats,
22 and indirect impacts outside the defined project boundary. Several comments addressed the protection of
23 birds, including shorebirds, seabirds and migratory birds. Potential stressors to birds mentioned in the
24 comments included noise disturbance. Among other terrestrial issues were general concerns about
25 impacts to Alaska’s ecosystem and resources.

26 **G.2.2.5 Cultural Resources**

27 Participants commenting on cultural resources were primarily concerned with preserving the integrity of
28 sport and subsistence activities to include native subsistence. A few comments also addressed the issue of
29 pollution and potential damage to ancestral homelands.

30 **G.2.2.6 Cumulative Impacts**

31 Comments in this category expressed concern about the overall impact of past and present military
32 activity in the GOA. One specific commenter asked “how the cumulative impact of noise from other
33 sources (military, fisheries, ship traffic and other commercial and industrial sources) can be measured and
34 monitored while the Navy sonar exercises are going on.” Another commenter asked that the
35 “...cumulative impacts on local communities, subsistence, endangered species, marine mammals, fish,
36 birds, and the ecosystem, among others, to include the EXXON Valdez oil spill, be fully evaluated and
37 presented to the public”. Finally, one commenter noted that cumulative impacts should include the
38 consideration of how Navy actions may impact climatic changes, given concerns about how climate
39 change may already be stressing many species.

40 **G.2.2.7 Environmental Justice**

41 Commenters requested that the EIS/OEIS disclose what efforts were taken to meet environmental justice
42 requirements consistent with Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice
43 in Minority and Low-Income/Populations. These commenters also requested information describing the
44 methodology and criteria for identifying low-income and minority populations as well as sources and
45 references used within the DEIS analysis. Comments were also made in reference to making a complete
46 analysis of impacts, including cumulative impacts, to low-income and minority communities, as well as

1 methods of input for low-income populations and the means of outreach to these potentially affected
2 communities.

3 **G.2.2.8 Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste**

4 Of the comments regarding hazardous materials and waste, the primary concerns articulated were over
5 spills, specifically fuel oil, other toxic liquids, wastewater ballast and other bilge water discharges.
6 Another area of concern was the effects of depleted uranium use in munitions on the environment in
7 general. Other comments were in regard to chemical composition of the munitions that would be released.
8 Additionally, a few individuals commented on World War II dump sites that are designated on some
9 marine charts. These individuals want these areas to be re-identified, the types and quantities of materials
10 and containers revealed to the public, and this information factored in to the DEIS analysis as previous
11 military impacts on top of present and future proposed activities, as well as used to establish a baseline for
12 cumulative impacts analysis.

13 **G.2.2.9 Health and Safety**

14 One comment expressed concern about safety implications to recreational swimmers and divers from
15 mid-frequency active sonar.

16 **G.2.2.10 Noise**

17 Several commenters expressed concern about noise from ordnance, mid-frequency sonar, sonar jamming
18 signals, low-frequency communication and surveillance sonar, mid- and high- frequency communication
19 sonars and mechanical noises associated with warfare exercises, to include engine noises, explosions and
20 munitions firing. Another commenter wanted to know what the seismic and sonic noise impacts will be to
21 marine mammals, especially whales, walrus, and seals, and to fish and birds. Another commenter stated
22 that the EIS should describe the impacts of noise on human and wildlife health and behavior, as well as
23 the measures that will be employed to mitigate those impacts, such as physical controls, operations plans
24 and flight corridors. Commenters stated that noise analysis methodologies should be explained and the
25 single-event and cumulative noise metrics utilized in the analysis should be defined. One commenter was
26 concerned about air or noise pollution in ancestral homelands – on or off shore.

27 **G.2.2.11 Miscellaneous**

28 Several comments were received that stated that the Navy was, in effect, moving to Alaska to conduct
29 training, specifically sonar training, because “Court orders and lawsuits ran the Navy out of both
30 California and Hawaii for similar tests and now you are making (a) move on our Alaskan waters.” One
31 commenter wanted to inform the Navy of vital telecommunication cables on the seafloor and indicated
32 that Navy activities must be conducted away from these cables.

33 **G.2.2.12 Mitigation Measures**

34 Most comments regarding mitigation measures focused on marine mammals. For example, several
35 comments expressed concern that spotting marine mammals is extremely difficult for even expert
36 observers, and those commenters doubted that shipboard lookouts could detect animals in adverse sea
37 conditions and especially at night. One commenter proposed that the Navy should use infrared imaging
38 devices at night. Other commenters expressed concern about the effectiveness of the Navy’s training
39 program for spotting animals. One commenter believed that it would be impossible to avoid encounters
40 with whales and other marine animals no matter how many lookouts the Navy utilizes or what time of the
41 year training is conducted. Others questioned how the Navy is going to mitigate sonar’s possible adverse
42 impacts on marine mammals. Additionally, others asked that the Navy aggressively consider ways to
43 expand, improve, and employ better protective measures in future sonar exercises, such as conducting
44 more monitoring and enforcing larger safety zones around ships. Finally, comments were made that the
45 Navy needs to better identify clear monitoring goals and objectives with specific parameters for

1 measuring success and provide a feedback mechanism for the public to view information on mitigation
2 effectiveness and monitoring results.

3 **G.2.2.13 Meetings/National Environmental Policy Act Process**

4 Comments on the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process included several that felt the
5 information available during the scoping process was inadequate to provide informed comments or that
6 the “poster” session was not the best format. Other commenters desired a more open forum type format,
7 where all questions voiced could be heard by all. One commenter was disappointed that the Navy chose to
8 hold scoping sessions in only three Alaska communities. Another requested that an additional scoping
9 meeting be held in Homer, Alaska. Still other commenters desired the Navy to shift its meetings to later
10 in the year (August), when there is less activity in the various fisheries.

11 **G.2.2.14 Recreation**

12 One comment expressed concern about preserving the integrity of commercial, sport and subsistence
13 activities, including fishing and traditional harvesting of animals. Another comment concerned the
14 possibility of being subjected to sonar while diving. Still others mentioned whale watching activities and
15 how Navy activities might affect them.

16 **G.2.2.15 Socioeconomics**

17 Comments regarding socioeconomic concerns included questions about the effects and impacts on
18 commercial fishing, tourism, and the economy in general.

19 **G.2.2.16 Sonar and Underwater Detonations**

20 Many comments mentioned concerns about the effect of Navy sonar on marine life, such as marine
21 mammals, fish, sea turtles, and invertebrates. Others mentioned recent reports that fish suffer from
22 hearing loss and widespread disorientation following loud noise intrusions and that catch rates of
23 commercial species of fish have plummeted in the vicinity of noise sources. Some specific references to
24 additional studies were received via comments. Others said that noise has been shown in several cases to
25 kill, disable or disrupt the behavior of invertebrates and that little is known about the effects of MFAS on
26 lower marine trophic levels such as phytoplankton and zooplankton. Participants frequently requested that
27 the EIS/OEIS consider alternative technologies to sonar. Many felt that sonar activity is not necessary or
28 appropriate for Alaska waters and that training could be accomplished through simulation and/or use of
29 alternate technologies. Several comments addressed protective and mitigation measures for marine
30 mammals when sonar is used. A few comments specifically mentioned concerns about possible acute
31 and/or chronic effects on benthic and pelagic marine life from munitions discharges and explosions. Some
32 commenters also discussed that analysis of possible impacts to the seafloor from expended materials
33 during training exercises would need to be discussed.

34 **G.2.2.17 Water Resources**

35 Comments regarding water resources included general concerns about the potential effects on quality of
36 both fresh and marine waters, not only in the designated training areas, but also in the land-based areas
37 utilized for logistical support of the exercises, and areas adjacent to the training areas to be affected by
38 military activities. Of specific concern were graywater (waste water from sinks, baths, showers, laundry,
39 etc) and blackwater (waste water from human body wastes) that will be discharged from all vessels
40 engaged in Northern Edge exercises, to include ballast water drawn from areas that may contain invasive
41 species. A few of these comments quoted specific provisions of the Clean Water Act.

42 **G.2.2.18 Summary of Comments**

43 Table G-1 provides a breakdown of areas of concern based on comments received during scoping.
44 Because most commenters provided comments on several issues, and because some commenters chose to

1 comment via multiple means, with only slight variations in their comments, the total count well exceeds
 2 the total number of 77 comments received.

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

Resource Area	Count	Percent of Total
Biological Resources - Marine Mammals	88	19.04%
Sonar and Underwater Detonations	74	16.01%
Biological Resources - Fish & Marine Habitat	45	9.74%
Mitigation	36	7.79%
Policy/NEPA	31	6.70%
Threatened and Endangered Species	30	6.49%
Commercial Fishing	27	5.84%
Alternatives	26	5.62%
Hazardous Materials / Hazardous Waste	24	5.19%
Socioeconomics	15	3.24%
Cumulative Impacts	11	2.38%
Water Resources	10	2.16%
Air Quality	8	1.73%
Biological Resources - Onshore	7	1.51%
Noise	6	1.29%
Miscellaneous	6	1.29%
Cultural Resources	5	1.08%
Proposed Action	5	1.08%
Coastal Zone Management Act	3	0.64%
Recreation	2	0.43%
Health and Safety	2	0.43%
Environmental Justice	1	0.21%
TOTAL	462	

4 **G.3 PUBLIC REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EIS/OEIS**

5 **G.3.1 Federal Register Notice**

6 On December 11, 2009, a Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS/OEIS was published in the *Federal*
 7 *Register*. This notice announced the availability of the Draft EIS/OEIS for public review. A news release
 8 was also issued and two media briefings were conducted to inform the public of the impending Notice
 9 publication. The Notice of Availability was the start of the public comment period for the Draft
 10 EIS/OEIS. The 45 day public comment period ended on January 25, 2010.

11 **G.3.2 Public Notification**

12 The Navy made significant efforts at notifying the public to ensure maximum public participation during
 13 the public hearing process. The public could submit comments in five ways:

- 14 • Oral statements at the public meetings (as recorded by the tape recorder);

- 1 • Written comments at the public meetings;
- 2 • Written letters (received any time during the public comment period);
- 3 • Electronic mail (received any time during the public comment period); and
- 4 • Comments submitted directly on the project website (received any time during the public
- 5 comment period).

6 A summary of the Navy's public notification efforts follows.

7 **G.3.2.1 Project Website**

8 The Navy provided a public website that has been active since the NOI was published in March 2008. On
 9 the day of the public release of the Draft EIS/OEIS, this website made available an electronic (PDF)
 10 version of the Draft EIS/OEIS for download and review. A comment form could be downloaded from the
 11 website to allow the public to submit written comments. The website also provided a paperless capability
 12 for members of the public to enter a comment directly.

13 **G.3.2.2 Newspaper Display Advertisements**

14 Advertisements were made to announce the availability of the Draft EIS/OEIS and to announce the
 15 schedule and locations for public hearings as follows:

16 <i>Anchorage Daily News</i>	35 <i>Kodiak Daily Mirror</i>
17 Monday, 14th December 2009	36 Monday, 14th December 2009
18 Tuesday, 15th December 2009	37 Tuesday, 15th December 2009
19 Wednesday, 16th December 2009	38 Wednesday, 16th December 2009
20 Monday, 28th December 2009	39 Monday, 28th December 2009
21 Wednesday, 6th January 2010	40 Tuesday, 5th January 2010
22 Thursday, 7th January 2010	41 Wednesday, 6th January 2010
23 Friday, 8th January 2010	42 Thursday, 7th January 2010
24 Sunday, 10th January 2010	
25 Monday, 11th January 2010	43 <i>Juneau Empire</i>
	44 Monday, 14th December 2009
26 <i>Peninsula Clarion</i>	45 Monday, 28th December 2009
27 Monday, 14th December 2009	46 Friday, 8th January 2010
28 Tuesday, 15th December 2009	47 Sunday, 10th January 2010
29 Wednesday, 16th December 2009	48 Monday, 11th January 2010
30 Monday, 28th December 2009	49 <i>Cordova Times(Thursday only)</i>
31 Wednesday, 30th December 2009	50 Thursday, 17th December 2009
32 Wednesday, 6th January 2010	51 Thursday, 24th December 2009
33 Thursday, 7th January 2010	52 Thursday, 31st December 2009
34 Friday, 8th January 2010	53 Thursday, 7th January 2010

54 **G.3.2.3 News Releases**

55 Two news releases were distributed by the Commander, Navy Region Northwest Environmental Public
 56 Affairs Officer (CNRNW EPAO) to media outlets, elected officials and other potentially interested
 57 parties. The first news release was distributed on 11 December 2009, and announced the availability of
 58 the Draft EIS/OEIS. This news release included details on the Proposed Action, public hearings dates,
 59 locations, times and comment information.

60 A second news release was distributed by the CNRNW EPAO on 31 December 2009, and announced the
 61 Navy's upcoming public hearings. This news release, meant to encourage the public to attend the open

1 houses and presentation/oral comment sessions, provided detailed information on the location, dates, and
2 times of the public hearings, in addition to comment information and details on the Proposed Action.

3 G.3.2.4 Public Service Announcement (PSA)

4 A PSA was distributed twice by CNRNW EPAO (31 December 2009, and 4 January 2010), announcing
5 the public hearing locations, dates, time, close of comment period, and project Web site.

6 G.3.2.5 Postcard Mailers

7 Postcards announcing the availability of the Draft EIS/OEIS, comment information, and the public
8 hearing dates, times, and locations were sent out to 691 individuals on the project mailing list on 23
9 December 2009.

10 G.3.2.6 Fliers

11 Fliers announcing the public open houses and presentation/oral comment sessions for each of the five
12 public hearings locations were distributed to 45 locations.

13 G.3.2.7 Stake Holder Letters

14 DEIS Distribution/Public Hearings Letters were distributed 11 December 2009 and included the
15 notification of public hearings and notice of availability of Draft EIS/OEIS (CD or hard copy of EIS
16 included).

17 Following is a list of public officials, government agencies, Native American Tribes and Nations,
18 organizations, and individuals who attended the public scoping meetings, provided comments during the
19 scoping process, or have been identified by the Navy to be on the distribution list for the Gulf of Alaska
20 Navy Training Activities Draft EIS/OEIS.

21 Federal and state regulatory agencies and project information repositories (noted below with an asterisk*)
22 received both one (1) hard copy version and one (1) CD-ROM version of the Gulf of Alaska Navy
23 Training Activities Draft EIS/OEIS. Stakeholders who specifically requested a hard copy version also
24 received one, along with a CD-ROM version. All other stakeholders received one (1) CD-ROM version.
25 Additional hard copies and/or CD-ROM versions of the Draft EIS/OEIS were made available when
26 requested.

Information Repositories*

Loussac Library, Anchorage, AK
Alaska State Library, Juneau, AK
A. Holmes Johnson Memorial
Library, Kodiak, AK
University of Alaska Fairbanks,
Rasmussen Library, Fairbanks,
AK
Cordova Public Library, Cordova,
AK
Copper Valley Community Library,
Glennallen, AK
Seward Community Library,
Seward, AK
Humboldt Homer Public Library,
Homer, AK

Federal Regulatory Agencies

Federal Aviation Administration
- Washington D.C.
headquarters
- Alaska Region
- Navy Liaison Officer*
Marine Mammal Commission*
National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service
- Washington D.C.
headquarters*
- Alaska Region*
- Office of Protected
Resources
- Habitat Conservation
Division

- Alaska Fisheries Science
Center
North Pacific Fisheries
Management Council*
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- Alaska District
U.S. Department of the Air Force*

U.S. Department of the Army -Environmental Resources Division*	Alaska Office of History and Archaeology Regulatory Commission of Alaska	Alaska State Senator Hon. Joe Thomas AK District D
U.S. Coast Guard - Headquarters Office of Operating and Environmental Standards* - District 17	Alaska Department of Military and Veterans Affairs <u>Native American Tribes and Nations*</u>	Alaska State Senator Hon. Joe Paskvan AK District E Alaska State Senator Hon. Gene Therriault AK District F
U.S. Department of the Interior - Bureau of Indian Affairs - Bureau of Land Management - Environmental Policy & Compliance Department* - Minerals Management Service, Alaska Outer Continental Shelf Region* - National Park Service, Glacier Bay* - U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Alaska Region* - U.S. Geological Survey, Alaska Science Center and Western Fisheries Research Center*	Kaguyak Village Lesnoi Village Native Village of Afognak Native Village of Chenega Native Village of Eyak Native Village of Old Harbor Native Village of Ouzinkie Native Village of Port Graham Native Village of Port Lions Native Village of Tatitlek Shoonaq Tribe of Kodiak Yakutat Tlingit Tribe	Alaska State Senator Hon. Linda Menard AK District G Alaska State Senator Hon. Charlie Huggins AK District H Alaska State Senator Hon. Fred Dyson AK District I Alaska State Senator Hon. Bill Wielechowski AK District J
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Washington D.C. headquarters* - Region X*	<u>Federal Elected Officials</u> U.S. Representative Hon. Donald Young, AK U.S. Senator Hon. Lisa Murkowski, AK	Alaska State Senator Hon. Bettye Davis AK District K Alaska State Senator Hon. Johnny Ellis AK District L
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service U.S. Department of Agriculture -U.S. Forest Service, Alaska Region	U.S. Senator Hon. Mark Begich, AK	Alaska State Senator Hon. Hollis French, AK District M
U.S. Department of Commerce <u>State Regulatory Agencies</u> Alaska Department of Fish and Game Alaska Department of Natural Resources Alaska Department of Commerce and Economic Development Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities	<u>State Elected Officials</u> Governor of Alaska Hon. Sean Parnell Alaska State Senator Hon. Bert Stedman AK District A Alaska State Senator Hon. Dennis Egan AK District B Alaska State Senator Hon. Albert Kookesh AK District C	Alaska State Senator Hon. Lesil McGuire AK District N Alaska State Senator Hon. Kevin Meyer AK District O Alaska State Senator Hon. Con Bunde AK District P Alaska State Senator Hon. Thomas Wagoner AK District Q

Alaska State Senator Hon. Gary Stevens AK District R	Alaska State Representative Hon. John Harris AK District 12	Alaska State Representative Hon. Lindsey Holmes AK District 26
Alaska State Senator Hon. Lyman Hoffman AK District S	Alaska State Representative Hon. Carl Gatto AK District 13	Alaska State Representative Hon. Bob Buch AK District 27
Alaska State Senator Hon. Donald Olson AK District T	Alaska State Representative Hon. Wes Keller AK District 14	Alaska State Representative Hon. Craig Johnson AK District 28
Alaska State Representative Hon. Kyle Johansen AK District 1	Alaska State Representative Hon. Mark Neuman AK District 15	Alaska State Representative Hon. Chris Tuck AK District 29
Alaska State Representative Hon. Peggy Wilson AK District 2	Alaska State Representative Hon. Bill Stoltze AK District 16	Alaska State Representative Hon. Charisse Millet AK District 30
Alaska State Representative Hon. Beth Kerttula AK District 3	Alaska State Representative Hon. Anna Fairclough, AK District 17	Alaska State Representative Hon. Bob Lynn AK District 31
Alaska State Representative Hon. Cathy Munoz AK District 4	Alaska State Representative Hon. Nancy Dahlstrom AK District 18	Alaska State Representative Hon. Mike Hawker AK District 32
Alaska State Representative Hon. Bill Thomas, Jr. AK District 5	Alaska State Representative Hon. Pete Peterson AK District 19	Alaska State Representative Hon. Kurt Olson AK District 33
Alaska State Representative Hon. Woodie Salmon AK District 6	Alaska State Representative Hon. Max Gruenberg AK District 20	Alaska State Representative Hon. Mike Chenault AK District 34
Alaska State Representative Hon. Mike Kelly AK District 7	Alaska State Representative Hon. Harry Crawford AK District 21	Alaska State Representative Hon. Paul Seaton AK District 35
Alaska State Representative Hon. David Guttenberg AK District 8	Alaska State Representative Hon. Sharon Cissna AK District 22	Alaska State Representative Hon. Alan Austerman AK District 36
Alaska State Representative Hon. Scott Kawaski AK District 9	Alaska State Representative Hon. Les Gara AK District 23	Alaska State Representative Hon. Bryce Edgmon AK District 37
Alaska State Representative Hon. Jay Ramras AK District 10	Alaska State Representative Hon. Berta Gardner AK District 24	Alaska State Representative Hon. Bob Herron AK District 38
Alaska State Representative Hon. John Coghill AK District 11	Alaska State Representative Hon. Mike Doogan AK District 25	Alaska State Representative Hon. Richard Foster AK District 39

Alaska State Representative Hon. Reggie Joule AK District 40	Richard Brenner Cordova, AK	Leona Heitsch Bourbon, MI
<u>Local Elected Officials</u>	Bruce Cain Cordova, AK	Pat Holmes Kodiak, AK
Fairbanks North Star Borough Hon. Luke Hopkins Mayor	Mark Cammrys Cordova, AK	Deb Jaros Kodiak, AK
Kenai Peninsula Borough Hon. David R. Carey Mayor	Madelene Caselli Palmer, AK	Joanna Kappel Chicago, IL
Kodiak Island Borough Hon. Jerome M. Selby Mayor	Al Clayton Anchorage, AK	Lee Keller Seward, AK
Matanuska-Susitna Borough Hon. Talis Colberg Mayor	Taral Clayton Anchorage, AK	Kimberly Kopanuk Anchorage, AK
Municipality of Anchorage Hon. Dan Sullivan Mayor	Trevor Clayton Anchorage, AK	Robert Kopchak Cordova, AK
City of Cordova Hon. Timothy L. Joyce Mayor	Mark Cummings Cordova, AK	Aldone Kowenta Kodiak, AK
City/Borough of Juneau Hon. Bruce Botelho Mayor	Terry Cummings Anchorage, AK	Kurt Krieter Palmer, AK
<u>Individuals</u>	Dean Cwrzah Kodiak, AK	Alexis Kwachka Kodiak, AK
Tom Anderson Cordova, AK	Tess Dietrich Kodiak, AK	Dave Lacey Fairbanks, AK
Claudia Anderson Kodiak, AK	Don Dunn Kodiak, AK	Ann Mallard Fairbanks, AK
Brad Barr Kodiak, AK	James Fisher Soldotna, AK	Craig Matkin Homer, AK
Wendy Beck Kodiak, AK	Robert Fisher Kingwood, TX	Irene Miramontes Nassau, Bahamas
Robert Berceli Cordova, AK	Susan Glinton Nassau, Bahamas	Maria Nasif Tuscon, AZ
Allison Bidlack Cordova, AK	Lavonne Heacock Rhododendron, OR	Susan Payne Kodiak, AK
Cheryl Boehlan Kodiak, AK	Pat Heitman Kodiak, AK	Geneveiva Pearson Kodiak, AK
	Carolyn Heitman* Kodiak, AK	Susan Peehl Cold Springs, NY

Barbara Sachau
Florham Park, NJ

Joan Stempniak
Homer, AK

Hans Tscherich
Cordova, AK

Mike Sirofchruk
Kodiak, AK

Dany Stihl
Kodiak, AK

Keith Van den Broek
Cordova, AK

Ralph Sirofchruk
Kodiak, AK

Delores Stokes
Kodiak, AK

Barbara Volpe
Kodiak, AK

Michael Sirofchuck
Kodiak, AK

John F. Thomas
Cordova, AK

Elise Wolf
Fritz Creek, AK

Erin Starr-Hollow
Kodiak, AK

Kip Thomet
Kodiak, AK

1 **G.3.3 Public Hearings**

2 During the public comment period the Navy held public hearings to present information from the
3 EIS/OEIS and to solicit public comments. Public hearings were held on the following dates and locations
4 in Alaska: 7 January 2010, Kodiak; 8 January 2010, Anchorage; 9 January 2010, Homer, Alaska; 11
5 January 2010, Juneau; 12 January 2010, Cordova. Staffed poster stations with detailed information about
6 the project and the Draft EIS/OEIS results were open for each meeting from 5:00 to 7:00 PM. During this
7 time, Navy experts were available to answer questions and receive comments from members of the
8 public. At 7 PM during each meeting a more formal, structured public hearing began in which the Navy
9 presented a briefing on the Draft EIS/OEIS and the study conclusions. Following that presentation,
10 individuals provided oral comments. All oral comments were captured by a court reporter and have been
11 reproduced later in this appendix. In addition to oral comments, the Navy received written comments
12 during these hearings.

13 **G.3.3.1 Public Hearing Comments**

14 In total, the Navy received comments from 213 individuals or organizations. These comments included
15 140 comments via the website, 38 comments via mail, and 64 comments made in person during the public
16 hearing meetings. Comments were further broken out into 1,127 comment issues to best respond to each
17 concern of the individual or organization.

This page intentionally left blank.