
APPENDIX N

**SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT EIS COMMENTS AND
RESPONSES**

This page intentionally left blank

Table N-1 Index of Commentors

| Document Code | Commenter | Page No. |
|----------------------|--|-----------------|
| 1. | Environmental Protection Agency | N-1 |
| 2. | US Fish and Wildlife Service | N-10 |
| 3. | US Department of Interior, Office of the Secretary, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance | N-12 |
| 4. | State of Hawaii Department of Accounting and General Services | N-14 |
| 5. | State of Hawaii Department of Health | N-14 |
| 6. | State of Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources | N-15 |
| 7. | City and County of Honolulu Department of Design and Construction | N-16 |
| 8. | The Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii | N-17 |
| 9. | City and County of Honolulu Board of Water Supply | N-19 |
| 10. | City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation | N-20 |
| 11. | City and County of Honolulu Police Department | N-20 |
| 12. | University of Hawaii, Manoa | N-21 |
| 13. | University of Hawaii, Manoa Ethnic Studies | N-31 |
| 14. | Earthjustice | N-33 |
| 15. | Nanaikapono Civic Club | N-45 |
| 16. | The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance | N-46 |
| 17. | Timothy J. Pickering, PP McCandless Ranch, LLC. & PP85 McCandless Ranch, LLC. | N-48 |
| 18. | Life of The Land | N-52 |
| 19. | Form Letter: Pter Sanderson; Elle Wilhite; Eva Collins; Kathy-Lyn Allen; Virginia W. Walden; Rosemary Bak; Milwa; Suzanne Garrett; Anne Springall; Anonymous | N-59 |
| 20. | Dave Kisor | N-60 |
| 21. | Bonnie Bonse | N-60 |
| 22. | Amelia Gora | N-61 |
| 23. | Amelia Gora, Acting Liaison of Foreign Affairs, Kingdom of Hawaii, Oahu, Hawaii, Mokupuni Pae Aina o Hawaii | N-63 |
| 24. | Nedra McKnight | N-65 |
| 25. | Wyatt Kang | N-66 |
| 26. | Faith Arakawa | N-66 |

Appendix N: Supplemental Draft EIS Public Comments and Responses

| Document Code | Commenter | Page No. |
|----------------------|---|-----------------|
| 27. | Donald G. Aten | N-66 |
| 28. | Jacquelyn Chappel | N-67 |
| 29. | Kevin G. O'Grady | N-67 |
| 30. | Alan Gormezano | N-67 |
| 31. | Jeannine Johnson | N-68 |
| 32. | Luelle Nohea Chang-Crutcher | N-69 |
| 33. | Mary Allen Pestana | N-70 |
| 34. | Maile Shimabukuro | N-71 |
| 35. | James K Mahaky SR | N-72 |
| 36. | Jean StavRue | N-73 |
| 37. | Cory (Martha) Harden | N-75 |
| 38. | Gail S. Hunter | N-78 |
| 39. | Robert Soares | N-79 |
| 40. | Kent West | N-80 |
| 41. | John Doe | N-80 |
| 42. | Alan Gormezano | N-81 |
| 43. | William Prescott | N-81 |
| 44. | William (Bill) Prescott, Commander, Leeward VFW Post 849 | N-82 |
| 45. | S. Joe Estores | N-85 |
| 46. | Rob Biggerstaff | N-86 |
| 47. | COL Joe Logan, HIARNG Chief of Staff | N-87 |
| 48. | Richard Sasaki | N-87 |
| 49. | Erik Ramseyer | N-88 |
| 50. | Sandra Gray | N-88 |
| 51. | Frederick A. Dodge, MD; Karen G. S. Young, APRN, MSN, MPH | N-88 |
| 52. | John Stimson | N-92 |
| 53. | William and Melva Aila | N-98 |
| 54. | Mr. Kaiana Hall | N-102 |
| 55. | Pueo McGuire | N-103 |

Appendix N: Supplemental Draft EIS Public Comments and Responses

| Document Code | Commenter | Page No. |
|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| 56. | Richard Pomaikaiokalani Kini | N-114 |
| 57. | Granny Grace | N-116 |
| 58. | Henry Ahlo | N-118 |
| 59. | Bill Prescott | N-120 |
| 60. | Bill Hambaro | N-124 |
| 61. | Fred Dodge | N-127 |
| 62. | Kevin Milnes | N-129 |
| 63. | Mary Pestana-Young | N-131 |
| 64. | Pat Patterson | N-133 |
| 65. | Wyatt Lee | N-134 |
| 66. | Pono Kealoha | N-135 |
| 67. | Kukui Maunakea-Forth | N-136 |
| 68. | Kealohi Maunakea-Forth | N-139 |
| 69. | Kauhi Maunakea-Forth | N-141 |
| 70. | Gary Maunakea-Forth | N-142 |
| 71. | Melva Aila | N-145 |
| 72. | Ms. Desoto | N-147 |
| 73. | Butch Detraye | N-149 |
| 74. | Ikaika Hussey | N-152 |
| 75. | James Manuku, Sr. | N-155 |
| 76. | John Carroll | N-158 |
| 77. | David Henkin | N-161 |
| 78. | William Aila | N-165 |
| 79. | James Cowles | N-170 |
| 80. | Henry Pelekai, Jr. | N-172 |
| 81. | Marti Townsend | N-174 |
| 82. | Albert Silva | N-176 |
| 83. | Dr. Kit Glover | N-179 |
| 84. | Ms. Thompson | N-179 |

Appendix N: Supplemental Draft EIS Public Comments and Responses

| Document Code | Commenter | Page No. |
|----------------------|--|-----------------|
| 85. | William Aila | N-180 |
| 86. | Ben Acohido | N-188 |
| 87. | Al Takesa | N-190 |
| 88. | Amelia Gora | N-192 |
| 89. | Kealoha Kuhio | N-195 |
| 90. | Norbert Enos | N-197 |
| 91. | General Irwin Cockett (Ret.) | N-199 |
| 92. | Summer Nemeth | N-201 |
| 93. | Summer Nemeth (Writing by George Helm) | N-205 |
| 94. | Noa Helela | N-207 |
| 95. | Joshua Monteleigh | N-208 |
| 96. | Isaac Suehiro | N-209 |
| 97. | Terri Kekoolani | N-210 |
| 98. | Robert Kent | N-216 |
| 99. | Pete Shimazaki Doktor | N-217 |
| 100. | Jean Starkue | N-222 |
| 101. | Mr. Peahi | N-227 |
| 102. | Vince Kanai Dodge | N-230 |
| 103. | Laulani Teale | N-235 |
| 104. | Daniel Anthony | N-237 |
| 105. | Terri Kekoolani | N-240 |
| 106. | Vince Kanai Dodge | N-243 |
| 107. | Isaac Suehiro | N-247 |
| 108. | Keith Ribbontrop | N-258 |
| 109. | Jim Albertini | N-261 |
| 110. | Kale Gumapac | N-265 |
| 111. | Louis Kao'iwi | N-267 |
| 112. | Cory Harden | N-269 |
| 113. | Denise Reghetti | N-273 |

Appendix N: Supplemental Draft EIS Public Comments and Responses

| Document Code | Commenter | Page No. |
|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 114. | Woody Vaspra | N-273 |
| 115. | Larry Kelly | N-276 |
| 116. | Margaret Furukawa | N-278 |
| 117. | Kahale Saito | N-279 |
| 118. | Gallen Kelly | N-281 |
| 119. | Pueo McGuire | N-284 |
| 120. | Iwani Kaiwi | N-286 |
| 121. | Miranda McQuade | N-289 |
| 122. | Herring Kalua | N-290 |
| 123. | Shannon Rudolph | N-304 |
| 124. | Reynolds Kamakawiwoole | N-305 |
| 125. | Shannon Rudolph | N-314 |

Table of Contents

Federal Agencies N-1
State Agencies..... N-14
Local Agencies..... N-16
Schools..... N-21
Organizations N-32
Individuals // General Comments..... N-59
Private Testimony N-102
October 6 2008 Public Meeting.....N-105
October 7 2008 Public Meeting.....N-183
October 8 2008 Public Meeting.....N-250
October 9 2008 Public Meeting.....N-297

D.1 Summary of Comments on the Supplemental Draft EIS

The Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) was available for public review and comment from September 19, 2008 through November 3, 2008. The SDEIS (hard copy, CD, and Executive Summary) was distributed to Federal and State recipients, and Public and Private citizens who requested copies of the document during the 2005 Draft EIS comment period.

The SDEIS was also available on the Internet for review or downloading. Additional copies of the SDEIS were made available at libraries and schools on O'ahu and the Big Island of Hawai'i. During the review period, a variety of agencies, elected officials, organizations, and individuals submitted letters, facsimiles, and e-mails containing comments on the SDEIS. Public testimony and comments were also accepted during the Public meetings held on O'ahu and the Big Island of Hawai'i during the 45-day comment period. Public meetings were held at Nanakuli High School, Waianae (October 6, 2008), Wahiawa District Park Recreation Center, Wahiawa (October 7, 2008), Auntie Sally's Kaleohano's Luau Hale, Hilo (October 8, 2008), and Waimea Community Center, Kamuela (October 9, 2008). A total of 71 individuals or persons representing organizations provided oral comments for the Army's consideration at the four public meetings. The Army also received written comments on the SDEIS from individuals, organizations, and government agencies in the form of e-mails and written letters.

D.2 Analysis of Comments

Respondents submitted a variety of comments on the SDEIS. The Army reviewed the comments and arranged them into the following commenter categories; Federal Agencies, State Agencies, Local Agencies, Schools, Organizations, Individuals, Private Testimony taken, and Public Testimony taken during public meetings. Then, a response was generated for each comment statement accordingly. Overall, the comments primarily focused on Alternatives, Cultural Resources, Biological Resources, and Wildfires. Other comments included Visual Resources, Airspace, Air Quality, Noise, Traffic and Transportation, Water Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Waste, Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice, Public Services and Utilities, and Depleted Uranium.

The table proceeding this section (Table N-1 Index of Commentors) identifies the individuals, organizations, and agencies that responded to the SDEIS. The table lists each respondent by commenter category, and identifies the page location within this appendix where their comment is found. The actual letters, e-mails, facsimiles, and transcripts of verbal statements are also available for public review in the administrative record.

D.3 Comment Statements and Responses

This section presents the comment statements received by the Army on the SDEIS, and the Army-prepared responses. The comment statements are numbered sequentially to facilitate references to them in Table N-1 Index of Commentors.

Federal Agencies

1. EPA Detailed Comments on the Mākua Military Reservation Military Training Activities Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, November 6, 2008

Alternatives / Purpose of Need

Consider Pōhakuloa Training Area

EPA commends the Army for including an alternative site location at Pōhakuloa Training Area (PTA) on Hawai'i in the SDEIS, in response to public comments. It appears that this alternative may result in reduced impacts to some resources. For the PTA site, all ammunition would be fired within the existing impact area. No land use conflicts or impacts to recreation would occur, such as those that would occur at Mākua Beach for the Mākua alternatives. Unlike the Mākua alternatives, no impacts would occur to spinner dolphins; there would be less potential to further contaminate seafood with training-related contaminants; and since PTA does not allow public access, this alternative appears to present fewer impacts to environmental justice populations.

Response: The Army conducted an impacts analysis among four Action Alternatives and one No Action Alternative. The Army will consider the EPA's comment. The Army will publish its determination in the Record of Decision (ROD) after publishing the Final EIS. The Army will take into account all environmental factors as well as the best way to accomplish the purpose and need.

Potential impacts to groundwater should be more carefully evaluated for PTA in the FSEIS, however. The SDEIS indicates that the site experiences rapid infiltration to the subsurface (p. 4-103) and that there are few data available to evaluate groundwater quality (p. 3-123). It is also unclear why reduced capacity alternatives were not included for PTA.

Recommendations: EPA recommends that the FSEIS include alternatives that vary in training intensity at the PTA site, as alternatives do for training at MMR.

Response: The Army conducted an evaluation of potential groundwater impacts as they pertain to Alternative 4, section 4.7 of the SDEIS. If Alternative 4 were selected, however, additional consultations and supplemental site specific NEPA documentation would be required prior to construction of the proposed range at PTA.

Unlike MMR, PTA does not currently present the phased restrictions that arise because of the threat of fire or the presence of endangered species, contained in the 2007 Biological Opinion. The Army looked only at the full range of training it would need to perform in the PTA alternative. If PTA were selected as the preferred alternative rather than MMR, it would have generated additional information such as a Biological Opinion. This, in turn, might have produced phased restrictions on training. Meanwhile, it was important to analyze a PTA alternative that would provide the same training opportunities as the full capacity use of MMR. Otherwise, there would be an uneven comparison and the decision-maker would not reasonably be able to select the PTA alternative.

We recommend mitigation for potential impacts to groundwater be identified for PTA alternatives in the FSEIS. Because of limited data, monitoring of groundwater quality should be included.

We also suggest hotspot cleanup of the areas containing lead concentrations above the industrial PRG (p. 3-337), especially if tungsten-containing “green ammunition” is used, since tungsten reduces soil pH and can increase the mobility of lead in soils.

Response: The environmental impacts at PTA are addressed in the EIS. If selected, the PTA alternative would require additional environmental studies, consultation, and NEPA evaluation and documentation. Use of green ammunition is no longer part of the proposed action. Section 3.11 of the EIS has been updated to discuss the issues concerning green ammunition.

Because fewer impacts would occur at the PTA site, we recommend this site be utilized to meet the stated training need.

Consider less intensive training at Mākua and Pōhakuloa

In our comments on the DEIS, we noted incremental contaminations to soil and groundwater that is occurring from training at Mākua and recommended the Army consider pollution prevention (P2) opportunities, consistent with Army policy and CEQ guidance, in decision-making for this project, including consideration of Alternative 1 which meets the purpose and need with the least environmental impact.

Since the DEIS was released in 2005, training needs have been changed. The SDEIS notes that Combined-Arms Live-Fire Exercises (CALFEXs) train soldiers for major combat against conventional opponents, which is not what is occurring in Afghanistan and Iraq. For these assignments, soldier training includes tasks related to irregular warfare and stability operations (p. ES-3), and to countering improvised explosive devices, which account for the majority of all US casualties (p. 1-10). Therefore, it appears that Alternative 1 with additional convoy live fire exercises would be appropriate for consideration.

Response: The Army is considering each of the alternatives presented in the SDEIS. The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS. The Army will consider the EPA’s comment and appreciates your review.

We understand that the Army’s approach has been to look at the highest level of activity under each alternative and that the Army desires flexibility in training, however, with the changes in immediate training needs, the need for the preferred alternative with up to 50 CALFEXs per year is not well substantiated.

Response: The number of combinations of CALFEXs that a Company Commander has the discretion to perform is somewhat flexible. For instance, the company commander could choose to have platoons train, rather than the entire company. He could also have the entire company train more than once per year. The Army has chosen the conservative number of 50 CALFEXs as the maximum under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4. 50 CALFEXs per year is the maximum that could be conducted at MMR given the restrictions on the use of the range. The Army wanted to analyze the impacts associated with the maximum possible use, even though it would be unusual to have that level of training occur.

Recommendation: The FEIS should evaluate an alternative with reduced capacity at the PTA site, which would also meet the purpose and need for the project. EPA recommends the Army

ensure than an alternative that meets the most immediate training needs while slowing the incremental contamination of soil and water resources be selected.

Response: Unlike MMR, PTA does not currently present the phased restrictions that arise because of the threat of fire or the presence of endangered species, contained in the 2007 Biological Opinion. The Army looked only at the full range of training it would need to perform in the PTA alternative. If PTA were selected as the preferred alternative rather than MMR, it would have generated additional information such as a Biological Opinion. This, in turn, might have produced phased restrictions on training. Meanwhile, it was important to analyze a PTA alternative that would provide the same training opportunities as the full capacity use of MMR. Otherwise, there would be an uneven comparison and the decision-maker would not reasonably be able to select the PTA alternative.

Army's Response to Comments on the DEIS

The DEIS contains responses to comments received on the DEIS in Appendix K. Some of the EPA's comments were not sufficiently addressed. While a "comment noted" type of response may be adequate for some of our comments, others that were substantive did not appear to receive sufficient consideration.

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) dictate how an agency shall respond to comments in the Final EIS (40 CFR 1503.4). If no modifications to the document are made, CEQ indicated that the agency shall explain why the comment does not warrant further agency response, citing the sources, authorities, or reasons which support the agency's position and, if appropriate, indicate those circumstances which would trigger agency reappraisal or further response (40 CFR 1503.4 (a)5.). CEQ's 40 Most Asked Questions about NEPA, question 29a, states that the agency must state what its response is, and if the agency decides that no substantive response to a comment is necessary, it must explain briefly why.

It is not clear whether the FSEIS will include responses to comment on the DEIS or just responses to comments received on the DSEIS; therefore, we raise this point so that the FSEIS can include responses to comments on the DEIS not adequately addressed in Appendix K of the DSEIS.

Recommendation: Comments we believe warrant a more appropriate response, for CEQ guidance, and further discussion in the FSEIS, include:

-Our recommendation that the Army implement the mitigation mentioned on p. 4-71 of the DEIS which includes "controlling run-on and runoff from areas with surface soil contamination" to contain and/or prevent the migration of contaminants. The Army thanked us for our comment and removed the text that identified this mitigation from the DSEIS.

Response: The Army has noted on page ES-51 of the SDEIS that these mitigation practices (as noted on page 4-71 of the DEIS) would be covered as part of the ITAM program. In addition, the Army has noted the continuation of water quality monitoring programs. Additionally, mitigation measures are recommended in the FEIS, the final mitigation measures that would be adopted will be published as part of the Record of Decision. Therefore, no changes to the EIS are required as part of the EPA's comment.

-Our suggestion that the Army should assess local soil properties at MMR when deciding on use of tungsten-containing ammunition (green ammunition) due to preliminary indications that green ammunition may complicate lead cleanup efforts by lowering pH/increasing solubility of lead in certain soils. The Army thanked us for our comment and removed the text from the DEIS (p. 4-161) that addressed use of green ammunition. We note that table 2-3 in the DSEIS (p. 2-26) identifies the proposed use of green ammunition. We also note that both Mākua and PTA contain areas with lead concentrations exceeding the industrial PRG (p. 3-337).

Response: The Army removed the text (prior to publishing the SDEIS) regarding Green Ammunition because the Army continues to evaluate replacement alternatives for the lead bullet. Table 2-3 has been modified appropriately to reflect this change. The Army also detailed on page 3-337 that the lead found at the Elk Objective at MMR is not migrating and does not require mitigation or maintenance until the range is closed. The Army has addressed lead from ammunition in sections 3.11 and 4.11 within the SDEIS. Furthermore, the Army determines the best method of cleanup based on site-specific conditions and a full evaluation of potential cleanup parameters are identified. Cleanup of MMR is not within the scope of this EIS.

-Our suggestion that if portions of Mākua Stream will be used in the selected alternative, mitigation should be identified to avoid troop impacts to this riparian area. The Army thanked us for our comment.

Response: The Army acknowledges in Table ES-6 of the Executive Summary that mitigations considered include continuation of land management practices through the Army's ITAM program to include erosion sediment control and the protection of intermittent streams. Mitigation measures will continue to be recommended in the FEIS. The final mitigation measures that the Army adopts will be published as part of the Record of Decision. Therefore, no changes to the EIS are required as a result of the EPA's comment.

We continue to recommend the following mitigation be included in the ROD:

-If an alternative with high fire-risk weapons is selected, a commitment to the mitigation identified on page 4-182 of the DEIS (p. 4-236 – 4-237 of the DSEIS). This includes increasing staff and training for the Wildfire Management Program and improvements to fire fighting infrastructure, such as additional water storage capacity and water distribution system upgrades.

-The mitigation mentioned on p. 4-92 (DSEIS p. 4-113) to prepare and implement an erosion control plan to mitigate the significant impact of soil erosion (DSEIS p. 4-112). The erosion control plan would include provisions and methods for monitoring and identifying management practices for addressing erosion problems including reseeding sloped or planting vegetation buffers, constructing run-on and runoff controls, recontouring or filling damaged areas, or avoiding damaged areas.

Response: Mitigation measures will continue to be recommended in the FEIS. The final mitigation measures that the Army adopts will be published as part of the Record of Decision. Therefore, no changes to the EIS are required as a result of the EPA's comment.

Environmental Stewardship

In our comments on the DEIS, EPA encouraged long-term site stewardship, consistent with Army policy and CEQ guidance, and consideration of future costs to the American people with would incur from future cleanup of contamination resulting from the project alternatives. The Army responded that because cleanup is not proposed, and because an estimate of costs associated with any potential cleanup is speculative, the EIS has not been revised to include the estimate.

We are concerned that this response does not recognize the intent of NEPA to facilitate sustainable decision-making. NEPA analyses encourage agencies to address the environmental implications of proposed decisions for the purpose of advancing the nation's environmental policy which includes fulfilling the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations (Sec. 101 (b) 1.). By addressing the environmental implications of proposed decisions at an early stage in decision-making, agencies can effectively allocate future resources.

Recommendation: We continue to recommend the Army view the long-term environmental effects of the alternatives to ensure there is a balance between short-term security needs and long term environmental health. Considering future costs of cleanup, even if qualitatively, is important for sustainable decision-making.

Response: The Army has proposed a number of mitigations that would help alleviate the long-term environmental impacts associated with the proposed action across all of the action alternatives. Many of these programs, including the Army's ITAM program, are designed to promote long-term environmental health and provide maintenance when necessary. Estimating the potential cost and level of cleanup of a particular area would require information the Army does not have at this time, such as time the area/range has been in use, and a complex schedule of the weapons systems utilized at a certain duration (10, 20, 30, or more years into the future). Since the Army does not have, at this time, a timeframe of when ranges would be closed for permanent cleanup, it is not feasible to estimate this cost.

Different Scope of Endangered Species Act and NEPA Alternatives

The project scope for the NEPA alternatives and that used for the Section 7 consultation under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) are different. The DSEIS indicates that some project components were removed from the scope of the Section 7 consultation because they posed an impact to endangered species (p. 1-5). The preferred alternative components removed from Section 7 consultation include the use of illumination munitions, training activities at Ka'ena Point Trail, and training activities on the C-Ridge between the north and south lobes of the training area (p. 2-47). The DSEIS states that for these parts of the preferred alternative not covered under the 2007 Biological Opinion, the Army would reinitiate consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) prior to conducting these exercises.

The DSEIS identifies this approach, but the DSEIS is also misleading in that it includes statements such as the footnote on p. 2-52 which states that the military training parameters (including types of weapons and land areas to be used) set forth in the EIS are consistent with the proposed actions that formed the basis of the formal Section 7 consultation with USFWS and comply with any restrictions established in the BO supplemental BO. Since certain weapons and geographic locations were excluded from the Section 7 consultation, this statement is unsupported, if not false. Page 4-124 also erroneously states that the Army has completed Section 7 consultation with USFWS on the effects of the preferred alternative on listed species and critical habitat. These errors should be corrected.

Response: We believe that the EIS sufficiently and directly identifies the fact that illumination rounds and the use of Ka`ena Point and C-Ridge were not part of the Section 7 consultation with the USFWS and that the Army would initiate Section 7 consultation prior to the use of this munition or training at Ka`ena Point and C-Ridge (pg 2-19, 2-20, 2-47, and 2-48). In addition, the referenced footnote also states, "The Army is continuing to consult with USFWS on weapons and training activities not addressed during previous Section 7 consultations." These facts were identified in Section 2 to establish a baseline for the reader that these munitions and locations will not be used until proper consultation is completed, but their impacts are still being assessed so the public would be fully informed and aware of all the potential environmental impacts associated with the complete implementation of the proposed alternative.

The USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) have proposed to amend their regulations governing interagency cooperation under the ESA. If adopted, the amended regulation will affect how federal agencies consult under Section 7 of the ESA. Under the proposed rule, the Army would not be required to seek concurrence from USFWS or NMFS for determinations of "not likely to adversely affect". In light of this proposed rule, we are concerned about the possibility of a "non likely to adversely affect" determination being made without the benefit of USFWS review for project components removed from the scope of the Section 7 consultation. We understand that the Army does not fund mitigation that is not associated with a BO. Therefore we are concerned that impacts from portions of the project that are not part of the 2007 BO will not be fully mitigated since, with a BO, there is no mechanism to ensure that mitigation will occur and be funded.

Response: During consultation with the USFWS and in the EIS, it was established that the use of illumination munitions and training at Ka`ena Point and C-Ridge pose a potential risk to ESA listed species and that the Army would be required to consult with the USFWS prior to using the illumination munitions or conducting such exercises. The Army thoroughly understands the critical nature and status of listed species on HI and would not carelessly or haphazardly carry out their ESA responsibilities so as to compromise the continued existence of any plant or animal potentially effected by a proposed Army action. Spending over \$10 million a year over the last few years for conservation and management of threatened and endangered species on HI, the Army has proven they are serious about and dedicated to fulfilling their ESA requirements and responsibilities.

The Army has identified an extensive number of mitigation measures that will help reduce the overall environmental impacts of the action. The Army is reviewing all these proposed mitigation measures and will select a number of the measures to implement. The selected mitigation measures will be identified in the Record of Decision. All such measures will be funded by the Army. As stated in 32 CFR 651.15 (b), "When the analysis proceeds to an EA or EIS, mitigation measures will be clearly assessed and those selected for implementation will be identified in the FNSI or the ROD. The proponent must implement those identified mitigations, because they are commitments made as part of the Army decision." Furthermore, in accordance with paragraph (e), "Mitigation measures that were considered but rejected, including those that can be accomplished by other agencies, must be discussed, along with the reason for the rejection, within the EA or EIS. If they occur

in an EA, their rejection may lead to an EIS, if the resultant unmitigated impacts are significant.”

Additionally, the reasonable and prudent measures included in the 2007 BO are not identified in the DSEIS as mitigation for the project. All commitments made during ESA Section 7 consultation with the USFWS and in the resultant 2007 BO and 2008 amendment to the BO should be included in the FSEIS and ROD. This includes the requirements that certain weapons and munitions be used only after conditions for their use are achieved. For example, tracer ammunition would be used unless it is during “green” fire danger rating periods, which occur most often from November to March, during the evenings and the early mornings (ES-10).

Response: The mitigation measures identified in the SDEIS are those measures that are specifically associated with the EIS that have been proposed by the Army to reduce the overall environmental impacts of the proposed actions. These measures do not include the reasonable and prudent measures and conservation measures identified during Section 7 consultation that are required to minimize the adverse impacts of the action on ESA listed species and/or critical habitat. These minimization measures are clearly identified within the Biological Opinion, which is an appendix to the SDEIS. These measures are not proposed as mitigation as part of the NEPA process but are statutory requirements associated with the ESA, so they were not identified within the EIS. Furthermore, the ESA requires that the adverse effects of an action on threatened and endangered species be minimized, not mitigated. Therefore, the Army does not believe it is necessary to record within the EIS all the “Conservation Measures” that are required per the Biological Opinion. However, the Army will identify the “Conservation Recommendations” outlined in the BO as mitigation measures in the EIS.

Recommendation: EPA recommends that the Army include and select an alternative in the FSEIS that corresponds with the project description that was used for the Section 7 consultation with USFWS which received a BO and incidental take statement.

Response: Although not all the elements of the preferred alternative underwent Section 7 consultation, consideration of these elements will require such consultation before they can be implemented. By addressing these elements in the EIS, the Army is given the flexibility to propose these missions/activities in the future without having to go through another full analysis of the environmental impacts, thus saving time, public resources and supporting critical Soldier training and national security in a timely manner.

For those projects not already subject to Section 7 consultation, as part of the ROD, the Army will identify the need to initiate such consultation for projects that may affect ESA listed species and/or critical habitat. The EIS makes clear that CALFEXs and other live-fire training would only be conducted under conditions specified in the 2007 BO.

Alternatively, if the above recommendation is not pursued, we recommend the Army commit, as part of the ROD for selected alternative, to conduct formal or informal consultation with USFWS for all project elements not already subject to consultation (removed from preferred alternative for the BO). The Army should commit to requesting concurrence from USFWS for its determination, even if it makes a “not likely to adversely affect” determination. Because of the potential risks to species from these project elements removed from consultation (p. 105), it is

important to continue working with USFWS to obtain their expertise. If this approach is taken, the FSEIS should clearly identify the process that will occur.

Response: During consultation with the USFWS and in the EIS, it was established that the use of illumination munitions and training at Ka`ena Point and C-Ridge pose a potential risk to ESA listed species and that the Army would be required to consult with the USFWS prior to using the illumination munitions or conducting such exercises. The Army thoroughly understands the critical nature and status of listed species on HI and would not carelessly or haphazardly carry out their ESA responsibilities so as to compromise the continued existence of any plant or animal potentially effected by a proposed Army action. However, due to the significant implications of any effects determinations regarding threatened and endangered species in HI, it is in the Army's best interest to informally consult with the USFWS or NMFS on any of the Army's "not likely to adversely affect" determinations.

The FSEIS should identify funding sources for mitigation that is not associated with a BO and discuss likelihood that mitigation will be funded and implemented. CEQ has stated that the probability of the mitigation measures being implemented must be discussed in the EIS and ROD, including the likelihood that such measures will be adopted or enforced by the responsible agencies. *"If there is a history of nonenforcement or opposition to such measures, the EIS and Record of Decision should acknowledge such opposition or nonenforcement. If the necessary mitigation measures will not be ready for a long period of time, this fact, of course, should also be recognized"* (Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations #19b)

Response: There is not a history of non enforcement or opposition to mitigation measures. The feasibility of mitigation measures will be taken into account when mitigation is identified in the ROD.

If Alternative 4 at Pōhakuloa Training Area on Hawai'i is selected over the preferred alternative, the DSEIS should identify the process that will occur regarding additional consultation. The DSEIS does not fully address impacts from Alternative 4 and simply repeats the mitigation measures from the Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT) EIS (p. 4-138). We recommend the Army adopt all potential mitigation identified in the DSEIS and coordinate with USFWS on additional measures to mitigate the greater fire and invasive species risk.

Response: If Alternative 4 at Pōhakuloa Training Area is selected over the preferred alternative, the Army will identify in the FEIS the Section 7 and NEPA requirements that will be necessary to implement the action on Pōhakuloa. In addition, the Army would formally consult with the USFWS on Alternative 4.

The Army believes that the SDEIS addresses all the potential impacts associated with Alternative 4. The impacts assessed in Alternatives 1 through 3 were also assessed in Alternative 4. Many of the mitigation measures proposed for Alternative 4 were identical to those for the SBCT because the SBCT EIS addressed many, if not all, of the same concerns (i.e., fire, invasive species) that would be associated with Alternative 4. However, additional mitigation measures were also identified that are unique to Alternative 4 (p. ES-54, ES-56; 4, 174, and 4-181, to name a few).

The Army has identified an extensive number of mitigation measures that will help reduce the overall environmental impacts of the action. The Army is reviewing all these proposed mitigation measures and will select a number of the measures to implement. The selected mitigation measures will be identified in the Record of Decision. All such measures will be funded by the Army. The Army will select the mitigation measures that are believed to be practicable and feasible to minimize the overall impacts of the proposed action. The Army continually works with the USFWS on measures to reduce fire and invasive species threats. The Army also pursues research to gain a better understanding of the fire and invasive species risk on its property.

Finally, in addition to including all mitigation measures from the BOs in the FSEIS and ROD, we also recommend that the conservation recommendations included in the BO be included in the FEIS and ROD.

Response: The Army will include the feasible BO "Conservation Recommendations" in the FEIS and discuss those selected or rejected in the ROD. The "Conservation Measures", as part of the 2007 and 2008 BO, have been incorporated as an appendix to the EIS.

Additional comments:

-The DSEIS removed information regarding the detailed history of waste disposal at the OB/OD area that was contained in the DEIS, p.3-103. The DEIS included much higher estimates and also identified waste generated by the University of Hawaii. It is not clear why this background information was not included in the DSEIS. We recommend including it for a fuller disclosure of the contamination history.

Response: A number of studies have been conducted to identify the types of materials that were used and disposed of at MMR, including materials that were burned in the OB/OD area. These findings are documented in the Hydrogeologic Investigation Report in Appendix G-1 of the SDEIS. No biomedical materials or infectious waste were discovered during these investigations (USACE 2006), and no such disposal or usage has been reported at MMR. Additionally, infectious waste has never been reported as being disposed of at MMR (Char 2003; Kim 2003). For these reasons, biomedical waste, lead-based paint, asbestos, and radon are not included in the impact analysis.

-Page 4-127 says the marine resources study showed that marine resources (fish, limu, shellfish, etc.) are not contaminated by substances associated with training, but this is contradicted by results on p. 3-97 which identifies nitroglycerine and RDX detected in Makua Beach nearshore specimens but not in the background specimens. This should be corrected in the FSEIS.

Response: The text at Chapter 4 has been corrected. Based on the collected data, the study determined that the marine resources (fish, limu, shellfish, and other resources) near Mākua Beach and in the Mākua muliwai on which area residents rely for subsistence could be influenced by military activities at MMR, but that such activities would not likely contribute substances to the marine environment at a level sufficient to cause a human health risk (US Army 2007c, US Army 2009).

The Army has released a Supplemental Marine Resources Study that discusses the presence of RDX and nitroglycerin in fish samples (Executive Summary, page 3). Essentially, in the amounts that were detected in those samples, it is more likely that lab analyses indicated false positive detection levels.

-The DEIS includes Additional Mitigation 3a on p/ 4-147 through 4-149 for mitigation of impacts to marine mammals. A commitment to this mitigation should be included in the FSEIS and ROD.

Response: The Army will explore all identified mitigation measures and determine which measures are practicable and reasonable. The mitigation identified on pgs 4-147 through 149 will be strongly considered and discussed in the ROD. Some of the measures will automatically be implemented due to the fact that they are requirements pursuant to the ESA or Marine Mammal Protection Act.

-The SDEIS states that a surface water monitoring plan would be developed (p/ 4-97) and a groundwater monitoring program would be developed (p. 44-98). Commitments to these programs should be included in the FSEIS and ROD.

Response: The Army has a surface and groundwater monitoring plan in operation right now. The decision maker will determine whether these programs will be adopted as mitigations, and will publish this decision in the ROD. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

2. US Fish & Wildlife Service

This letter acknowledges the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (Service) September 22, 2008, receipt of your letter inviting our comments on the August 2008, Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Military Training Activities at Mākua Military Reservation, Hawai'i (SDEIS). The SDEIS assesses the potential environmental impacts of preferred and alternative proposed actions within and in the vicinity of Mākua Military Reservation on O'ahu and Pōhakuloa Training Area on the Island of Hawai'i. Over 4,000 pages of documents are incorporated into the SDEIS and its Appendices.

The SDEIS specifies the preferred alternative would be conducted in accordance with the measures summarized in the project descriptions of the Service's June 22, 2007, "Reinitiation of the 1999 Biological Opinion of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for Routine U.S. Army Military Training at Mākua Military Reservation, Island of O'ahu" (Service File 1-2-2005-F-356) and the June 18, 2008, "Amendment to the Makua Biological Opinion of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for Military Training at Mākua Military Reservation" (Service File 1-2-2008-F-0108). These documents are incorporated into Appendix H of the SDEIS. In addition, the SDEIS indicated actions at Pōhakuloa Training Area would be conducted in accordance with the Service's December 23, 2003, "Biological Opinion for Routine Military Training and Transformation of the 2nd Brigade 25th Infantry Division, U.S. Army Installations, Island of Hawai'i" (Service File 1-2-2003-F-002). The Army partners with the Service and with the

interagency Mākua Implementation Team and Pōhakuloa Implementation Team to develop and adaptively refine the Army's conservation measures to minimize and offset potential impacts of Army actions, addressed in these biological opinions, to listed resources.

All proposed alternatives, including the preferred alternative, included descriptions of a number of actions which were not addressed in the biological opinions. Descriptions of these proposed actions, including but not limited to Ka'ena Point hikes, use of illumination rounds, training on C-Ridge, and development of new ranges and infrastructure at Pōhakuloa Training area are not described sufficiently in the SDEIS for the Service to adequately assess potential project impacts at this time. As noted throughout the SDEIS, pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, and as required in 50 CFR § 402.16, the Army states it will reinitiate consultation with the Service to address proposed actions under the following conditions: (a) the amount of extent of taking specified in the incidental take statement of a biological opinion is exceeded; (b) new information reveals effects of the agency action that may affect listed species of critical habitat in a manner of to an extent not considered in a existing biological opinion; (c) the agency action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species of critical habitat not considered in an existing biological opinion; or (d) a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that many be affected by the action.

Response: The Army will provide more in-depth project descriptions when consulting formally with the USFWS on actions not currently covered in the Biological Opinion.

In addition, the conservation measures and requirements of those Biological Opinions have been incorporated into the EIS analysis. Sections 1.1 and 2.4.1, states that training activities at Ka'ena Point Trail, C-Ridge, and use of illumination munitions were removed from the scope of ESA Section 7 consultation. Due to the potential need to use Ka'ena Point, C-Ridge, and illumination munitions in the future, the Army assessed the environmental impacts associated with these actions. The Army would initiate and fulfill separate ESA Section 7 consultation and coordination with the State of Hawai'i prior to conducting such exercises.

The key point is that the action alternatives present the methods by which the Army can meet the purpose and need of the Proposed Action. Many elements of the alternatives, however, would have to be phased in over time. The success of species stabilization efforts, the further development of fire-fighting techniques, and the development of new scientific information about endangered species, are all factors in determining when the alternatives could be fully implemented by the Army.

If Alternative 4 at Pōhakuloa Training Area is selected over the preferred alternative, the Army will identify in the ROD, the Section 7 and NEPA requirements that will be necessary to implement the action on Pōhakuloa. The Army recognizes if Alternative 4 is selected, a formal consultation under Section 7 is required.

Many of the mitigation measures proposed for Alternative 4 were identical to those for the SBCT because the SBCT EIS addressed many, if not all, of the same concerns (i.e., fire, invasive species) that would be associated with Alternative 4. However, additional mitigation measures were also identified that are unique to Alternative 4 (p. ES-54, ES-56; 4, 174, and 4-181, to name a few).

The Army has identified an extensive number of mitigation measures that will help reduce the overall environmental impacts of the proposed action. The Army is reviewing all these proposed mitigation measures and will select a number of the measures to implement. The selected mitigation measures will be identified in the Record of Decision.

Portions of the SDEIS include descriptions of actions which have not been updated to reflect the restriction and conditions specified in the Service's biological opinions. The SDEIS indicated the Army is updating the planning documents, found within the SDEIS, to ensure they consistently describe the conservation measures specified in the biological opinions. We recommend that the final EIS consistently reflect the project descriptions and conservation measures outlined in the biological opinions.

Response: The Army is committed to implementing all agreed upon restrictions and conditions specified in Biological Opinions. Biological Opinions containing project descriptions will continue to be published on the US Army Garrison Hawai'i's web site. The Biological Opinion is included as an appendix to the EIS.

Thank you for your ongoing efforts to conserve endangered species. We look forward to continued close partnership with the Army throughout the planning and implementation phases of this project.

Patrick Leonard, Field Supervisor, U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office

3. United States Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, Office of the Environmental Policy and Compliance

Subject: Review of the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for Military Training Activities at the Mākuā Military Reservation, O'ahu, HI (ER 08/1021)

The Department of the Interior has received and reviewed the subject document and has the following comments to offer.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Page 3-113, last paragraph, second-to-last sentence

The EIS speculates that several contaminants occur in samples because they bound to soil rather than in the ground water and introduced during drilling. A properly constructed and developed well should deliver minimal amounts of sediment or soil particles. Therefore, the speculation should be substantiated or deleted.

Web links in the References Section need to be corrected. Here are the changes:

Sinton, J.M. 1986. Revision of Stratigraphic Nomenclature of Wai'anae Volcano, O'ahu, Hawai'i. US Geologic Survey Bulletin 1775-A. pp. A9-A15.

_____. 1996. Hawai'i Hazard Maps 1996. Internet Web site: <http://geohazards.cr.usgs.gov/eq/>. Accessed on March 24,2003. (website not current)

Hawaii Hazard Maps 1998:

http://earthquake.usgs.gov/research/hazmaps/products_data/Hawaii/his.php (replace with this website) Accessed on October 14, 2008

1997a. Living on Active Volcanoes – The Island of Hawai'i. US Geological Survey Fact Sheet 074-97. Internet Web site: <http://wrgis.wr.usgs.gov/fact-sheet/fs074-97/>. Accessed on August 13, 2002. (website not current)

<http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/fs074-97/> (replace with this website) Accessed on October 14, 2008

_____. 2000b. Volcanic Air Pollution – A Hazard in Hawai'i Survey Fact Sheet 169-97, Online Version 1.1, revised June 2000. Internet Web site: <http://wrgis.wr.usgs.gov/factsheet/fs169-97/>. Accessed on January 6, 2003. (website not current)

<http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/fs169-97/> (replace with this website) Accessed on October 14, 2008

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this DSEIS. If you have any questions concerning our comments, please contact Lloyd Woosley, Chief of the USGS Environmental Affairs Program, at (703) 350-8797 or at lwoosley@usgs.gov.

Patricia Sanderson Port, Regional Environmental Officer, United States Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, Office of the Environmental Policy and Compliance

Response: We thank you for your comment. The text in the EIS points out that there is uncertainty and is merely suggesting a possible source for the chemicals found in the two wells. The Army followed established protocol of multiple sample rounds to determine the existence of these compounds in the groundwater. In addition, the wells were properly developed and installed in accordance with US Army Corps of Engineers well installation development protocols, as outlined in the 2002 Sampling and Analysis Plan.

We thank you for providing the information to update our web links. We have incorporated these updated into the EIS.

State Agencies

4. State of Hawaii Department of Accounting and General Services

Subject: Military Training Activities at Mākua Military Reservation Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your letter dated September 16, 2008 with compact disk. This proposed project does not directly impact any of the Department of Accounting and General Services' facilities, or projects and we have no comments to offer at this time.

Ernest Y. W. Lau, Public Works Administrator, State of Hawaii Department of Accounting and General Services

Response: The Army thanks you for your review and participation in the NEPA process.

5. State of Hawaii Department of Health

Subject: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDIES) for Military Training

Activities at the Mākua Military Reservation Near Ka'ena Point, within Mākua and Kahanakāiki Valleys Bordered by Farrington Highway and the Pacific Ocean Approximately TMK: (1) 8 8-2-002: 001 etc 4, 190 acres

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to review the above subject project request comments on the stated subject to address the potential direct, indirect and cumulative environmental impacts associated with the proposed use of Mākua Military Reservation (MMR) and alternatives for live-fire military training. We have the following comments and information on the above subject property:

The subject project is located in the No Pass Zone where no new cesspools will be allowed. Currently, we do not have any records of individual wastewater systems (IWSs) (cesspool) or treatments IWSs (septic tanks) for the area.

The report states that wastewater flows from the facilities at the Pōhakuloa Training Area were being disposed into cesspools. If the facilities are serving 20 people or more persons per day, the cesspools may be classified as large capacity cesspools. In 1999, EPA promulgated regulations under the Safe Drinking Water Act's Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program required closure of all existing large capacity cesspools (LCC) by April 5, 2005. Under federal regulations, a large capacity cesspool is a cesspool which serves multiple dwellings, or for non-residential facilities has the capacity to serve 20 or more persons per day. Operation of a large capacity cesspool after this date is a violation of federal regulations and subject to enforcement and fines.

Tomas S. See, P.E., Chief, Wastewater Branch, State of Hawaii Department of Health

Response: The SDEIS inadvertently stated that large capacity cesspools (LCC) were being used at PTA. All large capacity cesspools at PTA have been closed. A letter of final closure was issued by EPA Region IX, in which all requirements were met. A Corps

of Engineers (COE) contract was awarded to convert all large capacity cesspools to septic tanks with underground injection wells.

An underground injection control (UIC) permit #UH-2609 was obtained from SDOH, Safe Drinking Water Branch. The U.S. Army has been performing the required monitoring. The UIC Annual Status Report, as prepared by Tropical Marine Environments, via COE contract, was completed and submitted to Mr. Chauncey Hew, Safe Drinking Water Branch on December 12, 2008 by the due date.

6. State of Hawai'i, Department of Land and Natural Resources

Thank you for the hard copies of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for Military Training Activities at the Mākua Military Reservation, O'ahu, Hawai'i.

We have reviewed the documents and are particularly concerned that for alternative 1, noise disturbance to people who visit the Keawa'ula and Mākua sections of Ka'ena Point State Park are expected to be extensive, however, no regulatory or administrative mitigation measures have been identified. Noise disturbance is expected to increase with alternatives 2 and 3.

We have concerns about the noise impact on park users. Although we understand there is a 242 day training year, we are not clear on how many live fire days will be involved. If every day includes live fire exercises, park users will be impacted about 8 months out of the year.

We appreciate the chance to provide comments.

Daniel S. Quinn, State Parks Administrator, State of Hawai'i, Department of Land and Natural Resources

Response: Noise contours in Figures 4.5-1, 4.5-2, 4.5-5, and 4.5-6 do not show any significant noise reaching Ka'ena Point State Park. Under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, the Army would not use MMR any more than 242 days per year. Some of those days do not involve live-fire training, but instead, consist of dry runs and cleanup. The precise percentage of live-fire days cannot be determined, but would vary in any given training year.

Local Agencies

7. City and County of Honolulu Department of Design and Construction

Subject: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Military Training Activities at the Mākua Military Reservation

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to review the above Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Assessment (SDEIS).

The Department of Design and Construction has the following comments:

The SDEIS appears to be fairly thorough in disclosing and evaluating the proposed action and feasibility alternatives to that action. Nevertheless, some of the disclosed adverse impacts cause us concern.

- Your report cites the increased likelihood of wildfires caused by live-fire training leading to greater soil erosion. This could lead to pollution of our near-shore waters and damage to our coral reefs that local people recreate in at nearby City beach parks, particularly Keaau Beach Park.

We request that the Final EIS study the possibly adverse impacts the proposed live-fire training facilities will have on the City's beach parks and recreational resources along the Wai'anae coast and mitigative actions needed to ameliorate these possible impacts.

Eugene C. Lee, City and County of Honolulu Department of Design and Construction

Response: The Army does evaluate the impact of military training at Mākua on on-site and off-site resources and receptors. The impacts associated with live-fire training at Mākua are addressed as Alternatives 2 and 3, and more specifically are addressed as part of Chapters 4.7 Water Resources, 4.8 Geology and Soils, 4.9 Biological Resources, and 4.14 Wildfires.

As described in Chapter 4.14, the proposed weapons and ammunition have historical wildfire ignition records and are capable of igniting wildfires because of their explosive and flammable properties. However, Chapter 4.8 addresses the impacts of chemical contaminants in soils on on-site and off-site receptors. These impacts "are not considered significant due to the low concentrations of chemical residues that would result from live-fire training exercises"; which is supported by soil sampling data in the current hydrogeologic investigations conducted by the Army at MMR, the soil investigation conducted at PTA in 2002. In addition, the Army found that the potential for significant erosion is low because fires and storms are independent, and the likelihood that a major fire would be followed by a large runoff-producing storm (before vegetation cover was reestablished) is probably very low. Albeit, the Army concedes that if such an event were to occur, substantial erosive effects from a major fire cannot be entirely prevented, even with the implementation of mitigation measures.

8. The Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii

SUBJECT: Mākuā Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Military Training Activities at Mākuā Military Reservation

We compliment the U.S. Army for completing such a comprehensive review of the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts associated with the proposed use of Mākuā Military Reservation and alternatives for live-fire training, in particular company-level, combined arms, live-fire exercise (CALFEXs) and convoy training. The review offers an in-depth study of the requirements established by the NEPA and identifying the measures that could be taken to satisfy environmental policy without compromising the military's mission in meeting our national security and defense strategies.

The following are our comments relative to the findings and determinations outlines in the Mākuā Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS):

Reference Chapter 1, Section 1.1, Introduction and Background. We suggest the addition of discussion explaining the imperative need to forward-base combat ready forces in Hawai'i and other locations in the Pacific.

The section, as written, provides background on the Mākuā training range dating back to the early 1920s. It makes reference to the Hawai'i territorial government granting a revocable permit in May 1943 to allow military the use 6,600 acres at Mākuā "to assist in the present war effort extending for the duration of the present war and six months thereafter." It further states that the range at Mākuā "has remained under Army control ever since." However, there is no explanation as why the Army continues to maintain combat units in Hawai'i, which, in turn, necessitates the continued use of the Mākuā training area.

It is our understanding that one of the primary reasons for basing the 25th Infantry Division at Schofield Barracks is to meet our national security and defense strategies for the Asia Pacific region. We understand that the forward-basing of combat-ready forces in Hawai'i (and other locations in the Pacific) is to dissuade military aggression in the region and attacks on our homeland, and to defeat an enemy quickly and decisively should the need arise. We believe that this should be clearly stated in the SDEIS as it provides the rationale for basing the combat forces in Hawaii and, therefore, established the requirement for training areas.

Response: The purpose of the Proposed Action is to enable the military currently stationed in Hawai'i to achieve and maintain readiness for immediate deployment. Providing the best and most realistic training for the types of threats the Army expects to encounter during combat operations ensures that the military's leaders and Soldiers are prepared for the full spectrum of operations faced in combat. These operations include offensive, defensive, stability, and support operations. The stationing of US combat forces in Hawai'i is not within the scope of this Environmental Impact Statement; however, the following EISs were prepared recently that do discuss Army Transformation and Force Structure adjustments that affect Hawai'i; these include: Supplemental Programmatic EIS for Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment to Support Operations in the Pacific Theater (ROD signed August 2008); FEIS for the Permanent Stationing of the 2/25th SBCT (ROD signed April

2008); Final Environmental Assessment for Restructuring of US Army Pacific Elements to a Modular Force Structure, O'ahu, Hawai'i (FNSI signed August 2006); and Final Environmental Assessment for Transformation of US Army Hawaii Units to a Modular Force Structure (FNSI signed November 2005).

Chapter 1, section 1 adequately discusses the purpose and need for training. However, we also suggest that discussion be added to adequately explain why the forces must be trained up to "combat ready status" at all times, and address the consequences if the forces were below "combat ready" status and/or had to travel elsewhere to train up should a sudden requirement arise. We realize that the current combat deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan provide advance notices and time to train up elsewhere (albeit costly in terms of funding and additional family separations), but wouldn't the conditions during peacetime present a far different requirement?

Response: The purpose of the proposed action is to ensure the Soldiers stationed in Hawai'i have access to Company-level Combined Arms Live-fire exercises and convoy live-fire training exercises. The Army has not been able to sufficiently meet these training needs in Hawai'i. Most other types of individual and collective training requirements are currently being met for combat units stationed in Hawai'i through a combination of range areas and configurations at Schofield Barracks, South Range, East Range, Kahuku Training Area, Kawaihoa Training Area, Wheeler Army Airfield, Dillingham Military Reservation, and Pōhakuloa Training Area.

The purpose and need section of the EIS indicates that the 25th ID must be able to execute the full spectrum of military operations. The Army does not have enough combat forces to allow some units to cease training for combat deployment. As soon as a unit returns from a combat deployment, it must begin its training cycle again. The Army must also train Soldiers for deployment in conventional warfare situations even though none are currently foreseen.

Alternative 3 (Full Capacity Use With Fewer Weapons Restrictions) of the SDEIS reinstates the use of tracer ammunition and includes the addition of inert tube launched, optically tracked, wire-guided (TOW) missiles, 2.75-caliber rockets, and illumination munitions. This alternative also proposes to conduct 50 company-level CALFEXs per year using increased land area and at least 242 training days. These requirements appear to be the primary factors in rendering "significant impact" determinations for Land Use and Recreation, Noise, Geology and Soils, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice, and Wildfires, many of which are considered "unavoidable" or "unmitigable". This should likely attract strong opposition from those who may seek to close the Mākua training area because of these documented threats on endangered species and the potential loss or irreparable damage to important cultural artifacts and archaeological sites. We suggest that a more convincing argument be provided to justify the selection of the preferred alternatives in spite of the "unavoidable" and "unmitigable" determinations.

Response: The Army has selected Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative because implementation of Alternative 3 allows company commanders full flexibility to ensure their Soldiers and units are adequately trained and fully prepared for combat with fewer weapons restrictions that would result in more realistic training scenarios. The need for this level of training in Hawai'i is discussed in detail in Section 1.3 of the EIS. Through the NEPA process, and based on the consideration of comments and information received during the public comment period. The final decision will be

made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS. You are correct in predicting that this selection would attract strong opposition.

The SDEIS (Table ES-1) lists “Stryker” among items studied under each alternative. Although the EIS covers dismounted training of soldiers assigned to the 2nd Stryker Brigade Combat Team, this reference seems to imply that the Stryker vehicle may be used during training under the preferred alternative. This appears to contradict the information presented in the EIS completed for basing of the 2/25 Stryker Brigade Combat Team at Schofield Barracks, which indicated the Mākua range was not needed for Stryker brigade training. Perhaps this requires some clarification.

Response: The scope of which Stryker units would require the use of Mākua is discussed in Section 2.2a of the Supplemental Draft EIS for Military Training Activities at Mākua Military Reservation, Hawai‘i.

The FEIS for the Permanent Stationing of the 2/25th SBCT (ROD signed April 2008) is very clear that use of Mākua Military Reservation for Stryker vehicles was not within the scope of that EIS, however, Stryker use would be addressed within the scope of a separate EIS. Specifically, Section 1.5 Scope of Analysis states, “This EIS does not analyze the use of Mākua Military Reservation (MMR). The SBCT can be stationed and fully trained without the use of MMR. Thus, use of MMR is not required to implement the Proposed Action. If MMR were available, Soldiers of the SBCT might use it for some purposes. The use of MMR for resumption of military live-fire exercises is being analyzed in a separate EIS. The level of use of MMR for live-fire exercises will be determined with preparation, signature, and release of a separate ROD. If the ROD permits use of MMR for live-fire exercises, the unit stationed at USAG-HI under the Proposed Action and alternatives to it could use MMR for live-fire training exercises at a unit level and type considered in the MMR EIS and permitted by the ROD.”

Section 2.4.1 of the EIS makes clear that use of the Strykers would be limited to use of roads, trails, and paved areas. There will be no off-road use of Strykers.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this extremely important study. We are in complete support of the critical role played by the US military in deterring conflicts in the region and protecting our partner nations and homeland from military aggression.

Jim Tollefson, President and Chief Executive Officer, The Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii

9. City and County of Honolulu Board of Water Supply

Thank you for your letter on the proposed uses for the Mākua Military Reservation. The existing water system is presently adequate to accommodate the proposed projects. However, please be advised that this information is based upon current data and therefore, the Board of Water Supply reserves the right to change any position or information stated herein up until the final approval of your building permit application. The final decision on the availability of water will be confirmed when the building permit application is submitted for approval.

When water is made available for new or expanded service, the applicant will be required to pay our Water System Facilities Charges for resource development, transmission and daily storage.

The on-site fire protection requirements should be coordinated with the Fire Prevention Bureau of the Honolulu Fire Department.

Keith S. Shida, Program Administrator, Customer Care Division, City and County of Honolulu Board of Water Supply

Response: The Army thanks you for your review and comment. If services are required, a determination will be made by the BWS when the U.S. Army applies for or seeks final approval of a building permit. Also, additional facilities charges may apply at the time application is made and coordination will be performed with the Fire Prevention Bureau as strongly suggested.

10. City and County of Honolulu, Department of Parks and Recreation

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Military Training Activities at Mākuā Military Reservation.

The Department of Parks and Recreation has no comment and as the proposed project will not impact and program or facility of the department you are invited to remove us as a consulted party from the balance of the EIS process.

Lester K. C. Chang, Director, City and County of Honolulu, Department of Parks and Recreation

Response: The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Per your request, the Army is removing the Department of Parks and Recreation from future correspondence on this particular EIS.

11. City and County of Honolulu Police Department

This project should have no significant impact on the facilities or operations of the Honolulu Police Department.

Boisse P. Correa, Chief of Police, City and County of Honolulu Police Department

Response: The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

Schools

12. University of Hawai'i, Manoa

Dear Colonel Margotta:

The United States Army proposes to conduct military training exercises at Mākua Military Reservation (MMR) in Mākua Valley. Specifically, the Army intends to use the area as training grounds for company-level combined-arms, live-fire exercises (CALFEXs) and convoy live-fire exercises (LFXs) conducted by combat units assigned to the 25th Infantry Division as well as other military units. These exercises would allow troops to maintain combat readiness in an environment close to home. Mākua Military reservation is located on the northwest coast of O'ahu, 38 miles northwest of Honolulu. Military use of Mākua Valley dates back to the 1920s though the valley was not heavily utilized until the 1940s and the advent of WWII. The five alternatives discussed in association with the project are: No Action; Alternative 1 – Reduced Capacity Use with Some Weapons Restrictions; Alternative 2 – Full Capacity Use with Some Weapons Restrictions; Alternative 3 – Full Capacity Use with Fewer Weapons Restrictions; and Alternative 4 – Full Capacity Use with Fewer Weapons Restrictions at Pōhakuloa Training Area (PTA) on the Big Island. Alternative 3 is the Army's preferred alternative. All action alternatives would involve up to 242 training days per year. The proposed action and alternatives are discussed in terms of significant potential impacts to environmental and cultural resources. Potential environmental impacts are associated with water, air, and soil quality; hazardous materials; wildfire potential; recreational resources; and threatened and endangered flora and fauna.

This review was conducted with the assistance of Brenden Holland, Pacific Biosciences Research Center; Ryan Riddle, Environmental Center; and Jacquelin Miller, Environmental Center.

General Comments

In general, the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) is very comprehensive and discusses in great detail the potential consequences of the proposed military action. What appears to be missing, however, is a discussion of these consequences (impacts) relative to time and therefore permanence. While the Cumulative Projects and Impacts section (Volume 1, section 5.0) addresses projects and land use changes that may influence activities and impacts at MMR and PTA, the SDEIS glosses over long-term impacts to environmental resources. In the case of both Mākua and Pōhakuloa, most, if not all, of the most egregious impacts identified can be considered long-term or permanent impacts. Therefore, evaluation of the adequacy of this SDEIS to identify the consequences of the action must consider in-depth long-term as well as permanent impacts of the use of live-fire training at MMR and PTA. The cumulative impact sections for soil and water resources are particularly brief in their discussion of long-term impacts. Also missing is a discussion of long-term monitoring protocol for environmental contaminants.

Response: The Army conducted a full evaluation of the potential cumulative impacts to all resources identified in the EIS as a result of the proposed action as it relates to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects. This includes the potential short- and long-term effects within the region of influence.

At several points throughout the SDEIS the document refers to the future closing of the range. At what point is this projected? Twenty years from now? Thirty years from now? Is this something that the Army can project? Given the seriousness of many of the impacts stated in the SDEIS, it seems as though the military should explore developing alternative training materials that are less destructive and toxic. Are any long-term studies being undertaken to address this obvious long-term environmental problem?

Response: The Army at this time has no plans to cease the use of Mākuā Military Reservation. The commenter may be referring to the text presented in Section 3.1.2.2 Recognition of Military Use, which states “The importance of US military uses of lands at Lualualei and Mākuā Valley is recognized both in terms of the overall mission of the military and the importance of the military to the economy to the State of Hawai’i and the City and County of Honolulu. The current Wai’anae Sustainable Communities Plan, which looks ahead to the Year 2020, therefore, recognizes the continued use of these lands for military purposes for the foreseeable future.”

Nonetheless, the Army does continue to conduct research and development activities of materials that are less toxic to human health and the environment.

In addition to our general comments, we also have several specific comments.

Executive Summary (pp. ES-1 – ES-55)

Several of the tables in the Executive Summary utilize circles with hatch marks to signify varying degrees of impact significance. These designations often appear similar to one another in a table and it is difficult to extract the necessary information at a glance. Would it be possible to color-code the symbology in order to facilitate evaluating the significance of the table?

Response: The Army feels that the use of symbology, supported by a legend at the bottom of each table where used, is currently the most effective method of conveying the degree of potential environmental impact from implementation of each alternative. In addition, this method is consistent with EISs produced throughout the Army. It will assist decision makers because of that.

The SDEIS is a dense document that contains specialized vocabulary. For the non-military reviewer, the discussion of proposed weaponry and associated impacts is frequently confusing. A table similar to Table ES-5 would be of great benefit to familiarize the average reader with the many different forms of weaponry planned for use at MMR, as well as to summarize the forms of impact, environmental pollutants, and significance associated with each.

Response: Many of the weapons systems presented for proposed use across each alternative has been analyzed by DoD and coordinated with the USEPA for the quantity of pollutants released to the atmosphere upon weapons firing. These values may be found at the EPA’s AP 42 web page at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/index.html>. Section 4.4 of the EIS has been updated. Tables 2-3 and 2-4 show the weapons and ammunition expected to be used in the proposed action. Table 2-6 shows annual munitions expenditure.

Summary of Key Mitigation Measures (pp. ES-51 – ES-56)

We note that Table ES-6 in Volume 1 describes several mitigation measures that “could” be undertaken to reduce the impacts on sensitive species. How is the determination made in changing the “could” to “would”?

Response: The Army has identified an extensive number of mitigation measures that will help reduce the overall environmental impacts of the action. The Army is reviewing all these proposed mitigation measures and will select a number of the measures to implement. The selected mitigation measures will be identified in the Record of Decision in accordance with 32 CFR 651.15 (b), “When the analysis proceeds to an EA or EIS, mitigation measures will be clearly assessed and those selected for implementation will be identified in the FNSI or the ROD. The proponent must implement those identified mitigations, because they are commitments made as part of the Army decision.”

Sensitive Views – Mākuā Military Reservation (pp. 3-44 – 3-45)

In reference to Mākuā Rim trail viewpoints, the first paragraph on page 3-45 states, “Because the State of Hawai‘i requires users to obtain permits, these viewing locations are not frequently used.” The Keālia Trail does not require a permit, and it’s terminus is directly adjacent to a clear viewpoint of Mākuā Valley. While this viewpoint may technically be part of the Kuaokalā Trail, it is widely considered to be the end of the trail, and is thus used by a substantial number of Keālia Trail users. In addition, many recreational users that mountain bike or take day hikes around the Mākuā Valley Rim access the trail system from the Mokolē‘ia Access Road without a permit. As a result, there are likely a far larger number of recreational users that cannot be accounted for by permits.

Response: The impacts associated with visual resources are discussed in greater detail in Section 4.3. Significant impacts would result from the introduction of physical features that are substantially out of character with adjacent developed areas; Alteration of a site so that sensitive viewing points are obstructed and are inconsistent with visual resource policies of the Wai`anae Sustainable Communities Plan, the General Plan for the City and County of Honolulu, and the General Plan for the County of Hawai‘i.

The Army found no significant impacts would occur as a result of any level of proposed training associated with Alternatives 1-3 or the No Action Alternative.

Invertebrates (p. 3-190)

We wonder whether the Army is aware of the distribution and presence of some of the less well-known taxa of Hawaiian snails. *Succinea caduca*, for instance, has recently been discovered in many areas that had previously been considered poor habitat for native snails. Yet this species persists (in some cases in large numbers), though is often difficult to detect without specific search strategies (i.e. turning over rocks, boulders, tree trunks and searching clumps of dry grass and under bark). The following is an excerpt from page 59 of Holland and Cowie 2006: New island records of an endemic Hawaiian land snail species, *Succinea caduca* Mighels (Gastropoda: Pulmonata: Succineida :

“Lualualei Valley, dry bed of Ulehawa Stream near gate to Kolekole Pass Rd, B.S. Holland, 28 Mar 2004 (268704); Kalaniana’ole Hwy, dry grass along rock faces, and roadcut, multiple sites,

ca 100–500 ft [30–152 m], B.S. Holland, H. Nagatsuka, 18 Apr 2004 (268705); Koko Head, dry grass under rocks, B.S. Holland, H. Nagatsuka, ca 600 ft [182 m], 18 Apr 2004 (268706); inside Diamond Head Crater, along trail, ca 300–600 ft [91–182 m], K.A. Hayes, 5 Jan 2005 (268707); outside Diamond Head Crater, on rock face near tunnel, B.S. Holland, 13 Jan 2005 (268708); Mākua Valley, lower Ōhikilolo Ridge, ca 1000 ft [305 m], V. Costello, 3 Feb 2005 (268709); Barbers Point, in leaf litter, on kiawestumps and trees, B.S. Holland, H. Nagatsuka, 12 Mar 2005 (268710); cliffs above Farrington Hwy across from Mākaha Beach Park, ca 10–400 ft [3–122 m], multiple sites, B.S. Holland, 6 Apr 2005 (268711); Lualualei Valley, on cliffs above Lualualei Naval Rd, below Pu‘u Haleakalā, ca 200–400 ft [61–122 m], B.S. Holland, 6 Apr 2005 (268712); Wa‘ahila Ridge, ca 500 ft [152 m], B.S. Holland, 16 May 2005 (268713).”

A second relevant paper (Holland and Cowie 2007) details survey and population genetic data regarding the *Succinea caduca*. Pages 2424 and 2427 describe Succineid snail population localities in dry, leeward habitats in the main Hawaiian Islands. There are no doubt multiple *Succinea caduca* populations within areas impacted by military training activities, including these dry regions of valleys such as Mākua.

2006 Holland, B.S. & R.H. Cowie. New island records for the endemic Hawaiian land snail *Succinea caduca* (Mighels 1845). Bishop Museum Occasional Papers, 88: 58-60.

2007 Holland, B.S. & R.H. Cowie. A geographic mosaic of passive dispersal: population structure in the endemic Hawaiian amber snail *Succinea caduca* (Mighels 1845). *Molecular Ecology*, 16(12): 2422-2435.

Response: The Army is aware of these species’ presence and as with all native species, protects these pursuant to the Sikes Act and the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan. The Army conducts biological resource surveys to identify the plant and animal species that occur on its installations. Section 3.9.5 to which the reviewer is referring describes general invertebrate, amphibian, reptile, terrestrial mammal, bird, fish, and marine wildlife species in the region of influence of the proposed action. Field work is conducted on a regular basis at MMR. Native animal species that are found are recorded. Based on the information provided we will be more cognizant of the potential presence of these invertebrates in the habitats not normally associated with their occurrence.

Biological Resource Management – Pōhakuloa Training Area (p. 3-173)

In reference to the Palila habitat mitigation site (Kipuka Alala) page 3-173 states, “Almost all signatories agreed to participate in the development of a comprehensive, interagency fire plan as well as coordinated fire prevention and suppression activities and planning.” Why did the non-signatory party choose not to participate? How will this affect the implementation of the interagency fire plan?

Response: The EIS has been updated to state that “All signatories agreed to participate in the development of a comprehensive, interagency fire plan as well as coordinated fire prevention and suppression activities and planning.”

Lead from Ammunition (pp. 3-336 - 3-337)

In the last paragraph on page 3-336 the SDEIS states, “Lead accumulating over the long term in backstops, range floors, and berms can leach into groundwater, be transported off-site by stormwater, be ingested by wildlife, or become airborne.” In the last paragraph on the following page the text continues, “ As lead does not appear to be a migrating contaminant, no mitigation or maintenance is necessary until the range is closed.” Do you mean in general, or are you referring to results of tests performed at MMR and PTA? Since there is a stated possibility for migration (see first quotation), how extensive is the current testing program? Given the potential for lead to migrate out of ammunition over a long-term scale, what monitoring programs and protocol will be implemented to ensure that soil and water resources are protected for future generations?

Response: Lead is highly unlikely to migrate down to the drinking water aquifer. Generally lead does not migrate very far under most conditions either via surface water, ground water or through the air. In the case of Mākua, there has also been a significant effort to determine if lead that is on the range as a result of training activities is migrating off range. Several rounds of surface water and ground water sampling results (see Appendix G-1 of the SDEIS) collected at Mākua do not indicate that lead is migrating off the range at levels of concern. The Army will review conditions at Mākua at least every five years to assess the threat of off range migration. If those conditions warrant more in-depth evaluation, additional ground and surface water sampling will be conducted to ensure the water resources are protected for future generations.

Land Use and Recreation (pp. 4-4 – 4-15)

Given the large number of trails surrounding MMR, there seems to be little relative mention of them in the SDEIS. The upper Kuaokalā Trail is highly prone to erosion. How will you minimize erosion impacts resulting from company troop marches? Does the military anticipate using any of the recreational trails surrounding Makua Valley for purposes other than troop marches? Peacock Flats Campground, Mokulē'ia Trail, Keālia Trail, and the Mākua Rim Trail are popular recreational resources used by residents and visitors alike. How will you communicate with hikers and other recreational trail users in advance of particularly noisy or dangerous activities? Additionally, have there been problems in the past with discovery of ammunition and other training materials on the trails surrounding Mākua? If so, how have these safety concerns been dealt with? Currently recreational users can obtain a permit to access the Kuaokalā Trail. How will proposed military use of the trail affect access for recreational users?

Response: The Army is required to coordinate use of State Na Ala Hele trails with the Department of Land and Natural Resources. Through this coordination process, the Army and the state will work together to develop trail conservation measures to be implemented to minimize the impacts from training. The Army natural resource program utilizes the recreational trails to access endangered species management units.

Munitions or other items do not travel over the ridge top of the mountains. There have been no munitions found on, or along recreational trails near Mākua.

Section 2.4.1 states that Kuaokalā Trail would be used once per month by a company of Soldiers. Permits are issued by the State Department of Land and Natural Resources.

At Ka'ena Point the presence of endangered species makes the area a region of significant environmental importance. Are there any other areas that could be used to serve the same purpose (troop marches) without the same degree of potential ecological harm? Could open areas on Schofield serve this purpose?

Response: Due to the potential need to use Ka'ena Point in the future, the Army assessed the environmental impacts associated with these actions. Before the use of Ka'ena Point could occur, the Army would be required to undergo separate ESA Section 7 consultation and coordination with the State of Hawai'i, and prepare additional NEPA documentation. The Army recognizes the sensitive nature of the ecosystem at Ka'ena Point and will use alternative areas for troop marches whenever possible.

Significant Impacts Mitigable to Less than Significant (p. 4-171)

Page 4-171 of Volume 1 makes the statement that "Nighttime ground training is unlikely to interrupt and adversely affect the activities of wildlife". What is the basis for this statement? It would seem that wildfires, explosions, rockets, small arms fire, etc. would be equally destructive of wildlife whether at night or in the day.

Response: The Army presented this explanation as an impact related to similar expected impacts as a result of Alternative 2, and therefore summarized the impacts as they relate to Alternative 3. The original discussion occurs in the SDEIS at page 4-168 under the heading Significant Impacts Mitigable to Less than Significant, and states, "The increased noise and nighttime illumination that would occur as a result of implementing Alternative 2 are not expected to affect the O'ahu 'elepaio substantially. This determination is based on the 'elepaio's demonstrated tolerance of ammunition and training-induced noises (VanderWerf 2000), as well as a discussion with 'elepaio expert Eric VanderWerf (VanderWerf 2003). Shearwaters nesting along the coast are unlikely to be affected by illumination and noise coming from the training areas within Mākuā Valley, so night training would be unlikely to affect their night-flying activities unless the training is carried out within the Ka'ena Point NAR."

Critical Habitat Restoration (Volume 3, Appendix H, p. 53)

In paragraph three, the SDEIS mentions that critical habitat for the O'ahu 'elepaio will be addressed by various practices. According to this section, up to ten years can elapse before the site is cleared of ordnance and shrub and tree propagules are planted. Ten years is too long to wait to address the loss of habitat of endangered species. What is the rationale for this period? Certainly there are many plant species as well as the tree snail, *Achatinella*, that will require habitat restoration sooner than this ten-year period. What monitoring provisions have been made to ensure that habitat restoration is on an environmentally timely and hopefully species retentive, schedule?

Response: The reader misunderstood the intent of the BO. The intent of the BO is that restoration of critical habitat would begin immediately following a fire. The USFWS recognized that it may take ten years to restore to pre-fire native species percent

cover. To date, no plant critical habitat has been lost at MMR due to fire. The Army has an extensive monitoring program that ensures the targets identified in the BO regarding restoration are accomplished in a timely manner.

Wildfires (Volume 4, Appendix J)

Volume 4, Appendix J addresses at great length the problem of wildfires and operating procedures for Fire Management and Control. There is mention of two water dip ponds that can supply water for fire control and locations where Hummers and Water Tenders can refill. It would appear that either the location or quantity of water available is insufficient given the occasions of wildfires burning out of control. Are these ponds and locations for additional water accessible at night as well as during the day? Can they be accessed by other types of firefighting equipment or is the risk posed by unexploded ordnance too great to risk on-scene firefighting? Given the seriousness of the impacts resulting from wildfires, it would appear that additional water storage tanks should be provided at environmentally strategic locations both for Mākua and Pōhakuloa. Has this been considered? If so, where would they be located and how would they be accessed?

Response: The Integrated Wildland Fire Management Plan (IWFMP) was reviewed and found satisfactory by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. An assessment of the current capabilities of the dip ponds is found in Section 3.1.4 of the EIS and the MMR Section of the IWFMP, page 12.

Furthermore, nighttime firefighting activities using helicopters are typically not authorized and are primarily accomplished by ground crews, unless otherwise approved by the Commanding General upon completion of a risk assessment to ensure helicopter firefighting activities may be accomplished without compromising firefighter safety.

Nighttime training activities may consist of the same activities conducted during the day. Night live-fire training will not occur at Mākua until after fire suppression issues have been finalized by the Army and approved by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Nighttime live-fire training at Mākua will not occur unless nighttime helicopter fire suppression is authorized.

The USFWS has approved the IWFMP related to nighttime training activities at PTA.

Both O'ahu and PTA have wildfire management program staff that respond to training-related fires. Their involvement on the ground is limited by the presence of UXO.

Additionally, we found the discussion of fire prevention for PTA to be lacking. What are the provisions for fire suppression at Pōhakuloa? The presence of critically endangered plant and animal species in close proximity make wildfires at Pōhakuloa is a great concern. In Volume 1, page 3-362, the SDEIS mentions that the use of spring water for fire management was discontinued. Are there any plans to fix the sand filter? The lack of close proximal water reserves is a concern due to the high fire potential in the region.

Response: Fire suppression activities at PTA is discussed in detail in Section 3.14 and 4.14 of the EIS, and in the Integrated Wildland Fires Management Plan (IWFMP) in Appendix J of the SDEIS.

The Sand Filter identified by the reviewer was used for potable water only and is not indicated differently in the EIS. Fire suppression at PTA is conducted in accordance with the approved IWFMP, and is accomplished through a highly qualified and trained fire fighting staff; maintenance of fuel and fire breaks; three 5,000 gallon water tankers; six above-ground dip tanks; and mutual aid support from Hawai'i County Fire Department, National Park Service, State Civil Defense, National Guard, and the Division of Forestry and Wildlife. The Army also is planning the construction of an additional three dip tanks.

Water, Soil, and Air Pollutants

With regard to erosion control, do earthen berms or other water retaining structures exist in critically denuded areas to control erosion in case of heavy rains?

Response: The Army's Integrated Training Area Management (ITAM) program works on the perimeter roads at Makua, but the interior roads are carefully maintained by the Army's Department of Public Works. The Army employs various best management practices for trail rehabilitation such as broad based diversion dips to direct runoff to non-point source discharge zones, various slope stabilization methods such as erosion blankets or hydroseeding, and take-off channels to select discharge points and filter runoff.

The ITAM program does not on natural erosion or denuded areas unless there is on-going live-fire training damage to those locations. As MMR has been closed for the last few years, ITAM's role at MMR is limited to some repair on trails where only maneuver training has occurred. All water retaining structures at PTA are in place on their trails and are actively maintained.

In sections 4.8 (Geology and Soils) and 4.11 (Hazardous Materials and Waste), there is discussion of previous testing that has been undertaken to determine soil and water contaminants. Absent from this discussion, however, is a treatment of the Army's plan for long-term testing and monitoring of soils and water resources.

Response: In sections 4.7.3 (4-89) the EIS states that, "The Army has adopted a conservative approach to addressing the potential impacts on groundwater and will continue to perform groundwater monitoring to document that the impacts remain less than significant."

Health and Safety of Adjacent Residents

It is well known that in the past there have been occasional misfires that have impacted adjacent property owners. What provisions are being made to insure that stray rounds or rockets do not land in the back yards of adjacent residential areas or farmlands? What is the relative risk of stray ordnance at night vs. in the daytime? Given the difficulty of firefighting at night and the potential for errant rounds, it would seem prudent to avoid use of some of the more blatant fire starters during night hours.

Response: The Mākua Range Office or Officer in Charge develops a surface danger zone (SDZ) for each training event (in accordance with AR 385-64, Ammunition and Explosives Safety Standards) to determine the potential range and angle of a particular weapon. SDZs delineate the impact area and additional buffer area where fragments from exploding rounds could land. They are developed to specify the area that would contain all but one in one million rounds fired and are used to ensure personnel safety. Firing point location, direction of fire, left and right limits of fire, powder bag settings, fragment dispersion, and firing angle are among the variables that may be used to develop the SDZ.

The SDZs for weapons fired at MMR are modified so the munitions used there will not exceed the boundaries of the installation. Some weapons have the capability of firing munitions beyond the mountains that form Mākua's boundary. For those, the Army imposes restrictions to make sure rounds do not leave the installation. For instance, helicopter mounted .50 cal machine guns are prohibited from elevating the guns higher than 10 degrees. This deviation process is approved by the Commander, U.S. Army Garrison. It must be reviewed and approved each year. If additional weapons systems were to be authorized and their capacities exceed the installation boundaries, they would have similar restrictions imposed. These include the Javelin and inert TOW missiles. Thus, the SDZs for all weapons systems employed at Mākua would not go beyond the installation boundary.

The 2007 Mākua BO does not allow nighttime live-fire training of any kind until helicopter usage is approved for fighting wildfires at night. Also, there is no history of large fires starting at night due to military training.

Atmospheric contaminants resulting from hazardous wastes in the explosives can be extremely toxic. What provisions are envisioned to ensure that troops are not seriously injured in the course of inhaling these substances? Have studies been undertaken to determine relative seriousness of the air quality problems under varying wind conditions, i.e. both strength and direction?

Peter Rappa, Environmental Review Coordinator, University of Hawai'i, Manoa

Response: Emissions from ordnance use are discussed in Section 4.4 of the EIS. Section 4.4 of the EIS has been updated. Based on the general nature of detonation processes and the very low emission rates that have been published in studies of munitions firing and open detonations, emissions associated with ordnance use at MMR are expected to pose very little risk of creating adverse air quality impacts.

The U.S. Army Environmental Command (USAEC) has recently completed an extensive program aimed at identifying air emissions associated with munitions use. The Emissions Characterization Program initiated in 1997 to identify and quantify the emissions from firing point, exploding ordnance, and smoke/pyrotechnics items. Over 220 munition items have been tactically functioned in test chambers at Army Test Centers. The scientifically defensible emission factors developed as part of this program have been accepted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and is currently publishing this data in USEPA's Compilation of Air

Pollutant Emission Factors, better known as AP-42. This data can be accessed via the USEPAs website <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/index.html>, Chapter 15.

In addition, USAEC, in collaboration with the U.S. Army Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine (USACHPPM), has developed a program to evaluate potential inhalation risks from munitions air emissions to residents living near Army training facilities. The Environmental Health Risk Assessment Program (EHRAP) is based upon gathering emissions data for a single munition and developing a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to address concerns at a particular training site. USACHPPM uses an air dispersion model to determine ambient air concentrations at locations downwind from a hypothetical training site. Modeled air concentrations are combined with a typical use scenario to estimate the amount of each substance a hypothetical off-site residential population breathes. Air concentrations are time-adjusted for both acute and chronic exposure, and are compared with health-based screening levels. Exposures are based on a residential population most likely to be affected. This consists of both adults and children living 100 meters away; directly downwind; under worst-case meteorological conditions; with the wind constantly blowing toward the exposed population 350 days a year. Since these studies are not modeled after any one existing training facility, conservative model input data are used so that the results are generic enough to be applicable to most facilities that use these munitions. The Health Risk Assessments completed to date indicate there is minimal, if any, potential inhalation risk to off-site residents.

Concerning potential occupational health risks incurred to Soldiers working with such items, the Army's Health Hazard Assessment (HHA) Program is designed to identify and eliminate or control health hazards associated with new and improved materiel and weapon systems. The HHA Program focuses on potential health hazards resulting from training, combat, and maintenance throughout a system's life. The hazard categories evaluated by the HHA Program include: Acoustic Energy, Biological Substances, Chemical Substances, Oxygen Deficiency (ventilation), Radiation Energy, Shock (Rapid acceleration/deceleration), Temperature Extremes & Humidity, Trauma, and Vibration. The materiel system developer is responsible for providing information to the medical assessor. The data may already exist, i.e., that from a predecessor or like system may be sufficient, or it may be acquired during developmental/technical (and sometimes user/operational) testing. When the health hazard data are provided to the Army Medical Department's Independent Medical Assessors (IMAs), an assessment is performed. Often there are multiple health hazard issues; therefore, the expertise of people from several scientific and health disciplines is required. A matrix concept is employed to address multiple health issues. A team of IMAs is formed and coordinated by the Army HHA Program at the US Army Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine. The product of this process is the Health Hazard Assessment Report (HHAR) that meets the requirements of DODI 5000.2, AR 40-10, AR 70-1, and AR 602-2. The HHA provides risks associated with exposure to hazards, in this case the chemical hazards resulting from the combustion described in the original question, as well as recommendation to eliminate or control those hazards. Those recommendation are provided back to the materiel developer who is responsible to either accept the risks or eliminate or control that hazards.

13. University of Hawaii, Manoa Ethnic Studies

Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Military Training Activities at Mākuā Military Reservation, Hawai'i

Remember this common mainland theme – “Not in my backyard” but rather do it in your backyard and ask your kids to accept it.

From University of Hawai'i Ethnic Studies Student:

To: Environmental Impact Statement:

Mākuā Valley has potential direct and indirect consequences that directly [result] (text is not definitely decipherable) from live fire military training. Since military personnel have no connection to the land, it is no wonder that contamination from spent munitions is so prevalent on sacred Hawaiian land. This is unacceptable and hereby viewed with discord and disdain, and warrants opposition and _____ (text is indecipherable).

Severe impacts are:

- 1) to the ecosystem and the preservation of native forests, plants, trees and all native species in a pristine managed ecosystem. These contaminants impact health immune and respiratory systems. These chemicals are already in our land, fresh water and oceans.
- 2) Let me give you alternatives – do this in your own back yard. Like Virginia, Florida, Louisiana, California/Nevada border. The impact lessons on Kohoolawe, which is still contaminated to present day, are evident in the toxins which are still in the environment.
- 3) Cultural impact – Mākuā Valley is sacred land which rests on ancestral Heiau's (shrines). Hawaiian families/kids will never know their culture due to this cultural dis-integration of indigenous people. Alternatives exist, and environmental statements.....(the rest of the text has been cut off)

Kaleo Paul, UH Manoa Ethnic Studies

Response: 1 – Prior to military training activities, much of O'ahu has been invaded by invasive species that have compromised the integrity of the native ecosystem. The Army continues to implement a very intense natural resource program that involves elements of invasive species monitoring and management activities that benefit native ecosystems and the threatened and endangered species found within. The Army is also very conscious about its responsibility as a land steward, and continues to take action to minimize its impact on the environment.

Response: 2 - Alternatives that do not advance the purpose and need are not considered reasonable alternatives. The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried forward for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5. This section discusses the reasons the Army considered but eliminated other identified alternatives. There were no locations outside of Hawai'i that could meet all four screening criteria. Other locations considered included Fort Irwin, California, Yakima Training Center, Washington, and Fort Polk, Louisiana. Therefore, these locations were dismissed and not considered for further evaluation.

3- The Army allows access to cultural sites at Mākuā. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the Army must allow cultural access to sites on Mākuā, twice a month and two overnight sessions a year. In addition, the Army grants access requests to any interested member of the public beyond the minimum number of days required in the settlement agreement. The Army feels it has thoroughly considered the impacts of its proposed actions and alternatives, and has sought to accommodate the practice of religion involving Army lands in Hawai'i to the extent practicable due to human health and safety concerns and the conduct of training to support the readiness and well-being of our Soldiers in fulfilling the Army mission.

Organizations

14. Earthjustice Comments

David L. Henkin
November 3, 2008

Re: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for Military Training Activities at Makua Military Reservation (MMR), Hawai'i, 63 Fed. Reg. 54,566 (Sept. 22, 2008).

On Behalf of Malama Makua, Earthjustice offers the following comments in response to the U.S. Army's request for input on its Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("SDEIS") for Military Training Activities at Makua Military Reservation ("MMR"). See 63 Fed. Reg. 54,566 (Sept. 22, 2008). The SDEIS is an improvement over the draft EIS circulated in 2005, in that the Army finally concedes it can meet the project's purpose and need through use of a replacement facility at Pohakuloa Training Area ("PTA") on Hawai'i Island. Numerous deficiencies remain, however, which the Army must address to comply with both the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") and its additional obligations under the two settlement agreements reached in litigation brought by Malama Makua in the federal district court for the District of Hawai'i over the Army's failure to prepare a legally adequate environmental impact statement ("EIS") for military training at MMR. See Joint Stipulation Re: Partial Settlement of Plaintiff's Motion to Enforce the October 4, 2001 Settlement Agreement and Stipulated Order, *Malama Makua v. Gates*, Civ. No. 00-00813 SOM LEK (D. Haw. Jan. 8, 2007) (hereinafter "2007 Settlement Agreement"); Settlement Agreement and Stipulated Order, *Malama Makua v. Rumsfeld*, Civ. No. 00-00813 SOM-LEK (D. Haw. Oct 4, 2001) (hereinafter "2001 Settlement Agreement").

Please note that, in offering these comments, we have focused on information presented for the first time in the SDEIS. The Army has already received from Malama Makua and the technical assistants retained pursuant to paragraph 9 of the 2001 Settlement Agreement voluminous comments regarding its earlier draft EIS and various studies released for public review. Those comments have alerted the Army to Malama Makua's position and contentions, giving the agency ample opportunity to give those issues meaningful consideration. Unfortunately, rather than modify its analysis to address the deficiencies Malama Makua and other identified and provide the full disclosure of potential impacts and alternatives NEPA mandates, the Army often chose merely to restate its prior position, asserting its draft analysis was legally adequate. Malama Makua sees no point in restating its prior objections, as it has already put the Army on notice regarding its legal obligations.

[Response: The previous comments and responses were included in Appendix K of the Supplemental Draft EIS \(2008\). They remain part of the administrative record and will be taken into account by the decision maker.](#)

Inadequate Time for Public Comment

As a threshold matter, Earthjustice objects to the limited time the Army has allowed for public review of the SDEIS. While styled as a "supplemental" to the DEIS the Army released in 2005, the SDEIS is, in fact, a wholesale revision. It is simply unreasonable to expect the public to plow through the thousands of pages of main text and appendices in the forty-five days

provided. The difficulty of the task is increased by the Army's failure to redline the revised document to direct the public's attention to the portions of the original draft analysis that have been altered.

In light of the limited time available, Earthjustice has focused its review on the major structural flaws in the Army's analysis that compel preparation of a revised draft and its circulation for additional public review and comment. See 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9(a). When the Army circulates the revised DEIS, it hopefully will give the public adequate time to scrutinize all aspects of the document.

Response: The Army does not intend to send out the EIS as another draft. Rather the document will be published as a Final EIS, after which a 30-day waiting period will be observed before a decision is made.

Failure to Complete Archaeological Surveys

The 2007 Settlement Agreement provides that, "[a]s part of the preparation of the [EIS] for military training activities at [MMR]," the Army is obliged to:

complete surface and subsurface archaeological surveys of all areas within the company Combined-Arms Assault Course [{"CCAC"}] circumscribed by the south firebreak road, except that the area within the firebreak road identified as containing improved conventional munitions ("ICMs") ... shall be surveyed only in {if} the Headquarters, Department of the Army ..., grants the appropriate waiver ...

2007 Settlement Agreement ¶ 1.¹ The Army further agreed it would "not finalize the EIS until ... any such surveys are completed, circulated for public review ... and incorporated into the final EIS, along with responses to public comments" 2007 Settlement Agreement ¶ 1.

The Army's claim in the SDEIS that it has surface surveyed all areas within the south firebreak road outside the ICM area cannot be squared away with Army Cultural Resources Manager Laurie Lucking's testimony, under oath, that the Army has never conducted a surface survey of the area within the southeastern lobe of the south firebreak road. Compare SDEIS at 3-9 with deposition of Laurie Lucking, *Malama Makua v. Rumsfeld*, Civ. No. 00-00813 SOM-LEK (D. Haw. Dec. 22, 2005) at 20:11-23:22, 25:3-27:9 & Exhs. 2 & 3. The Army cannot avoid its obligations under the 2007 Settlement Agreement merely by revising the Figure 3-24 (now Figure 3.10-1) to shade in the southeastern lobe. Rather, the Army must conduct the required additional surface surveys, circulate them for public review and then incorporate them into the final EIS, along with responses to public comments. See *id.*

Response: The required subsurface surveys have been completed. These are described in chapter 3.10.6 at p. 3-309 [2008 Supplemental Draft]. Section 3.10.8 includes information about unexploded ordnance (UXO) [p. 3-322, 2008 Supplemental Draft]. This UXO prevents surveying activity. Section 3.11.4 has been expanded to describe the Army's efforts to clear UXO, particularly where it affects public access to cultural resources.

Dr. Lucking's testimony was inaccurate and was based on an inaccurate map in the 2001 EA. In fact, the entire south firebreak road was surveyed for the MK 19 range

¹ The 2001 Settlement Agreement imposed similar obligations. See 2001 Settlement Agreement ¶ 6.c.

project in 1995. Additional areas were surveyed between 1995 and 2007 as a result of controlled burn. The map at Section 3.10.1 has been updated to show additional areas that have had complete surface and subsurface surveys. The Army has not conducted any surveys subsequent to the 2007 settlement agreement.

In September 2004, the Department of Defense Explosives Board (“DDESB”) conducted an inspection. In December 2004, the DDESB “restricted access to certain cultural sites by non-government personnel due to safety concerns relating to the presence of UXO at Makua, as well as Department of Defense and Department of the Army regulations prohibiting public access to impact areas containing UXO.” In January and February 2005, the United States Army Technical Center for Explosives Safety (“USATCES”) conducted a risk assessment. USATCES then issued a report stating that, for members of the public to visit cultural sites at MMR, “there must be clearly defined and marked trails (footpaths) and cultural sites cleared subsurface to a depth of one foot.” The Army told members of the public in February 2005 that they could not visit the 12 cultural sites at MMR that they previously were allowed to visit. A contractor hired by the Army to clear UXO from MMR, began clearing UXO on November 20, 2006, selectively clearing parts of sites 4536, 4537, 4538, 4541, 4542, 4543, 4544, 4547, 5456, and 5926. On January 11, 2007, the Army contacted the State Historic Preservation Division to explain what the Army intended to do to destroy the UXO found near sites 4546 and 5456, as well as other UXO. On March 16, 2007, the State Historic Preservation Division said it agreed with the Army that its intended means of destroying the UXO would not adversely affect those cultural sites. The UXO located near sites 4546 and 5456 was destroyed on March 26, 2007. On the morning of September 1, 2007, the Army allowed members of the public and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs to visit certain cultural sites at MMR. On February 9, 2008, members of Mālama Mākuā were allowed to walk around sites 4537 and 4546.

The 2001 Settlement Agreement required the Army, no later than October 2002, to identify “high priority” cultural sites outside of the 1,000-meter area Makua (toward the mountain) of Farrington Highway for UXO clearance. Public meetings were held to identify additional high priority sites in September and December 2002. The October 2002 burn and the July 2003 burn were both conducted in part to provide additional access.

The identification process was the subject of a lengthy legal dispute. In early 2009, the federal district court resolved the dispute by requiring the Army to complete the compilation of the list of cultural sites for publication no later than February 26, 2009. The Army will conduct a second public comment period. No later than June 12, 2009, the Army will identify the high priority sites for UXO clearance.

The Army had also failed to satisfy its obligations under the 2007 Settlement Agreement with respect to subsurface surveys. The Army has previously acknowledged that, due to its extremely limited scope, the subsurface survey it conducted could not produce “a representative sample of the designated survey area” and, thus, “has limited potential of producing significant data about the whole of Makua.” 11/17/05 Letter from Alan Goo at 2 (included in Appendix A to survey). The Army cannot discharge its obligation to “complete ... subsurface archaeological surveys of all areas within the [CCAC]” through a study which, by design, cannot provide representative information about the subsurface archaeological resources found there and threatened by proposed training. *Id.*; see also 3/26/07 Dye Report (research design inadequately described and executed).

Response: The Army believes that it has completed the required surface and subsurface archeological surveys. These are described in Section 3.10.6 [at p. 3-309]. As required by the settlement agreement, the Department of the Army made a final decision not to grant a waiver to allow archaeological surveys in the ICM area. This decision was approved by the Director of Army Safety and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Environment, Safety, and Occupational Health.

The letter from Mr. Alan Goo is Appendix A to the report, which is at Appendix G9 of the Final EIS. Mr. Goo’s comment must be taken in context. For instance, Mr. Goo states that a one percent sample of the area would require 28,000 test units and would take 11 years to complete. He notes that this would be destructive to intact cultural deposits. He then goes on to describe the Army’s stratified random sample plan, based among other things, on site probability. He also stated that some sample sites might have to be avoided for safety reasons. Mr. Goo emphasized the Army’s desire to avoid damaging archaeological sites. Finally, the survey was aimed at the area within the south firebreak road. It is in this context that Mr. Goo’s comment about the survey’s “limited potential of producing significant data about the *whole* of Makua” must be taken [emphasis added]. The survey was not about the “whole” of Makua. Nothing in Mr. Goo’s letter should be taken as saying that the survey would not meet the requirements of the limited survey required by the settlement agreement.

Failure to Complete Studies of Potential Contamination of Marine Resources

Malama Makua strongly disagrees with the Army’s assertions in the SDEIS that compliance with the 2007 Settlement Agreement does not require that shellfish be tested. We assume the Army reached the same conclusion, since it carried out additional fieldwork focusing on sampling and analysis of shellfish in late September through mid October 2008. To comply with its legal obligations, the Army must put its study regarding potential contamination of shellfish out for public review and comment and then incorporate the study into the final EIS, along with responses to public comments. See 2007 Settlement Agreement ¶¶ 6, 11-13.²

Response: This comment is correct. Testing of shellfish was performed and is now included in the Marine Resources study.

² Until Malama Makua and its experts have had the opportunity to review the shellfish contamination study, we express no opinion regarding whether it complies with the Army’s obligations under paragraph 6 of the 2007 Settlement Agreement.

While the Army appears to be making some effort to comply with its obligation to assess potential contamination of shellfish, it has failed completely to test any marine resources other than fish, limu and shellfish (e.g., non-shellfish benthic or demersal invertebrates) to assess potential contamination, in violation of the 2007 Settlement Agreement.

Response: Although marine resources other than fish, limu and shellfish were not tested, their potential contamination was assessed. The study states, “Although marine resources other than fish, shellfish, and limu were not tested, the sampling was representative of other marine resources within the Mākua area. It is reasonable to suggest that other marine resources occupying similar trophic levels and ecological niches contain similar substances and concentrations as those detected in fish, limu, and shellfish collected as part of this study.

Essentially, conclusions were drawn for these resources based on the levels of contamination of fish, limu, and shellfish.

In addition, for the reasons previously set forth in comments submitted by Earthjustice and technical assistants Drs. Jack Rensel and Ralph Elston, the fundamental flaws in the previously released marine study render it incapable of satisfying the Army’s obligation to “complete one or more studies to determine whether fish [or] limu ... near Makua Beach and in the muliwai on which area residents rely for subsistence are contaminated by substances associated with the proposed training activities at MMR.” 2007 Settlement Agreement ¶ 6. The Army’s responses to these comments merely confirm its researchers had no idea whether much of the limu they were gathering and testing were the types “on which area residents rely for subsistence,” as required under the 2007 Settlement Agreement. *Id.* Long-term monitoring that may (but may not) include limu as species of interest cannot satisfy the Army’s obligation to complete a study of potential contamination of limu “[a]s part of preparation of the EIS for military training activities at MMR.” *Id.*³

Response: These issues were addressed in the revised study. Responses to comments about the 2009 version of the study are included with the study itself.

The long-term monitoring plan is currently under development. The Army will engage the public as required by the Settlement Agreement.

Failure to Consider a True “No Action” Alternative

NEPA requires the Army to evaluate “the alternative of no action.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(d). In the case of MMR, since Army has never previously prepared a comprehensive EIS for any military training, “no action” means no military training at MMR whatsoever. The SDEIS fails to consider this true “no action” alternative. Rather, it evaluated only a “no live-fire military training” alternative, which is properly viewed as an alternative action to the live-fire training proposed in the other alternatives. SDEIS at 2-16 (emphasis added).

Response: Although it is true that the Army has never completed a comprehensive EIS for Makua, it has prepared NEPA documents in the past. It is also important to

³ Note that paragraph 7 of the 2001 Settlement Agreement required the Army to “provide a 60-day public comment period on the scope of, and protocol for, such [long-term] monitoring.” The Army has yet to release a draft protocol for long-term monitoring, in violation of the 2001 Settlement Agreement.

remember that MMR has been used for military training even before the signing of NEPA into law. A certain amount of training and maintenance activities occur at MMR even though no live-fire occurs. The proposed action is to perform live-fire at MMR; no action means not performing live-fire, in its simplest form. It does not mean the complete cessation of all activities at Makua. Section 2.3 has been expanded to make clear the types of activities that would occur at MMR under “no action.”

The Army must revise its EIS to consider the alternative of ceasing military training at MMR altogether. When it does so, it must evaluate the “predictable actions by others” that would likely result from “a choice of ‘no action.’” 46 Fed. Reg. 18,026, 18,027 (Mar. 23, 1981). Predictable actions would include, but are not limited to, increased efforts to protect cultural and biological resources once potential conflicts with training activities are eliminated, as well as increased access to sacred sites.

Response: The 2005 DEIS did not take into account the non live-fire military training that currently occurs at MMR. The 2008 Supplemental DEIS clarifies this issue.

Closure of MMR would require an EIS in itself, because reasonably foreseeable actions by new users would have to be analyzed. There would also be complicated issues of clean up and restrictions on future use. A formal Biological Opinion under the Endangered Species Act would be required. Essentially, ceasing the use of MMR altogether and declaring it excess would be an action in itself, rather than no action. Of course, as is obvious, neither the no action alternative nor the drastic curtailment and closure alternative would meet the purpose and need for the proposed action. The “no action” alternative included in the EIS has the advantage of serving as the baseline against which the proposed action can be evaluated.

Failure to Consider Reasonable Alternatives

For reasons set forth in comments Earthjustice submitted previously, the Army was obliged to, but failed to, consider alternatives that involve substantially less live-fire training than the least intensive live-fire training alternative evaluated in the SDEIS, Alternative 1. In response, the Army simply asserts “[t]he level of training reflected in Alternative [1] is the minimum amount of [combined-arms live-fire exercise (‘CALFEX’)] training required for the companies of the 25th Infantry Division.” SDEIS at K-81. The Army cannot rely on such conclusory statement, even if it purportedly from its experts, to support its refusal to evaluate these alternatives.⁴ Rather, the Army must disclose to the public the underlying data and analysis on which it bases its conclusions. The SDEIS fails to comply with this mandate.

Response: Section 2.4.6 of the EIS has been updated to identify for the reader how the Army determined the minimum number of CALFEX training events.

⁴ As one example among many, the Army fails to justify its claim it must conduct live-fire exercised at MMR at night, which pose substantial, additional threats of irreparable harm to cultural resources and endangered species. Since the Army has not conducted any nighttime, live-fire exercises at MMR in well over a decade, the public is left wondering why it is allegedly so urgent to carry out such potentially destructive activities now.

Chapter 1 explains the need for nighttime live-fire training. Section 2.4.1 makes clear that the Army does not intend to conduct nighttime training unless it is authorized under conditions described in the 2007 Biological Opinion.

While Malama Makua appreciates the Army's concession that training at PTA is a reasonable alternative to training at MMR, it questions the Army's decision to examine only training at full capacity use (i.e. up to 50 CALFEXs per year) with fewer weapons restrictions (i.e. with the most destructive suite of weaponry). Having conceded it could accomplish its goals with fewer exercises and/or more weapons restrictions at MMR, the Army must consider alternatives involving similar restrictions at PTA. Such alternatives could satisfy the stated purpose and need with far fewer impacts than the sole PTA alternative evaluated in the SDEIS.

Response: Unlike MMR, PTA does not currently present the phased restrictions that arise because of the threat of fire or the presence of endangered species, contained in the 2007 Biological Opinion. The Army looked only at the full range of training it would need to perform in the PTA alternative. If PTA were selected as the preferred alternative rather than MMR, it would have generated additional information such as a Biological Opinion. This, in turn, might have produced phased restrictions on training. Meanwhile, it was important to analyze a PTA alternative that would provide the same training opportunities as the full capacity use of MMR. Otherwise, there would be an uneven comparison and the decision-maker would not reasonably be able to select the PTA alternative.

The SDEIS makes clear that some, if not most/all, of the Army's alleged training needs could be met through the use of battle area complexes ("BAXs") the Army intends to build at PTA and Schofield Barracks for the Stryker Brigade Combat Team ("SBCT"). See SDEIS at 2-62 (noting "PTA BAX would be capable of conducting modified company CALFEX training"), 2-65 (Schofield BAX "capable of supporting dismounted infantry CALFEXs"). Even if, as the SDEIS asserts, the primary use of these facilities would be the SBCT mounted training exercises, the Army should consider whether all or most of the alleged training needs could be met using a combination of the two BAXs. If all training needs could not be met at the BAXs, the Army should evaluate conducting the remaining training elsewhere (e.g., during rotations to mainland and/or foreign training facilities and, if that is inadequate to meet anticipated needs, at a new facility at PTA). By concentrating most CALFEXs at the BAXs, the Army may be able to reduce substantially the overall impacts of its operations.

Response: Sections 2.5.1, and 2.5.2 of the EIS explain that throughput and scheduling conflicts would prevent the use of the BAXs for CALFEX training essentially when other adjacent ranges are in use the BAX cannot be used because the SDZs of the adjacent ranges overlap onto the BAX. They also show that the CALFEXs performed at BAXs would not include the full integration of units and weapons. Section 2.5 explains why training at sites outside of Hawaii are not feasible.

The Army fails adequately to justify its refusal to analyze in detail several alternatives involving use of locations at PTA other than the Twin Pu'u location.⁵ For example, the only reason the

⁵ During the public comment period, Earthjustice asked the Army to identify the documents that contain the Army's analysis of alternative locations at PTA (there are no citations in section 2.5.1) and tell us where we could locate these documents, so we could independently evaluate the Army's conclusion that the Twin Pu'u location is the only viable alternative at PTA. We were informed by the Army counsel

Army provides for failing to consider PTA Alternative 8 (IPBC/Southeast) is the “its boundaries would be located in the impact area of a convoy live-fire range proposed to be constructed along Redleg Trail.” SDEIS at 2-61. It is not, however, certain that a decision to build the proposed convoy training facility will ever be made. The Army provides no justification for completely ruling out an otherwise viable alternative due to speculation that, at some time in the future, another training facility would be built in the vicinity. Moreover, even if a decision to proceed with the convoy training facility were made, the Army fails to explain why it would be infeasible to combine the replacement CALFEX facility and the convoy live-fire range. After all, the Army intends to carry out both types of training at MMR.

The Army does not provide a legally defensible reason for failing to analyze PTA Alternative 2. The only rationale given for eliminating this alternative is that it would “require the establishment of a new duded impact area.” *Id.* The Army concedes that “establishing new impact area[s] can be done,” and accordingly, this alternative is clearly feasible. *Id.* That there would be many approvals needed and that “expanding duded impact areas does not maximize the use of the installation range complex for future range requirements” may be factors the Army could weigh in making its final decision regarding which alternative to select, but they do not justify rejecting this alternative out-of-hand. *Id.* at 2-61 to -62.

The Army likewise improperly refused to analyze in detail PTA Alternative 7. The only rationale given is that the Army has entered into “various settlement agreements,” but the Army never explains why those agreements preclude consideration of this alternative. *Id.* at 2-62. While the Army claims that “[a] detailed explanation of the MPRC requirements is provided in Chapter 5, Cumulative Projects and Impacts,” there is, in fact, no mention of the MPRC in that chapter. *Id.* For PTA Alternative 7, as with all the others the Army excluded from detailed consideration, the Army cannot lawfully rely on conclusory statements in the SDEIS regarding obstacles to implementation. Rather, the Army must fully disclose the facts and analysis on which it based its conclusions.

Response: For purposes of comparison, the Army chose for comparison with the action proposed for MMR the best possible choice at PTA. A proliferation of PTA choices would only have made the MMR choice look artificially better by comparison. Instead, the Army looked at the best choice available at PTA. This gives the decision-maker a fair choice between PTA and MMR options.

Regarding alternative 8, the EIS now points out “The IPBC/Southeast (PTA Alternative 8) also had critical SDZ limitations since its boundaries would be located in the impact area of a convoy live-fire range proposed to be constructed along Redleg Trail. The final decision on this project was made in February 2009 and included an EA and FNSI.”

Chapter 5 has been adjusted to include discussion on the MPRC. Additional supporting text has been added to Chapter 2.5.1 of the EIS.

that “the source of the information for this analysis is not listed as a reference.” 10/31/08 Email from Robert M. Lewis. Moreover, at no time were we told how we could locate and inspect the documents containing the Army’s analysis.

The Army’s failure to cite in the SDEIS the material on which its analysis of PTA alternatives relies and to make the relevant documents “reasonably available for inspection by potentially interested persons within the time allowed for comments” violates NEPA. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.21; see also *id.* § 1500.1(b) (“public scrutiny ... essential to implementing NEPA”).

Failure To Take A Hard Look At Cumulative Impacts

The SDEIS falls far short of satisfying NEPA's mandate to analyze the impacts of the various training alternatives in light of each alternative's interaction with the effects of the past, current, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. 40 C.F.R. §1508.7. Initially, the SDEIS does not provide adequate information regarding the time, type, place and scale of the past, present, and future projects included in the cumulative impact analysis. Vague discussion of the general impact of past and present activities, without identifying the environmental impacts from such projects on an individual basis, fails to satisfy NEPA.

The SDEIS then offers no quantified or detailed data about cumulative effects, failing to provide anything other than general, conclusory statements regarding the significance – or lack thereof – of potential impacts. Factors such as soil erosion, water quality, acreage burned by wildfires, cultural resource damage, traffic, economics, toxins, habitat and listed species loss, air quality, noise, and so forth can be quantified, and, absent justification regarding why more definitive information could not be provided, the Army is required to do so. The SDEIS illegally fails to quantify cumulative impacts or to justify why it doesn't quantify impacts.

The SDEIS's failure properly to analyze cumulative impacts prevents the Army, the public and elected officials from comparing the cumulative impacts of the alternatives presented for consideration and making a reasoned choice between them. See 40 C.F.R. §§ 1500.1(c), 1502.1, 1502.14.

Response: Adjustments have been made throughout Chapter 5.

Miscellaneous Comments

Page 2-13: The legend on Figure 2-4 is so microscopic as to be illegible.

Response: Adjustments have been made to the legend.

Page 3-2: The SDEIS inaccurately states that “no CALFEXs were conducted at MMR in fiscal year 2004.” In fact, the Marine Corps conducted a CALFEX in early April 2004.

Response: We clarified this text to state “Consequently, the Army did not perform CALFEXs at MMR during 1999, 2000, and 2001.”

Page 3-179: Figure 3.9-6 fails to identify which sensitive plant species are indicated by the different color hash marks. In general, the figure is illegible.

Response: We modified the map to include the names of the plant species, however, we had to scale the map to be able to have a complete view of all species at PTA. If the decisionmaker were to choose the PTA alternative, additional NEPA documentation would be prepared and more specific maps would be created.

Page 3-201: The symbols for the various endangered vertebrates in Figure 3.9-8 are so fuzzy as to be illegible.

Response: We modified the map to have a more clear view of the species.

Page 3-320: As discussed in Earthjustice's December 20, 2007 comments on the Proposed Draft Programmatic Agreement For Section 106 Responsibilities For Routine Military Training At MMR, the Army has failed to complete the identification of sites required under the September 2000 Programmatic Agreement ("PA"). Thus, the SDEIS is inaccurate when it states the Army implemented all aspects of that PA.

Response: The Army did in fact complete the identification of sites required under the September 2000 Programmatic Agreement.

Page 4-189: There are inconsistencies between the summary of potential cultural resources impacts in the table on page 4-189 and the narrative in the pages that follow. For example, the table states the impacts of the so-called "no action" alternative on archaeological resources and areas of traditional importance would be significant, but mitigable to less than significant. In the text that follows, both of these impacts are deemed "significant."

In general, it is disingenuous for the SDEIS to gloss over the substantially greater potential for destruction of cultural resources from live-fire training as compared to non-live-fire training by stating that impacts from either would be "significant." While Malama Makua concurs that the loss of any cultural resource would be significant, the SDEIS must communicate that the likelihood of such loss as a result of live-fire training is orders of magnitude greater than the likelihood of such loss from non-live-fire-training.⁶

Response: You are correct, there were inconsistencies between the summary of Potential Impacts table and the summary that follows. These inconsistencies have been corrected. Under the No Action Alternative, "Significant" Impacts are those related to Access to Areas of Traditional Importance and archaeological sites; "Significant Impact Mitigable to Less than Significant" include Impacts on archaeological resources, and Impacts on Areas of Traditional Importance; "Less than Significant" impacts may occur to cultural resources from vehicles; and "No Impacts" are anticipated to paleontological resources.

Pages 4-224 to 4-225: The SDEIS fails to provide any data or analysis to back up its assertion that construction of a replacement facility at PTA would have only "minor beneficial" direct and indirect effects on employment, income, and business volume in Hawai'i County. In its March 2007 Report on Army Live-Fire Ranges in Hawaii (prepared pursuant to section 343 of Pub. Law 109-364, the National defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007), the Army claimed it would cost \$550 to \$600 million to construct a replacement facility at PTA. See 3/07 Army Report at 34. That the expenditure of over half a billion dollars would have only "minor" impacts is not self-evident. The Army must provide data and analysis to back up its assertions.⁷

⁶ Likewise, while the loss of any endangered species or native habitat would be significant, the likelihood of suffering such loss as a result of live-fire training is far greater than the likelihood non-live-fire training would inflict such a loss. See SDEIS at 4-140.

⁷ At the October 6, 2008 public hearing of the SDEIS, we asked Army representatives David Howlett and Paul Thies for copies of any analysis the Army performed to arrive at its conclusions regarding the economic impacts of the PTA alternative (the SDEIS fails to cite to any such study). As of today (the last day of the public comment period), none has been provided. As noted above, the failures to cite materials on which the SDEIS relies and to make those materials available to the public during the comment period violate NEPA.

Response: The portion of the report in question referred to the cost of building a range capable of training two Brigade Combat Teams simultaneously. The cost estimate included infrastructure improvements to the PTA cantonment area as well as the ranges. This is obviously a much bigger project than is planned for MMR. So the PTA alternative chosen for analysis in the EIS is both smaller and less expensive. Because of this, however, it serves as a much better basis for comparison than the range notionally referred to in the report. An “apples-to-oranges” comparison might have provided fidelity to the report, but would have served neither the decision-maker nor the public very well. Having said this, use of the twin Pu’u area would require significant PTA cantonment area upgrades as well. The best estimate currently available is that the Twin Pu’u range (Alternative 4) would cost about \$71 million. Associated cantonment area improvements could cost as much as \$200 million. Currently, there are no formal cost estimates for these projects.

Appendix G-8, Appendix F, Pages 5-6: To determine whether the arsenic concentrations in limu from Makua are naturally occurring or elevated due to military activities at MMR, the Army was obliged to sample and test limu from appropriate background locations in Hawai’i. To comply with its obligation to determine whether activities at MMR might be contaminating limu, the Army would not simply assume the levels of arsenic detected are normal and call it a day.

Response: We assume for the purposes of risk assessment that the Arsenic in the limu was all of the inorganic variety, which is the most conservative assumption for human health risk assessment purposes.

The Army is developing a long term monitoring plan for MMR. Further, the Army is considering the inclusion of obtaining appropriate background information on limu and the characteristics of Arsenic contamination in its long term monitoring plan.

Appendix G-8, Appendix F, Pages 6-8: For reasons set forth in the comments Dr. Elston and Rensel previously submitted, we strongly disagree with the Army’s decision to use highly polluted urbanized areas as background locations. The Army’s approach ignored that, in the absence of military use of MMR, the watershed would be in a near pristine state. The Army’s claim that “the most appropriate control watersheds are on the leeward (Waianae) coast of Oahu” cannot be reconciled with its decision to use Sandy Beach, which is located near the far eastern point of the island, as a control.

Response: Section 2 Methods, of the 2009 Marine Resources Study outlines the Army’s decision to sample for marine resources at the selected background locations. In addition, the sampling and analysis plan, which was commented on by the public in 2006, states “samples will be collected from locations distant enough from Makua valley that biota will be unlikely to be affected by target chemicals originating from MMR. Background muliwai will be located in watersheds that are not subject to military activity.”

As long as the background sites selected are representative of ambient conditions for the general Makua vicinity and have not received contamination from MMR, they are considered acceptable as per USEPA (1999, 2002a) risk assessment guidance.

This is a significant concern as there are many potential sources of contamination to the muliwai and nearshore environments other than the MMR. To adequately address the Army's impact alone on Mākua Valley resources, an appropriate control site i.e., background location would be a valley where biotic and abiotic variables are as similar as possible to Mākua. Since inter-watershed transport of contaminants is facilitated by wind and rain, the control valley should have similar wind and rain patterns as that of Mākua.

Page K-85: In response to O1-12, the Army states that, “[d]ue to increased training requirements resulting from transformation increases in numbers of squads, platoons, and companies in newly configured brigades, the Army requires both BAX and CALFEX capabilities on the island of O’ahu.” (Emphasis added). If, in fact, the prior transformation decisions made it a foregone conclusion the Army would return to CALFEX training at MMR (the only location on O’ahu the Army alleges such training can take place), the Army was obliged to evaluate the impacts of training at MMR before making those earlier transformation decisions. See 40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.16, 1508.8, 1508.25 (Army obliged to evaluate indirect and cumulative effects); see also 3/13/08 Earthjustice Comments Re: Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Permanent Stationing of the 2/25th Stryker Brigade Combat Team (February 2008). Its failure to do so would violate NEPA. If, on the other hand, providing CALFEX capabilities at PTA would satisfy the Army’s purpose and need (as the rest of the SDEIS indicates), the statement that CALFEX capabilities are required on O’ahu should be deleted.

Response: The Soldiers of the 25th ID must train at their home station for possible deployment anywhere in the world.

Page K-86: The Army’s statement in Response O1-15 that “the Army has decided not to use C-ridge due to high risk of wildfire: cannot be squared with the description of the Alternative 3, which expressly contemplated the use of C-ridge. See SDEIS at 2-47, Fig. 2-2 & Table 2-5.

Response: The final EIS states that the environmental impacts of training on the ridge located between the north and south lobes of the training area are still addressed in the EIS, but separate ESA Section 7 consultation would also be required prior to conducting such exercises. The Army would not be able to use C-Ridge until completion of the ESA Section 7 consultation.

Appendix G-9, Response to T.S. Dye, Page 1: The Army’s repeatedly refrain that, due to past disturbance, it “would not have surveyed the area in question but for a court order to do so” is a legal non sequitur. The fact is that the Army voluntarily agreed to two separate consent decrees that require it to complete a subsurface archaeological survey of all areas within the south firebreak road. Having made those legally binding commitments, the Army was obliged to carry out the survey in good faith, using a methodology adequate to ensure potential subsurface features would be discovered. It failed to do so.⁸

Response: The Army has completed a subsurface archaeological survey of all areas within the south firebreak road, excluding the improved conventional munitions area.

⁸ Notable, even the Army’s cursory investigation revealed “three previously unrecorded mounds and several other previously unrecorded archaeological features,” which presence “indicates traditional cultural use.” SDEIS Appendix G-9, 2007 Subsurface Archaeology Survey Report at 20.

The Army inaccurately states that, when it circulated its plan for subsurface surveys, Malama Makua “had access to funds to pay for technical assistants.” The 2001 Settlement Agreement permits Malama Makua to use technical assistance funds at only three stages of the EIS process: (1) scoping, (2) during the public comment periods for the contaminations study protocols, and (3) during comment on the draft EIS. 2001 Settlement Agreement §9(a). Malama Makua was, accordingly, obliged to wait until the Army circulated the completed subsurface study for public comments before it would use technical assistance funds to secure Dr. Dye’s services in pointing out the inadequacy of the work the Army carried out. See 2007 Settlement Agreement ¶ 14.

The Army also inaccurately claims the letter it sent on November 16, 2005 (we are not aware of any letter sent on October 17, 2007, which is after the subsurface survey was completed) was a consultation letter. Rather, the letter merely informed Malama Makua and others of the Army’s plans, with no suggestion that any input one might offer could influence those plans. The Army misleadingly claims “the 600 test probes examined in the 2007 report resulted in no findings of archaeological features.” As noted in Table 1 of the 2007 Subsurface Archaeology Survey Report, three shovel test probes has “Notable Deposit and/or Surface Indication of Site.” Two other shovel test probes were “Unexcavated Due to Presence of Previously Unrecorded Archaeological Features.”

Response: The EIS now has additional information in Section 3.10.8 about the archaeological survey. Issues regarding the proper use of funds by Malama Makua are outside the scope of the EIS and are best resolved by discussions between attorneys for the parties.

Appendix G-9, Response to T.S. Dye, Page 2: Having discovered during its subsurface survey “three previously unrecorded mounds and several other previously unrecorded archaeological features,” whose presence “indicates traditional cultural use,” 2007 Subsurface Archaeology Survey Report at 20, the Army has no basis for continuing to assert that prior disturbance means the area within the south firebreak road “was unlikely to yield archaeological features.”

Response: The statement that “prior disturbance means that the area within the south firebreak road was unlikely to yield archaeological features” is in reference to only one of the strata used to determine the stratified random sampling plan (the area where the A and B horizons had been removed by bulldozer activity), and not the area of the south firebreak as a whole.

Thank you for your attention to these comments. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,
David L. Henkin

15. Nanaikapono Civic Club

Mākua as training grounds is a no-no. It is fertile land, people living on it or near it and sacred sites and burial grounds located there that verify our existence and ownership. Military did not cleanup or return it after their first permission was granted – over 60 years.

Response: The Army presents a brief history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

The Iraq war is mostly desert terrain – Mākua is farm land to provide food for an island economy. Why can't you bomb Arizona/California/Texas deserts?

Response: Alternatives that do not advance the purpose and need are not considered reasonable alternatives. The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried forward for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5. This section discusses the reasons the Army considered but eliminated other identified alternatives. There were no locations outside of Hawai'i that could meet all four screening criteria. Other locations considered included Fort Irwin, California, Yakima Training Center, Washington, and Fort Polk, Louisiana. Therefore these locations were dismissed and not considered for further evaluation. While our Soldiers are currently deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan, they must be ready to deploy to places the full spectrum of terrain. See Section 1.3.

Most of military will have less expensive travel costs involved than plane fare to Hawai'i! And does your PX and Commissary buy local food and other products or do you import from the continent? We are an island – help sustain our economy, employ local people, close down smaller base operations – let the dependents go to larger base stores. That's one small way to give back.

Response: The socioeconomic impacts of the proposed action are evaluated and presented in Section 4.12 of the EIS.

Secondly, transporting the bombs thru Farr Hwy. There was a gasoline truck that ran over a bumper for a sidewalk and exploded right in front of St. Rita Church maybe 20 years ago. Amazing no one was killed. But what effect will bombs have if there was an accident.

Ruby K. Maunakea, Nanaikapono Civic Club

Response: As discussed in Chapter 2, the Army seeks to avoid ground transportation of munitions through Farrington Highway and the Wai'anae community whenever possible. Ground transportation may be necessary at times. Chapter 2 also presents the safety measures that would be employed to reduce safety risks associated with such action. The analysis of safety measures is found in Section 4.6 Traffic and Transportation, and 4.11 Hazardous Materials and Waste of the EIS.

16. The Hawaiian-Environmental Alliance

KAHEA: The Hawaiian-Environmental Alliance remains in strong opposition to the U.S. Army's proposal to increase training activities at Mākua Valley or alternatively at Pōhakuloa. KAHEA is a non-profit network of over 6,000 kupuna, Native Hawaiian cultural practitioners, conservationists, and concerned citizens working to improve the quality of life for Hawai'i's people and protect Hawai'i's unique natural and cultural resources.

Mākua is a valley on the west side of O'ahu that is sacred to Kanaka Maoli (Native Hawaiians) and the location of extensive cultural sites and endangered native ecosystems. The U.S. Military began using Mākua for live fire training in the 1920s. In 1942, the Army seized the entire valley, evicted the residents and transformed the once fertile valley into a land of orphaned families, unexploded bombs, fires, and toxic chemicals.

Response: The Army presents a history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. In Section 3.10 the EIS describes the cultural importance of Makua. The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been included in the administrative record for this process.

In 1998, Mālama Mākua sued the Army for failing to conduct an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for all of its destructive activities in Makua. After resisting the requirement to complete and EIS for many years, the Army finally agreed in 2001 to conduct a full EIS. Because the Army failed to meet agreed upon deadlines for completing its EIS, live fire training in Makua has been suspended for more than three years.

Response: The original NEPA suit filed by Mālama Mākua came after 1998. It is true that the Army is completing this EIS long after it had predicted. Part of the reason for that, however, is that it took time to conduct the full analysis that is now in the EIS. The additional information serves both the public, and the Army Decision-maker.

The immediate history of the US Army vis-à-vis Mākua provides a clear reason to deny the reinstating of live-fire training. For seven of the last ten years, the Army has been able to certify its soldiers as trained and carry on its military mission in two wars, all without the use of Mākua Valley as a live-fire training site. Why, then, does the military need to use the valley now?

Response: Without training at MMR, the Army has been able to mitigate its training needs; however, these solutions are not sustainable over the long term. Over the past several years, deployments have meant that there is usually only one brigade of the 25th ID either prepared to conduct the type of training in the proposed action or in Hawai'i. We cannot expect this situation to last forever, and the time will come when the Army must train both brigades simultaneously for deployment world-wide.

Moreover, the draft environmental impact statement is very clear in identifying substantial harms which will be incurred to present and future generations if training is re-started. The SDEIS admits that devastation from wildfires will be even more likely due to the Army's plan to increase training to 242 days of Cal-Fex training and 200 days of convoy/ambush training every year, using munitions that are toxic, inaccurate, and known to cause wildfires. The document even

mentions that training will occur all year long, day and night, despite the fact that fires are more likely during exercises conducted in the dry season and at night. The SDEIS also says that native religious and burial sites – located throughout the valley – will indeed be harmed by training.

Response: The Army has identified an extensive number of mitigation measures that will help reduce the overall environmental impacts as a result of wildfires from implementation of the proposed action. The Army is reviewing all these proposed mitigation measures and will select a number of the measures to implement, based on the Alternative chosen. The selected mitigation measures will be identified in the Record of Decision.

A full discussion of the potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures as they pertain to wildfires resulting from training at MMR (Alternatives 1-3 and the No Action Alternative) is found within Section 4.14.

It is not correct to state that fires are more likely to occur at night. Nighttime conditions consist of cooler temperatures and greater moisture content of the vegetation that are less conducive to fire ignition.

We are also extremely concerned about the lack of analysis regarding groundwater resources and contamination from training activities. The DSEIS mentions the discovery of perchlorate in the soil at Mākua. Perchlorate is an energetic that is linked to cancer, nervous system disorders, and delayed learning. Unfortunately, the SDEIS fails to fully analyze the threat to the public's health from contamination of the groundwater supplies of the Wai'anae Coast. If military training is allowed to process and intensify, then the U.S. Department of Defense must commit to assisting residents with clean up, medical expenses, and other remediation, when the groundwater of the Wai'anae Coast is found to be contaminated.

Response: A report on an extensive investigation of Mākua Military Reservation (MMR) can be found in Appendix G of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact statement. This study included six rounds of ground water sampling. The analytical results did not show any Perchlorate above established regulatory limits (EPA Region IX Preliminary Remediation Goal for Drinking Water). In fact, the results indicate that no explosives or their degradation products are migrating off range at levels of concern as a result of Perchlorate soil contamination. However, the Army will review conditions at MMR at least every five years to assess the threat of off range migration. If those conditions warrant more in-depth evaluation, additional ground and surface water sampling will be conducted to ensure the water resources are protected for future generations.

The Army adequately evaluated the potential for groundwater contamination at MMR, and found that compound levels generally meet EPA Region IX PRGs. From the information gathered to date, there is no evidence that contamination is impacting off-site drinking water sources. Therefore, DoD does not anticipate a requirement to assist with the groundwater contamination issues on the Wai'anae coast.

In the face of this voluminous evidence, the only logical course of action for the military is to devote resources to the demilitarization of the valley. However, the current 'preferred

alternative' is the exact opposite: a radical expansion of military training in Mākua, a land which is the patrimony of our ancestors.

We call on the Army to review and select the community's preferred alternative – which was not even included in the list of alternatives considered – an end to Army training in Mākua, a complete clean up and restoration of the environmental and cultural resources of the valley, and a return of the land to the community in consultation with the Kanaka Maoli people to be managed for sustainable and culturally appropriate uses.

Miwa Tamanaha, Executive Director; and Marti Townsend, Program Director, KAHEA: The Hawaiian-Environmental Alliance

Response: Closure of Mākua is not included because it would not meet the purpose and need of the proposed action. In fact, closure of Mākua would require a great deal of analysis and a separate NEPA document.

17. Timothy J. Pickering, PP McCandless Ranch, L.L.C. & PP85 McCandless Ranch, L.L.C.

Thank you in advance for reviewing our comments on the Army's proposed use of Mākua Military Reservation.

As a neighbor of Mākua Military Reservation, who owns 5/6ths of the 'Ohikilolo Ranch land to the south of MMR, we have several concerns with regard to the ramifications of the Army's proposed Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 described in the Supplemental Draft EIS. These concerns relate to the noise level, air quality, water resources, and hazardous conditions that will, or have the potential, to occur. The No Action Alternative and Alternative 4, however, present considerably less concern and even the possibility for positive consequences of implementation. Therefore we urge the Army to cease further consideration of Alternatives 1-3, and proceed with either of the less invasive No Action Alternative, or Alternative 4.

Response: The Army thanks you for your comment. Each of the alternatives presented within this EIS are being fully considered for implementation. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publication of the Final EIS.

Noise Level

As stated in page ES-14 of the Mākua SDEIS Vol 1 – Executive Summary, noise caused by training at MMR will result in "significant and unmitigable impacts" at Mākua Beach as the projected noise levels conflict with recreational land use. Page ES-18 also states that with Alternative 1, "Significant and unmitigable noise impacts would be expected... as a result of ordnance use" and would even "exceed the Army's planning guidelines for land use compatibility" at Mākua Beach. According to pages ES-14 and ES-15 of the same document, the noise caused by training activities under Alternative 2 will be worse than those under Alternative 1, and Alternative 3 will result in even greater noise than Alternative 2 because of the "use of additional high explosive weapons." According to page 3-56 of Mākua SDEIS Vol 1 – Sec 3.05, The Region of Influence (ROI) for high intensity noise sources, "such as ordnance detonations, may have an ROT extending several miles from the noise source." With our land directly south of MMR and Mākua Beach, we – as well as other neighboring inhabitants and

beachgoers – will certainly be affected. In contrast, under the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4, “Less than significant impacts will result.”

Response: It is correct to say that noise may affect people at Mākua beach, as shown in noise contours in Figures 4.5-1, 4.5-2, 4.5-5, and 4.5-6. Noise contours do not show significant noise impacts to areas directly south of MMR.

Air Quality

While, according to the SDEIS, Alternatives 1-3 would result in (at most) a “short-term increase in air emissions” of a less than significant impact (page ES-18 of the Mākua SDEIS Vol 1 – Executive Summary), we suggest that any decrease in air quality which can be prevented, should. Not only could civilians and sensitive plant and animal species be negatively impacted by a decrease in air quality, but – to briefly digress – one question is whether the most populous county in Hawai’i is an appropriate setting for military training involving life-fire exercises at all.

The No Action Alternative, however, would result in a “minimal increase in air emissions or degradation to air quality,” according to page ES-17, and according to page ES-18, Alternative 4 would result in impacts on air quality which are “Significant... mitigable to less than significant,” however vegetative cover would be reduced or eliminated in some areas, “resulting in increased, susceptibility to emissions from vehicle travel and wind erosion.” Here, the No Action Alternative seems the most logical choice to preserve air quality.

Response: As discussed in Section 4.4, the Army will take steps to minimize the impacts to off-post air quality while providing realistic training. Air quality impacts are not expected to be significant.

Thank you for your participation in the NEPA process. Through the NEPA process, and based on the consideration of comments and information received during the public comment period, the final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

Water Resources

According to page 5 of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment conducted in August of 2003 of ‘Ohikilolo Ranch, lower aquifers on the eastern and western portions of the land have high and moderate vulnerability to contamination, respectively, are used for drinking water, and are irreplaceable – if you would like a copy of this Phase I report, please send your request to Melissa Pickering at pickeringprop@hotmail.com, she will respond with the report as an attachment. Page vi of the same document states that “Because current tenants on the subject property use a private well that derives its water from the same aquifer that underlies MMR,” contaminates at MMR are of major concern. On page 11, we read that arsenic, lead, 2,4 dinitro toluene and 2,6 dinitro toluene were found to be present “in concentrations exceeding EPA public health criteria (PHC) at the open burning/open detonation (OB/OD) unit area at Mākua” in 1998. The same pages described how “The U.S. Army Mākua Military Reservation (MMR) was identified on three databases within the specified search distances from the subject property. MMR was listed as having numerous U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Resource conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) violations between 1987 and 1994.” Even though “all RCRA violations at the MMR have been resolved,” as the report states, there appears to be a history of environmental regulation violations which does not instill confidence in the Army’s ability and/or will to keep the environment, and civilians using water from the shared aquifer, safe from the contaminations they leave behind.

Response: The Army adequately evaluated the potential for groundwater contamination at MMR, and found that compound levels generally meet EPA Region IX PRGs. From the information gathered to date, there is no evidence that contamination is impacting off-site drinking water sources. Therefore, DoD does not anticipate a requirement to assist with the groundwater contamination issues on the Wai'anae coast.

This report cited above claims that the aquifer at this site and MMR are attached and are the same aquifer, and that is not correct. The two are distinct and not attached, separated by the Waianae Mountain Range. Even if it were possible for a tiny component of flow to make it through the Mountains, this would have to occur against regional groundwater flow directions. All of the water within their valley (Ohikilolo Ranch) recharges locally in the mountains just east of the Ranch, and flow from the mountains towards the sea in their little valley. The higher TDS concentrations of 230 to 1000 mg/l shows that there is little recharge in the area. The reader is using the State's aquifer map that does not differentiate within the Waianae Aquifer complex to make this determination. Each valley is its own separate aquifer, with each being a small local flow system. Upon reviewing the report, it is clear that the contamination they found was part of the Ranch operations, such as drum and fuel storage tanks that held hazardous materials and automotive fluids; large volumes of solid waste also found on the property (tires, unprocessed pig feed and biohazardous wastes); and structures located on the property that contained hazardous materials, all sited in the subject report.

History aside, the Mākuā SDEIS Vol 1 – Executive Summary states on page ES-20 that significant and mitigable impacts on water resources would be expected under Alternative 1 due to potential for flooding or runoff which may disperse pollutants. These could travel downstream to the stream channel, on the floodplain, in the *muliwai* or ocean. Alternative 2 would have similar impacts as Alternative 1, however these impacts would increase in magnitude because of the increase in frequency of CALFEX to 50 per year and because of the use of tracer ammunition. Alternative 3 would have impacts similar to Alternative 2, except that the potential for wildfires would increase because of the increase in weapons use. Alternative 4, on the other hand, would have less than significant impacts as “PTA... surface water resources and the groundwater is at a great depth” (page ES-22). Here again, the No Action Alternative or Alternative 4 clearly present the least risk to the environment and to civilians in the vicinity of MMR.

Response: The Army acknowledges there are potential significant impacts associated with the proposed action. The Army is considering each of the alternatives presented in the SDEIS. The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS. The Army will consider the EPA's comment and appreciates your review.

Hazardous Conditions

Alternatives 1-3 will provide increased opportunity for significant impacts to safety with regard to “inconsistencies with state ammunitions transport policies” (page ES-19), wildfires, unexploded ordnance, ricocheting rockets and more (pages ES-17 to ES-34). These hazards are summarized in the following chart:

| Page | Comments |
|------------------|---|
| ES-17 | Alternative 2 – Increased chance of wildfires due to use of tracer ammunition. |
| ES-17 | Alternative 3 – Increased chance of wildfires due to use of tracers, inert TOW missiles, 2.75-caliber rockets, and illumination munitions |
| ES-19 | Alternatives 1,2,3 – Significant and mitigable impacts with regard to “inconsistencies with state ammunitions transport policies” would result. |
| ES-25 | Alternative 1 – During live-fire activities there is a moderate to high likelihood of fire, resulting in significant and unmitigable impacts on sensitive species |
| ES-25 | Alternative 2 – Similar to Alternative 1 impacts however use of tracers could increase frequency and magnitude of wildfires |
| ES-25 – ES-28 | Alternative 3 – Similar to Alternative 2 impacts however use of additional munitions could increase frequency, magnitude and widespreadness of wildfires. For public access areas to cultural sites at MMR, as provided by the 2001 Settlement Agreement, unexploded ordnances only required to be cleared to a depth of 1 foot by the DOD Explosives Safety Board, US Army Technical Care Center for Explosives Safety |
| ES-29, ES-30 | Alternative 3 – “inert TOW missiles and 2.75-caliber rockets have a greater potential for affecting properties due to their greater destructive force and the potential for misfires and ricochets extending beyond specified target areas.” |
| ES-30 | “UXO is buried throughout the installation [MMR] and could be unearthed by natural processes. UXO is a serious safety risk if encountered by members of the public or Army personnel.” |
| ES-30 | Alternative 1 – During live-fire activities there is a moderate to high likelihood of fire, resulting in significant and unmitigable impacts on sensitive species. |
| ES-30, ES-31 | Alternative 1 – “slight increase in hazardous material waste management due to new ammunition, UXO, lead from ammunition, pesticides and general training activities” would result. |
| ES-31 | Alternative 2 – Impacts considered less than significant, similar to Alternative 1, existing mitigation and abatement measures would be followed. |
| ES-31 | Alternative 3 – Impacts considered less than significant, similar to Alternatives 1 and 2, existing mitigation and abatement measures would be followed. |
| ES-31 | Alternative 4 – “Significant impacts mitigable to less than significant would result from increased firing of lead ammunition,” however “Less than significant impacts would result from UXO and ammunition since this alternative is located in an existing impact area that is in a very remote location and is closed to the public.” |
| ES-32 | Alternative 1 – “transporting ammunition along Farrington Highway would increase the risks to public safety, creating significant and mitigable impacts for environmental justice and protection of children.” |
| ES-32 | Alternatives 2,3 – Impacts similar to Alternative 1. |
| ES-32 | Alternative 4 – Less than significant, temporary, but beneficial impacts to the economy, employment, and income of Hawai’i County can be expected for the duration of the range construction. No impacts on environmental justice or protection of children. |
| ES-33 | Alternative 1 – Ammunition which is “new to training at MMR, and that is capable of landing outside the firebreak road” have “historical wildfire ignition records and are capable of igniting wildfires because of their explosive and flammable properties.” |
| ES-33 | “nonmilitary wildfire ignition sources (members of the public and nonmilitary activities) accounted for only five percent of the historical wildfires at MMR,” so the military |

- accounts for 95%?
- ES-34 Alternative 2 – Significant and unmitigable wildfire impacts including those associated w/Alternative 1. Also at least 50 days of live-fire training including tracers, responsible for 49% of historical wildfires. Live-fire training would occur during day and night, and fires more difficult to extinguish at MMR at night. Live-fire training would occur “during the most fire-prone months at MMR.”
- ES-34 Alternative 3 – Impacts similar to Alternative 2 with regard to wildfires, additionally the 2.75-caliber rocket used in this alternative is fired from a helicopter and “has an increased risk of misfiring.” Significant and unmitigable wildfire impacts expected.

In contrast to this long list of potential hazards, Alternative 4 would result in temporary, but beneficial impacts to the economy, employment, and income in Hawai'i County that can be expected for the duration of range construction. There would be no impacts on environmental justice or protection of children, according to page ES-32. However because Ohikilolo Ranch is zoned as AG-2, allowing for one home for 2 or more acres, approximately 300 families could be impacted by the environmental harm incurred by Alternatives 1, 2, or 3 on Ohikilolo Ranch alone.

For all the concerns outlined above, we feel that the only way to ensure residents in the vicinity of MMR are safe, allow them the quiet enjoyment of their homes and public areas, protect the environment, and make the most of our land as its use dictates is to keep live-fire training out of MMR. As such, the No Action Alternative or Alternative 4 present the only sensible options for moving forward.

Timothy J. Pickering, PP McCandless Ranch, L.L.C. & PP85 McCandless Ranch, L.L.C.

Response: The EIS analyzes the impacts to nearby residential areas. These impacts will be taken into account when a decision is made.

18. Life of the Land

For the type of chemicals that are used on the site for fire suppression, for pesticides and herbicides, what chemicals are used? Where are they stored? How are they disposed of? What pipelines exist? What underground facilities exist now that have not been removed?

Response: Class A fire suppression foam, which is analogous to commercial dish detergent, is commercially available and is not treated as a hazardous waste. The primary fire retardant for fighting fires at MMR is water from the dip ponds, which are located on-site. A detailed discussion of hazardous materials such as pesticides and herbicides used at MMR is found in Section 3.11 of the EIS. There is a water pipeline operated by the County Board of Water Supply that provides water service to MMR through a 4-inch diameter underground line located in the state right-of-way. The Army is not aware of any underground facilities at MMR.

There needs to be a complete record search so we can find all the documents that exist on Mākua. If training is not done at Mākua, if Mākua is rejected as a site, what would be your second choice, and why, on the islands? What are the best sites for alternative types of training?

Response: The Army is compiling a full administrative record as required by 40 CFR Part 1500 and in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 557(d) Administrative Procedures Act.

The Army has presented a No Action Alternative and four (4) Action Alternatives for the public to review and provide comment. A description of the proposed action and alternatives is found in Section 2 of the EIS. The decision maker will choose one of these Alternatives. The decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publication of the Final EIS.

What do military people do when they are relaxing? At Ka'ena Point, where there is home to a lot of endangered plant species, military people drive around, do wheelies, round -- roundabout driving, off road at Ka'ena Point, and there have been a number of endangered species that have been run over. So how do you educate military people so that they don't destroy the environment after they've left MMR and they recreate?

Response: The Army has an active volunteer program associated with its natural resource program geared towards educating Soldiers, their families, and the general public regarding the sensitivity of the Hawaiian landscape and the importance of conserving it. In addition, the natural resource program gives monthly classes to Soldiers regarding conservation best practices.

What are the alternatives to training at Mākua? Is there a plan to phase out training at Mākua and what is it? What would the Army do if your access was blocked or denied to Mākua? Where would you go?

Response: The Army has presented a No Action Alternative and four (4) Action Alternatives for the public to review and provide comment. A description of the proposed action and alternatives is found in Section 2 of the EIS. The impact analysis of the proposed action against each alternative is presented in Section 4. The decision maker will choose one of these Alternatives to implement. The decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publication of the Final EIS.

What type of weapons will you use? Please describe them, the type of training surrounding their use and what happens to spent bullets or ordnances.

Response: The types of weapons proposed for use is listed in Table 2-3 Weapons and Ammunition Analyzed for Use at MMR and PTA. Discussion of live-fire and the hazards associated with surface danger zones (SDZ) is discussed extensively throughout the entire EIS. Discussion of spent bullets and ordnances is discussed in Section 2.4.3 of the EIS.

How will you transport weapons to Mākua from Schofield or wherever you're going to transport them from? What are the impacts of transporting weapons? What are the traffic imports of transporting weapons if it's done by truck?

Response: Section 2.4.3 of the EIS describes the method of transport of weapons and munitions as they relate to both MMR and PTA. The transport of ammunition would be conducted early in the morning and late in the afternoon, during non-peak commuting hours to reduce the safety impacts to the community. Ammunition and

weapons are handled in strict accordance with applicable Army and internal range safety regulations designed to secure and protect weapons and ammunition. In addition, weapons are segregated from ammunition to eliminate accidental misfires and detonation.

How many soldiers will be training during each exercise? How long will each training exercise last?

Response: A description of training exercises, as they relate to the proposed action and as they related to the No Action Alternative or Alternatives 1-3, is found throughout Section 2 of the EIS.

How are troops transported to and from Schofield? Will they travel in convoys? How often? How many trucks in a convoy? What are the truck impacts expected to be? Please include how many trucks in the convoy, the average number of soldiers in each convoy, the equipment, the type of equipment and the explosibility of any equipment that would be transported by truck, how often these convoys are expected to travel. How will the community be notified of these convoys so they can figure out when they can leave or enter their homes?

Response: As discussed above, a description of transportation actions required as it relates to the proposed action is found throughout Section 2. The associated impacts relevant to each Alternative is found in Section 4.6 of the EIS.

Has the Army considered helping the state pay for an access road? If not, why? What is your safety plan if the road or access to the valley is blocked? In case of emergency, do you have a safety plan for your soldiers and for the community? Please outline that.

Response: The current transportation conditions regarding the use of MMR and PTA are discussed in Section 3.6. The analysis of potential impacts associated with Alternatives 1-3 are evaluated in Section 4.6. This discussion involves safety analyses and risks.

Does training involve setting fire to clear the training area? What's your fire safety plan? I did read the EA and found it deficient in this area. To protect — what's your safety plan to protect the environment, the community and your troops? Please describe in detail, noting the Army's holding area for people awaiting transportation, medevac, etc. Does the Army have an area designed for triage or medical care? Where would that be?

Response: The Army's fire safety plans as they pertain to prescribed burns and live-fire training at MMR (Alternatives 1-3) is discussed in Sections 3.14 and 4.14. The Army's Integrated Wildfire Management Plan is found in appendix J of the SDEIS. In addition, the Army prepares a site-specific prescribed burn plan for each individual burn.

Will helicopters be used? How often? How low will they fly? How will you mitigate the noise impacts and the disturbance to the community? What is the risk of helicopter accidents? Please look at -- describe accidents, helicopter accidents that have happened, the impacts of those accidents and how they were handled and how community safety will be assured.

Response: The use of helicopters at both MMR and PTA is discussed throughout the SDEIS. Noise impacts associated with helicopter use is explored in Sections 3.5 and 4.5.

Safety conditions associated with the use of helicopters and other forms of aviation are discussed in Sections 3.2 and 4.2. Aircraft leaving and arriving at WAAF follow well-defined flight corridors, in accordance with the air traffic, general operating rules, and flight rules of Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 91 and Army Regulation (AR) 95-1.

Will the community be given the flight schedules in advance? How will you send -- how? Will you send letters to the residents? Will you post a notice in the local papers of the two dailies? Please outline your plan.

Response: Due to security considerations, the Army does not publish flight schedules in advance. Discussion of aircraft maneuvers as they pertain to MMR and PTA alternatives may be found in Sections 2.4.3, 3.2 and 4.2.

Noise questions by the public that are related to aircraft maneuver may be directed to (808) 656-3159.

What's the procedure for preparing areas for ranges? Please detail the study of the areas intended. Please describe in detail your archaeological surveys. Will you do subsurface archaeological surveys? If not, why?

Response: Range preparation and clearance, as it pertains to the protection of archaeological and cultural resources is governed by NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. The Army strictly follows these policies. Archeological surveys associated with MMR are discussed extensively in Sections 3.10 and 4.10 of the EIS. The full subsurface archaeological survey report (including public involvement discussion) is found in Appendix G-9 of the SDEIS.

How will the community be protected in case a fire rages out of control?

Response: The Army's fire control policies as they pertain to MMR and PTA are detailed in the Integrated Wildfire Management Plan, found in Appendix J of the SDEIS, and published on the US Army Garrison Hawai'i web site. In addition, the Army prepares a site-specific prescribed burn plan for each individual burn that outlines safety measures.

What's the Army's responsibility to the community and the environment should people become sick because of past or present actions? What tests will be done to assure the community their groundwater is not or will not be contaminated?

Response: The Army takes its responsibilities to public health very seriously, and as such, has conducted studies at MMR to sample for contaminants, and identify the potential for contaminants to pose a human health concern. These studies, found in Appendix G of the SDEIS, include a Hydrogeologic Investigation Report and a *Muliwai* Sediment Sampling Report. In addition, a Marine Resources Study was completed to determine whether consumable marine resources near Mākua Beach and in the Mākua *muliwai* are contaminated with constituents primarily associated with proposed training activities at MMR.

The Army is also recommending to adopt a long-term monitoring plan, as discussed in SDEIS Table ES-6 Summary of Key Mitigation Measures. Mitigations that the Army will adopt will be included as part of the Record of Decision (ROD), published no sooner than 30-days after publishing the FEIS.

Does the Army train on lands which they don't own in other places? Do they pay rent for those lands? What kinds of agreements or contracts with those communities do they have? Please include the other public or private lands used along with names and contact information of other communities and copies of any agreements or contracts you have with them.

Response: The Army only trains in approved locations. The comment, and information related to the comment is outside the scope of this EIS.

What do you do after training is over? Please detail the cleanup plan and restoration plan for Mākua. What is your plan to communicate with the community? What and how do you clean up unexploded ordnances? Are there unexploded ordnances in the ocean? How do you retrieve them? How are they detonated?

Response: Cleanup as it relates to training activities on HI is discussed in Section 2.4.3 of the EIS.

How do you test the ocean for effects on marine life and subsistence fishers?

Response: The Army prepared a study of the marine resources for the muliwai and Makua Beach near shore area, published February 2007 and a supplemental study was published January 2009. The sampling and analysis plan, including the study methodology, was available for public comment. The results of this study have been incorporated into the EIS.

What contaminants, if any, are found -- what if contaminants are found in the land and water in 60 years, will the Army be liable to clean it up and to pay for medical bills in the community? What is your health plan for the community? Will any nuclear weapons be used?

Response: A report on an extensive investigation of the Marine Resources Study can be found in Appendix G of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact statement, and is incorporated into the Final EIS. The Army is developing a long term monitoring plan for MMR that will be available for public comment in 2009.

Will troops be staying at overnight at Mākua? Where? What happens to their waste? How is that disposed of?

Response: The Army anticipates nighttime training activities will occur as they relate to the Proposed Action and Alternatives. Hazardous Waste disposal activities are discussed in detail in Sections 3.11 and 4.11 of the EIS. Human waste is dealt with in Section 3.13.7.

Where will weapons be stored? Has that area been surveyed?

Response: Ammunition storage points are discussed in Section 3.11 of the EIS. Discussion of potential impacts from ammunition use and storage as related to Alternatives 1-4 is found in Section 4.11 of the EIS.

Cleanup after training is done in one day? How? What equipment is needed to do this? They worked on Kahoolawe for many, many years. \$400 million will clean up ten percent of that island.

Response: Concerning your comments on cleaning up following a training event, Section 2.4.3 Combined Live-Fire / Maneuver Training of the SDEIS describes a typical five-day CALFEX training event – planning the exercise, movement to the range, preparation and dry fire, live-fire exercise, and cleanup. Cleanup is on day five and sometimes at the end of day four, and includes removal of target equipment, brass casings, litter, and disposal of UXO and mortar/artillery propellant charges.

Kahoolawe is completely isolated by water and is much larger than MMR. It is not comparable to Mākuā.

What is the chance of shooting outside the valley? Please assess the cumulative impacts of this.

Response: The direction of fire is toward the mountain and not toward the beach. Surface Danger Zones (SDZ) discussion is found throughout the EIS. In addition, new text discussing how SDZs are determined at MMR, and safety measures taken has been added to Chapter 2.

The danger of an indirect round leaving the valley is minimal with the safety measures currently in place. First, limited firing charges are used to reduce the maximum range of the weapon. Second, Fire Direction Control procedures include computer and hand trajectory calculations, multiple checks on both the gun line and the FDC of data and gun settings by several individuals, and review of historical data to ensure that the gun is aimed in the correct direction and aligned for the change in elevation to preclude rounds from leaving the valley. Third, rounds with the longest range are also the heaviest and are therefore less likely to be affected by wind during the flight time.

Cleanup should be to the level when the Army leaves that the community could go in and actually grow food crops in the area and eat them without fear. Identify all streams and stream life to assure contamination is not going into the ocean. If it is, please tell us how you mitigate this. How or will land contamination affect streams and our drinking water?

Response: Levels of potential contamination from Army activities were very low, below EPA Region IX PRGs, and no cleanup of soil, surface water, or groundwater is required. In addition, restoration is not within the scope of this environmental impact statement; however, responsible and sustainable use and management of Army lands and the protection of DoD personnel and the public from explosive hazards on operational ranges is detailed in Department of Defense Directive 4715.11 Environmental and Explosives Safety Management on Operational Ranges Within the United States (May 10, 2004).

Discussion of streams and other resources that are monitored for contamination at MMR is found within Appendix G of the SDEIS.

Chemical exposure to risks over time, are they cumulative? What is the interaction of the different chemicals that you find with each other and does that create something worse? Determine past practices by interviewing people who worked and trained at Mākua and report that info into the document. Try to create a historical record so we can understand what happened there and how we can ameliorate the damage.

Response: Levels of potential contamination from Army activities were very low, below EPA Region IX PRGs, and no cleanup of soil, surface water, or groundwater is required. Interactions between trace levels of chemicals in the subsurface are unlikely to create a compound at a detectable concentration level to pose a risk to environmental or human health.

Restoration is not within the scope of this environmental impact statement. The Army conducted several studies regarding potential contamination of surface water, groundwater, and within the *muliwai* and nearshore areas outside of Mākua. These studies are detailed thoroughly in the SDEIS. The results of these studies are found in Sections 4.7 Water Resources, 4.8 Geology and Soils, 4.9 Biological Resources, and 4.11 Hazardous Materials and Waste. The full text version of all field investigations conducted in support of this EIS are found in Appendix G of the SDEIS.

What are the bird/helicopter interactions and mitigation disturbing nesting birds?

Response: Bird/helicopter interaction is best analyzed as a function of noise disturbance. Noise related to the effects of aircraft overflights to birds is found in Section 3.9 and 4.9 of the EIS. Noise data is further defined in Appendix F of the SDEIS.

Henry Curtis, Life of the Land

Individuals // General Comments

19. (Form Letter): Peter Sanderson; Elle Wilhite; Eva Collins; Kathy-Lyn Allen; Virginia W. Walden; Rosemary Bak; Miwa; Suzanne Garrett; Anne Springall; Anonymous

I am writing to express my opposition to any expansion of live-fire training by the U.S. Army in Mākua Valley.

According to its current proposal, the Army plans to fire over two million munitions annually – further destroying the beautiful and sacred Mākua Valley during their proposed 242 days a year of war games.

Response: The Army identifies and evaluates five alternatives. Under the No Action Alternative no live-fire would occur at Mākua Military Reservation (MMR). Alternative 4 would occur on the Big Island at Pōhakuloa Training Area (PTA) thereby no live-fire activities would occur at Mākua Military Reservation. Chapter 2, Table 2-4 identifies for the reader the approximate number of rounds expended at MMR under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 associated with Convoy Live-fire Weapons and Munitions Usage. Table 2-6 provides the reader estimates of Annual Munitions Expended for Daytime and Nighttime CALFEX activities. None of the alternatives identified in the EIS will result in even two million rounds of ammunition fired annually. The EIS also identifies mitigations that would reduce environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

These munitions include the most threatening illumination munitions, 120mm HE mortars, 155 HE howitzers, inert TOW missiles and 2.75 caliber rockets, some of which will be launched from helicopters, and all of which the Army admits will increase chances of wildfire and “physical damage and loss of mana for the Native Hawaiian culture” (SEIS 4-199).

Mākua Valley is home to numerous sacred and cultural sites, including Heiau and a fishing shrine. It is also habitat for 41 endangered species of plants and animals which make their home in or near the valley. In addition to contamination, noise, and other disturbance that will be caused by this proposed expansion, the risk of devastating impacts of wildfire caused by Army war games are unacceptable.

Any further desecration of our sacred sites is unacceptable. Limiting access to the valley is not acceptable.

(Form Letter): Peter Sanderson; Elle Wilhite; Eva Collins; Kathy-Lyn Allen; Virginia W. Walden; Rosemary Bak; Miwa; Suzanne Garrett; Anne Springall; Anonymous

Response: The Army makes every required effort to protect cultural sites at MMR through site protection measures, avoidance, changes to training scenarios and the realignment of SDZs. In Sections 4.9 and 4.10 of the SDEIS, the Army assessed impacts to all natural and cultural resources consistent with NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act, and the Endangered Species Act. The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been included in the administrative record for this process. Note that

some munitions such as illumination would not be allowed under the proposed action.

20. Dave Kisor

I was in a Carrier Airwing Light Attack, “To break things and hurt people,” so very aptly stated by a Marine Corps Aviator. My parents had both served Army, Dad in the Artillery & Intelligence (he hated G2, but unfortunately he was too damned good at it) and Mom served Motor Transport, Medical (Enlisted Nurse – Med-Surg) and was also an Army Woman’s Doubles Tennis Champion. I fully understand the need for readiness and training, but it should not be at the expense of those you are supposed to be defending. I shouldn’t have to tell you about the animosity that exists between some locals and the military in Hawai’i. It existed when Dad was stationed at Shafter in the 1960s and I’ve heard of recent incidents.

The local citizenry does not want live-fire exercises destroying their land, and particularly their sacred spots and even the act of digging a mortar pit would be enough to cause grief and anguish. This expansion could be deemed as an unnecessary encroachment. If you really need live fire, what’s to stop you from loading on a C-17 to Fort Irwin, where the facilities exist? If the public bitches about the cost, tell them you have to train and the closest live fire training ground is in southern California. Life is a series of trade offs. Instead of walking out of your front door, make a detachment out of it, just like the real thing, getting hauled around the world. You spend more time carrying your weapon than you do firing it anyway.

You aren’t alone. Approximately 95% of the population in and around Vicenza, Italy do not want the U.S. Military air base built at Dal Molin.

Kipling wrote “Tommy,” about a British Redcoat that seems to endure. (It was written in the late 19th century, but you should understand it.) <<Transcribed “Tommy”>>

Dave Kisor

Response: Alternatives that do not advance the purpose and need are not considered reasonable alternatives. The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried forward for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5. This section discusses the reasons the Army considered but eliminated other identified alternatives. There were no locations outside of Hawai’i that could meet all four screening criteria. Other locations considered included Fort Irwin, California, Yakima Training Center, Washington, and Fort Polk, Louisiana. Therefore these locations were dismissed and not considered for further evaluation.

21. Bonnie Bonse

I understand that the US Army wants to expand live-fire exercises in Mākua Valley on O’ahu. I strongly disagree with this plan.

Mākua is home to Kamuakuopio Heiau, the Mākua Koa (fishing shrine), and many other sacred and cultural sites. In and around this valley live 41 endangered species of plants and animals.

Live munitions and the threat of wildfires caused by these destructive weapons makes this an unthinkable choice. Already, there has been too much desecration of Hawai'i's land and sacred places. There is no right, or just, reason to cause the Hawaiian people to have limited access to their land, much less to destroy it with violence! It is wrong, simply not acceptable.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my feelings about this vital issue.

Bonnie Bonse

Response: The Army makes every required effort to protect cultural sites at MMR through site protection measures, avoidance, changes to training scenarios and the realignment of SDZs.

In Sections 4.9 and 4.10 of the SDEIS, the Army assessed impacts to all natural and cultural resources consistent with NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

As part of the NEPA process, the Army has developed a No Action Alternative and 4 reasonable alternatives that support the Proposed Action. The Army seeks input from the public on these alternatives. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been included in the administrative record for this process. Because the reviewer is only requesting a certain course of action, no changes to the EIS will result from this comment.

22. Amelia Gora

Opposition to Makua, Schofield, Pohakuloa Live Ammunition Practices by the Military in our Hawaiian archipelago. As recorded in the Meeting held at the Wahiawa District Park on October 7, 2008, Tuesday, 7:30 p.m. approximately.

I, Amelia kuulei Gora, gave a four (4) minute Opposition to the use of our lands by the Military in Makua, in Schofield, and Pohakuloa.

The following are excerpts of the opposition documented in the midst of uniformed, military personnel, armed police officers looking to arrest people:

“My name is Amelia Kuulei Gora, I write Hawaiian history books, and am the editor of the news on the web the IOLANI – The Royal Hawk...scientists send articles pertaining to DEPLETED URANIUM, the effects, etc...have you ever seen YouTube and noticed the eight-legged girl, babies with two faces, babies with red bubble eyes, etc...well, that's what happens when DEPLETED URANIUM is used in the environment!”

Response: The types of munitions that are planned for usage at Mākua Military Reservation do not contain Depleted Uranium. AR 385-63, Range Safety, prohibits the use of DU ammunition for training worldwide. This policy has been in effect for over 20 years. At this point the Army has been unable to confirm the presence of Depleted

Uranium at Mākua. Discussion regarding the historical use of munitions containing Depleted Uranium in Hawai'i is found in Chapter 3.11 of this document.

Although DU is slightly radioactive and is considered a toxic metal, such as nickel and lead, a wide range of governmental and independent non-governmental bodies have studied the environmental effects of DU for decades and indicate that the health risks associated with DU exposures are low. Uranium is a naturally occurring heavy metal that is mildly radioactive. Humans and animals have always ingested particles of this naturally occurring substance from the air, water and soil.

This important article from the New York Times dates January 9, 1893 shows a premeditated move on the part of the U.S. to dethrone our Queen in 1893...seven (7) days later, she was dethroned, and this article found by one of the researchers only two (2) months ago shows that the U.S. did premeditate, and are occupiers in our Hawaiian islands.

Someone used a Hawaiian word "Pono" and I have to say, "How dare you use OUR Hawaiian word to describe all that you have here!" This is NOT PONO!...everything here shows the lands that the military plans to destroy, ruin...what did we do to you people? You've failed to show the toxins, the use of DEPLETED URANIUM, the deleterious effects on people, etc...there is nothing about what kind of live fire, what it's made of...realistically DEPLETED URANIUM is part of it...

Response: The types of munitions that are planned for usage at Mākua Military Reservation do not contain Depleted Uranium. AR 385-63, Range Safety, prohibits the use of DU ammunition for training worldwide. This policy has been in effect for over 20 years. At this point the Army has been unable to confirm the presence of Depleted Uranium at Mākua. Discussion regarding the historical use of munitions containing Depleted Uranium in Hawai'i is found in Chapter 3.11 of this document.

Although DU is slightly radioactive and is considered a toxic metal, such as nickel and lead, a wide range of governmental and independent non-governmental bodies have studied the environmental effects of DU for decades and indicate that the health risks associated with DU exposures are low. Uranium is a naturally occurring heavy metal that is mildly radioactive. Humans and animals have always ingested particles of this naturally occurring substance from the air, water and soil.

I'm one of Kamehameha's, Isaac Davis, John Young's etals. descendants...and for those who don't know who they were, they were part of our Hawaiian history, the owners of these lands...the owners still exist...and I am one of them...for the record, I say NO, you cannot use our lands to muck it up, use military fire to destroy, harm, make toxic, our environment!

I am the Acting Liaison of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Hawaii and I hereby document in this meeting OPPOSITION to the use of military firearms in Hawaii/our Hawaiian Islands...Hawaii is and remains a neutral, nonviolent nation...and what does that mean? It means NO MILITARY ARMS, no practices, use of our lands for WAR purposes, etc.

I am on the record as having sent e-mails, letters OPPOSING military use of our lands. This testimony will also be sent, recorded as e-mail, etc. and posted around the world as well.

Lastly, as a reminder, rents and leases are due to our Kingdom of Hawaii in the amount of \$500 trillion dollars in gold coins per year, retroactively to 1893. Thank you.'

(surprisingly I got claps even though my voice became extremely loud at times. The recording of the meeting was made via video and court reporter notes on the archaic machine for the records.)

For the record, I have three (3) copies of the PEARL HARBOR TREATY article dates January 9, 1893 to two officers at the front who were prepared to answer questions, and the court reporter. The officers were non-smiling, numb, cold, and likened to dead persons sitting in an upright position.

I left the meeting after another long time researcher named Kealoha Kuhia gave his testimony OPPOSING live fire, military in Hawaii.

End of meeting notes ----

The following was posted on the English forums:

Public Post of the U.S. Premeditation against a neutral, friendly, non-violent nation; and Rents and Leases are due.

Amelia Gora

Response: [The Army presents a brief history of the Mākuā land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. A historical overview is also found in Section 3.10.3. The events that occurred in 1893 and the subsequent recognition of Hawai'i as a US territory are beyond the scope of this EIS, and have nothing to do with the proposed action.](#)

23. Amelia Gora, Acting Liaison of Foreign Affairs, Kingdom of Hawai'i, O'ahu, Hawai'i / Mokupuni Pae Aina o Hawai'i

The U.S. made a move to usurp the Kingdom of Hawai'i's Queen, a neutral non-violent nation which is documented and there are ramifications which affects Hawai'i and the World....

ARTICLE RE: PEARL HARBOR COALING STATION.; IMPERATIVE NECESSITY THAT THE UNITED STATES TAKE POSSESSION

January 9, 1893, Wednesday
Page 9, 1176 words

WASHINGTON, Jan. 8. – The United States, through the inactivity of the Navy Department and the indifference of the State Department, is likely to lose the only coaling station of which it stands in real need. Nothing has been done since 1884, when the Pearl Harbor site in the Hawaiian Islands became available, beyond a number of surveys which have abundantly demonstrated the excellence of this harbor as a site for a naval station. [END OF FIRST PARAGRAPH]

View full article <http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9FOCE6DC1F3FEF33A257ACA0A9679C94629ED7CF>

Note: the article is dated January 9, 1893...the criminal dethronement of our Queen took place seven (7) days later...

Monies of our nation were assumed by criminals, conspirators/terrorists/Pirates of the Pacific for their own government, the U.S. and partner England.

The monies were assumed through President McKinley's Vice President's bank – because he was an international banker who did international transfers and then sold his back to the James Morgan bankers, the agents for BANKRUPT U.S. and England in 1893 because both nations (along with France) were in financial straits due to the American Civil War.

Congressmen celebrated the wealth of the U.S. shortly after the wrongful, planned dethronement of our Queen in 1893...did you know that the U.S. was documented in a depression, many of the bankers were going under and out of business and were 'saved' by the investments of the James Morgan bankers...partners in crime agents.

Roosevelt allowed the Federally owned Federal Reserves to be purchased by private persons, and he allowed the monopoly by the Standard Oil Company (evolved into EXXON Corporation) to continue...Congress failed to control the corporations who had attorneys maintain their existence outside of the U.S. and gain military protection, which included the road to WAR since 1893...Spain got it, Germany got it, Japan got it (including micronecians), even Iraq...and the eye to WAR continues...

The U.S. is a brokeass nation that has criminally utilized monies stolen off of a neutral, friendly, non-violent nation...and everyone needs to take heed due to the financial ruins that it has created for all who have failed to track the history of the evils...the new world/One world order is the goal...

The Bank of England funds both sides of every war...the U.S. is over the debt level and has been out of control since criminally assuming the Kingdom of Hawai'i's assets...a U.S. representative approached our nation for loans and was denied because they wouldn't have paid back for thousands of years the full principal amount, instead they would pay only small amounts of interest...

Although the U.S. acts as the bully in the world for it is a mere "colony of the Crown (of England)", it is a corporation too that is bound like a slave to many nations that it owes monies to...especially China!

Rents and Leases are owed to our Kingdom of Hawai'i in the amount of \$500 trillion dollars in gold coins per year retroactively to 1893...this is an ongoing reminder to U.S. President George W. Bush as well --- this is one of the public notices for the world to see.
Aloha.

Response: The Army presents a brief history of the Mākuā land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. A historical overview is also found in Section 3.10.3. The events that occurred in 1893 and the subsequent recognition of Hawai'i as a US territory are beyond the scope of this EIS, and have nothing to do with the proposed action.

IOLANI – The Royal Hawk Vol III No. 204 Wednesday –Continued OPPOSITION TO MILITARY, DU WEAPONRY, ETC. In the Hawaiian Islands

Citing Article: ARMY CONFIRMS DU AT POHAKULOLOA- by Bob Nichols
Citing YouTube video decrying U.S. use of DU throughout the world and infant deformities attributed to exposure to DU.

Amelia Gora, Acting Liaison of Foreign Affairs
Kingdom of Hawaii, Oahu, Hawaii / Moku-puni Pae Aina o Hawaii

Response: AR 385-63, Range Safety, prohibits the use of DU ammunition for training worldwide. This policy has been in effect for over 20 years.

24. Nedra McKnight

Dear Gentlepersons: Please do not do live fire exercises in Wai'anae or Mākuā Valley!

I understand that our Soldiers need to be trained, but please do not do live fire exercises on O'ahu. Hawai'i is a beautiful treasure. The coast and valleys of Wai'anae represents the unspoiled beauty and connection to past generations.

Response: The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

Live fire exercises create waste. There is not enough known about potential health hazards from Depleted Uranium. Please protect our land and the people of this island. Please save this beautiful island for generations to come. Protect our island. Keep it as safe, clean and unspoiled as possible.

Sincerely,
Nedra McKnight

Response: The types of munitions that are planned for usage at Mākuā Military Reservation do not contain Depleted Uranium. AR 385-63, Range Safety, prohibits the use of DU ammunition for training worldwide. This policy has been in effect for over 20 years. At this point the Army has been unable to confirm the presence of Depleted Uranium at Mākuā. Discussion regarding the historical use of munitions containing Depleted Uranium in Hawai'i is found in Chapter 3.11 of this document.

More than 40 years of research by more than 160 independent and government agencies and individuals has proven that depleted uranium is not a cause for health concerns at the low concentrations associated with the historical use of the M101 spotting round.

25. Wyatt Kang

I personally am glad that the military is here in Hawai'i. The need for training the troops is vital, to be ready, fit and trained is critical for Soldier survival. I support your efforts and your need for training.

Wyatt Kang

Response: The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

26. Faith Arakawa

I am a resident of the Wai'anae Coast. My opinion is that the United States military promised to return Mākua after World War Two ended. The United States should keep its promise which is long overdue.

Faith Arakawa

Response: The Army presents a brief history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. The long-term status of MMR and legal title to it are beyond the scope of this EIS.

27. Donald G. Aten

Sirs: It is my view that the majority of the citizens of Hawai,i, including me, does NOT object to our Soldiers using Mākua Valley for live-fire training. Indeed, the US Army has proven to be a far better steward of the land, and the environment in general, than either our City or State government.

Moreover, the imperative of providing adequate (and cost-effective) training of our Soldiers can not be over emphasized. I fought with the 1st Marine Division in Korea during the first year of the Korean War and I can vouch from personal experience that inadequate training costs lives.

Response: The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

One final observation. I find it somewhat amusing (and disconcerting) how land that has been totally ignored for untold decades miraculously becomes "sacred." I have been a Hawaii resident for over half a century and I have the utmost respect for the history and culture of Hawaii. However it is my observation that there are individuals who improperly exploit that history and culture in a manner that is not in the best interest of either our State or our Nation.

Donald G. Aten

Response: The Army is dedicated to fulfilling its responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. The Army has conducted extensive research to the cultural resources present at both MMR and PTA. The results of this research is found within Section 3.10 of this EIS. The Army has based the analysis of potential impacts of the proposed action in part on this documentation. The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

28. Jacquelyn Chappel

Has the military not learned the lesson of Kahoolawe? You don't practice live ammunition in beautiful places. It doesn't make any sense in the world.

Hawai'i's major resources here in the middle of the Pacific Ocean is our land. Firing live ammunition in a valley considered sacred to its native people is just counter-intuitive. Even if it were not considered sacred ground, why in the world would you choose this valley to practice with live ammunition?! Go to Nevada for goodness sakes. Or Arizona or South Dakota!! Not a sacred valley in Hawai'i. This is a no-brainer.

The military should end the controversy surrounding their activity at Mākua Valley by leaving. For now though they should definitely NOT practice live ammunition here.

Jacquelyn Chappel

Response: The EIS considers conducting required training at sites in the continental United States at Section 2.5.3. To be carried forward for full evaluation, all reasonable alternative training locations must meet the Army's four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5.3. The continental United States alternative would not meet the purpose of the proposed action.

29. Kevin G. O'Grady

I completely support the use of the land by the Army and believe that the Army will administer the land properly. I live in Hawai'i and as a reservist I am honored to have the Army use the land for training to defend our country. Ense et Aratro

Kevin G. O'Grady

Response: The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

30. Alan Gormezano

Has there been enough destruction of sacred lands already?

It is time to stop destroying Hawai'i as practice to destroy other lands and peoples.

This land and the people of this land have been crying out for this to stop, and instead it is being proposed to be increased.

How can you be the protectors of freedom, when the results of the actions of the military in Hawai'i have been to destroy the freedoms of the people of Hawai'i and of even the lands.

I ask you to show yourselves and the rest of us what freedom really means, and free this land from destruction once and for all. Thank you.

Response: The Army is dedicated to fulfilling its responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. The Army has conducted extensive research to the cultural resources present at both MMR and PTA. The results of this research is found within Section 3.10 of this EIS. In Section 4.10 of the SDEIS, the Army assessed impacts to all cultural resources consistent with NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

31. Jeannine Johnson

As a Native Hawaiian, I object to the use of Mākua Valley for the purposes of live-fire military training exercises which use toxic and hazardous chemicals and materials on ceded lands. I also strongly object to increasing the land area for which the Army may use live ammunition, missiles, and rockets which can ignite wildfires in an area rich in endemic species and ancient cultural sites.

Hawaiians know that the 'āina sustains us, supports us and is the foundation of our culture.

"Man is merely the caretaker of the land that maintains his life and nourishes his soul. Therefore, the 'āina is sacred. The church of life is not in a building, it is the open sky, the surrounding ocean, the beautiful soil..." George Helm, January 1977

Even the Department of Land and Natural Resources is interested in balancing the protection and use of our natural and cultural resources in a better, sustainable way to protect the special natural and cultural heritage of Hawai'i because "We are all po'e mālama 'āina, people who care for the land and the sea."

Response: The Army remains dedicated to the protection of natural and cultural resources at MMR. Pursuant to this cause the Army has adopted a number of resource management policies and procedures that it implements based on input from Federal and State agencies, and the public. Examples of these include the Makua Implementation Plan, Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, Integrated

Wildland Fire Management Plan, and Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.

In Sections 4.9 and 4.10 of the SDEIS, the Army assessed impacts to all natural and cultural resources consistent with NEPA, the Endangered Species Act, the Sikes Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. In addition, the Army does not plan to expand range areas outside the existing footprint of either MMR or PTA.

As a Mother of a Soldier who received excellent combat training at the Army's facility in New Jersey at Fort Dix prior to his first deployment to Afghanistan, I know there is no need to continue to destroy Hawai'i's unique and fragile environment with military munitions that create environmental and human health dangers with contaminated soil and groundwater.

I respectfully request your kōkua in protecting our 'āina and cultural heritage for generations to come by precluding the use of Mākua Valley for the purpose of live-fire military training exercises.

Ua mau ke ea o ka 'āina I ka pono!

Jeannine Johnson

Response: The EIS considers conducting required training at sites in the continental United States at Section 2.5.3. To be carried forward for full evaluation, all reasonable alternative training locations must meet the Army's four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5.3. The continental United States alternative would not meet the purpose of the proposed action.

32. Luella Nohea Chang-Crutcher

To Whom it may concern:

I humbly beseech you to support, protect and respect our spiritual sites and our land. We are small islands. We are minute compared to the vast space of land you have available on the mainland. The military has destroyed one of our islands (Kaho'olawe). Don't you think that is enough destruction here? You have not bothered to clean up that space or the other spaces here that you have contaminated. Now you want more!!!

Response: The Army is a dedicated steward of the land at MMR. This is evidenced in our award winning natural resources management programs (for example, the 2006 and 2008 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Military Installation Conservation Partner Award). The Army spends millions of dollars annually on the conservation and management of endangered species, cultural resources, and clearance of unexploded ordnance to promote cultural access. The Army also monitors the land at MMR for potential transport of pollutants caused by military actions, which is evident by the Army's Marine Resources Study, Hydrogeologic Investigations, and the Army's Operational Range Assessment Program.

The type of land you need to use for military practice is probably closer to desert areas in the mainland. Find sites there. The military is using enough land here in the islands, you do not need to desecrate and ruin more of our precious island. Use the mainland --- or elsewhere.

Response: Training requirements are constantly changing based on lessons learned in combat, training events, new equipment, and new commanders. The Soldiers of the 25th ID must train at their home station for possible deployment anywhere in the world.

Also – when Japan bombed Pearl Harbor, it was because of your presence. So please leave. These countries that are angry at America, are angry at you, not at us. In fact they have empathy for us because they know that your presence here is illegal and you do not respect us, anymore than you respect them. If they attack these precious islands, it's because of your presence!!!

I know that Senator Inouye is pushing for your presence here. I do not support Senator Inouye – never have and never will. He DOES NOT SPEAK FOR THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE. HE IS JAPANESE NOT HAWAIIAN. The land you want to use is ceded land for the Hawaiian race. Please do not take anymore of what we have!!!

Luella Nohea Chang-Crutcher

Response: Senator Inouye's lengthy and distinguished service to his country, and the motivations for the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor are beyond the scope of this EIS.

33. Mary Allen Pestana

I feel that the Army really needs to reconsider the need to train at Mākua. There are other sites available for the specific type of training that the Army would like to conduct.

The Mākua area is such a beautiful, serene area and to disrupt the general quietness of the area by an assault of helicopters; GI "Joes" shooting guns, and the overall serenity of it by the army is not acceptable!

With all the rare species of insects, bats, snails and all things big and small that was placed there by God, why may I ask...does the military continue to push?

Response: The Army is a dedicated steward of the land at MMR. This is evidenced in our award winning natural resources management programs (for example, the 2006 and 2008 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Military Installation Conservation Partner Award). The Army spends millions of dollars annually on the conservation and management of endangered species, cultural resources, and clearance of unexploded ordnance to promote cultural access. The Army also monitors the land at MMR for potential transport of pollutants caused by military actions, which is evident by the Army's Marine Resources Study, Hydrogeologic Investigations, and the Army's Operational Range Assessment Program.

For further information on the Army's conservation programs please reference the Mākua Implementation Plan, the US Army Garrison Hawai'i's Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, and the Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.

I personally hold the beach area as a very special place. A couple of years ago, I was so very sad and overwhelmed by things that occurred in my life and as soon as I punched out at work I would race there to swim, snorkel, pick up lead sinkers, bullet casings, empty cans, fishing monofilament, plastic bags and other “junk” from the ocean. It was my healing place and I would do my daily worship while in the water. Oh the beauty! Turtles swim with you, eagle spotted rays would approach you when called and the dolphins would always swim in close to see what was going on.

It's too bad though that when it rains the water is contaminated with all the military “junk” in the valley. You can feel the ice cold water seeping into the ocean from the riverbeds even though the water and the well were capped.

It is too bad that there is a need to constantly engage community groups to “comment” etc. when you know darn well that there should NOT be any more training. I am not suggesting that Mākua be given back to these “groups” or the state; just cease the training.

The state continues to pit the army against the citizens by sitting back and not saying anything...state is the one that leased it our during LBJ's days...Training can be done elsewhere...were there that many conflicts that are truly victorious due to the men training there? Was the Vietnamese conflict won? Desert Storm (Soldiers injured because of chemicals) and what about Iraq? Is there any signs of any sort of “victory”? And now Afghanistan...and then?!!

Troops can train elsewhere and hopefully will be successful in their conflict resolution strategy.

Please stop, let's take care of Mākua and Mākua will watch over all of us.

Sincerely,

Mary Allen Pestana

Response: The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

34. Maile Shimabukuro, State Legislature

Please support the bill that Senator Hanabusa introduced that would set up a Mākua Commission similar to what there is for Kahoolawe.

Please provide more time for the community to review the SDEIS.

Maile Shimabukuro, State Legislature

Response: The Army, of course, takes no position on pending legislation. We have to balance the need for comment, and the need to perform our mission, and regret that we could not provide more time for the public to read the document.

35. James K. Mahaky SR.

- Longer time to read the volumes from the proposed EIS study

Response: The Army has provided the time allotted for public review under NEPA regulations. Although the document is lengthy, we have to balance the Army's need to train its Soldiers and to resolve our training range shortfall against the desire for longer review.

- Against the transportation of munitions thru our communities, period.

Response: Chapter 2 also presents the safety measures that would be employed to reduce safety risks associated with such action. The analysis of safety measures is found in Section 4.6 Traffic and Transportation, and 4.11 Hazardous Materials and Waste of the EIS.

- Totally against all military use of Mākuā Valley as a gun range

Response: The Army is limited in where it can conduct these types of training in Hawaii. The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

- Does study include impact zone or radius should an accident occur along its route

Response: The Army's policies for transporting ammunition are found in Chapter 3.6. The Army's first priority is to transport ammunition to MMR by helicopter to avoid schools and the risk of accident. The transportation of ammunition by helicopter includes safety measures, such as avoiding flying over heavily populated areas, using over-water routes, and ensuring secure storage of ammunition. No records have been found regarding accidents involving aircraft transporting ammunition in Hawai'i.

- Against the time limit of 3-5 minutes

Response: Public meetings are designed so that the Army may receive oral input from the public. The facilities used by the Army for these public meetings operated under imposed time limitations on facility use in accordance with their standard management policies. The Army facilitated time limits on speakers to ensure all participants were allowed equal time to speak while guaranteeing the facility was cleaned and empty by the facility deadline.

All speakers were allotted four (4) minutes to provide comment. The Army ensured that the first twenty-five (25) public participants to sign-in to speak were fairly allotted four (4) minutes to speak. The Army also provided time for standby speakers to provide public input (time permitting). During the night of the first public meeting, held October 6 at Nānākuli High School, thirty (30) individuals provided public input. Each meeting held thereafter (October 7-9) ended deficient of twenty-five (25) speakers. On those nights, the Army encouraged members of the public who felt they were not allotted sufficient time to speak, to provide oral input more than once. During public meetings, the Army additionally encouraged attendees to provide comment to the court recorder prior to the open mic phase of the public meeting; and, a second court recorder was available to register public input privately during the open mic phase of the public meeting. Members of the public were also provided blank public comment forms in order to register their input. Finally, written comments were accepted via mail, e-mail, and facsimile; and oral comments were accepted via voicemail throughout the SDEIS 45-day public comment period.

36. Jean StavRue

My name is Jean StavRue and I do not support live-fire training in Mākua, nor do I support the Army's efforts to continue occupying Mākua, Kahanakāiki and Ko'iahi valleys. Here we are, years of protest and resistance later, with little progress. Perhaps a new generation of people, generals and sergeants, we will hopefully reach a resolution to an old story waiting to reach a conclusion. A little history about me so you understand where I am coming from, I was born in Ridgecrest, CA, my father was working nearby at the Naval Weapons Training Center where they have air warfare and missile trainings). We later moved to Hawai'i when I was about 4 years old. I call Hawai'i my home; this is where I was raised.

Last night's meeting was the perfect example of a lesson I learned in my past: Listen to what your kapuna, elders, keep your mouth shut and listen. I was surprised that the Army was also practicing this simple lesson.

I remember going to Mākua with my father. It was, and still is, a sanctuary, a place of refuge, a place to feel safe (which is ironic, since you could hear the sound of the trainings in the background), this essentially felt like being at home. It is where I go to find comfort, peace of mind. It is a spiritual place that is so alive. Happy, sad, or angry, I can always find balance and harmony at Mākua. Unfortunately, my father passed away in 1997 and was unable to finally hear the silence of the valley.

My father was in the Marines and was proud to serve the USA in WWII and the Korean War, so I am aware of the training necessary for the military. I understand that at a time of war the military needs places to practice their tactics and missions. What I don't understand is how the military, particularly the Army, wants to practice in a tropical environment, when the war is currently in places like Iraq and Afghanistan. Last I heard the terrain was sandy, dry, hot and desert like, more like Death Valley and the Mojave Desert in California.

There is a significant difference between the Army's wants and needs. Ultimately, we can all agree that the military needs training and they want Makua, when they don't need Mākua. Live-fire training has been ceased for 3, almost 4 years now. The military has been at conflict /war

since 2001, with little training at Mākua. Mākua is not needed for the military's efforts at this time. It was mentioned that recently, the military could access Mākua for 35 days of trainings, which they used only 26.

Response: The experience of the past decade should not be used to predict the required level of training. First because MMR was closed for much of the time, and second because units deploying to Iraq and Afghanistan did not have the opportunity to execute required training at MMR.

Additionally, the military has changed tremendously over the years. There was a time in history when those in the military were looked up to as "true American heroes." The upper ranks appeared to be well-mannered and gentleman like. The military was respected and also did respect such things as "host culture." The modern culture of the military is viewed as mostly all grunts, negatively connotative, and at times looked down on. I urge you the military to do its part in restoring and returning Mākua, allow everyone to eventually heal. This would be an opportune time to finally do the right thing and "look good." The military should start to repair its name and finally make a difference for the positive, in the community, the environment and humanity.

Response: The Army balances mission, community, and environment, which is the foundation of the Army's strategy for the Environment. The Army wishes to remain a positive influence in the Hawaiian community, culture, and land.

I do commend the Army for its efforts in attempting to essentially repair Mākua. We are at a crucial time, where if we do not stop the fire the effects will be irreversible. I was perturbed to be attending a cultural access in June or July and, while walking on the road, we found some old shells. The "attendant" got out of his car, picked it up and threw it on the side. I thought this was a strange way of disposing the ordnance. I also found it odd that the person lecturing us about picking up debris was dangerous and might explode would throw something into the air, which could possibly explode when landing. The irony to everything is so uncanny. I do not agree with this type of action or attitude.

Response: The event the commenter is referring to was attended by Army's Cultural Resources Manager and an EOD escort. To the recollection of the Cultural Resources Manager the EOD escort picked up spent shell casings, which is not live ammunition but is an empty brass casing. The EOD escort next placed the spent brass shell casings to the side of the road to be collected later.

I do not agree with the program of the Natural Resource Program, which I am an active volunteer of. I do not agree that it is helping the valley heal from military trainings; rather it focuses on invasive species and protecting endangered species. The program works at various sites, such as Mt. Kaala, Kahanahaiki, Kahuku, and the koolaus. To access the sites we go up through the Waialua route. We work at the back of the valleys or top of the ridges, not in the fire training areas. This does not account for the huge training areas. I urge people to volunteer, as it is not with Army officials, but rather more human beings, scientists, educators and cultural specialists. It partners with RCUH and is a great opportunity to visit Mākua.

Response: Invasive species pose the greatest threat to HI's natural environment. They out compete the native flora and fauna, pose a tremendous fire threat that will alter the native ecosystems, and they have direct impact on native vegetation through

grazing, trampling and other disturbances. Control of the invasive species threat is critical for restoring (healing) HI back to its native condition. Protection of endangered species is a requirement of the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Many of the plants and animals on HI are critically endangered and the Army's management and conservation efforts have helped prevent the extinction of these organisms.

Again, I do not support live-fire training at Mākua. I do not support the military's presence at Mākua, other than cleaning up the ordnance and debris. I also support the idea of the community having more time to review the report, as the community has been waiting 25 years for this to be completed; it is only fair to grant more time for review.

Jean StavRue

Response: The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been included in the administrative record for this process.

37. Cory (Martha) Harden

Depleted Uranium. Is there any study of records to detect other forgotten hazards? (Past, current, and/or planned study)

Response: A number of studies have been conducted to identify the types of materials that were used and disposed of at MMR, including materials that were burned in the OB/OD area. These findings are documented in the Hydrogeologic Investigation Report in Appendix G-1.

Why did the Army not publicize the 2005 discovery at Schofield Barracks until after citizen groups did so?

Response: In August 2005, while conducting range clearance activities to modernize ranges for the new Stryker Brigade, an Army contractor discovered 15 tail assemblies from the M-101 spotting round body (SRB), a component of the Davy Crockett weapons system.

In early 2006, a scoping survey confirmed the presence of DU fragments from the M-101 on a portion of the SBMR impact area. After confirming the presence of DU, the Army disclosed that information to the public once the Army had comprehensive data.

Is there any research on airborne DU hazards resulting from munitions exploding on top of DU lying on the ground?

Response: Live-fire impacts may further fragment M-101 remnants, but would be unlikely to cause particles small enough to be transported outside the impact areas. Ongoing air testing will provide information to determine whether DU dust is transported outside the impact areas. Results from previous air quality studies also confirmed that DU dust is not transported outside the impact areas.

DU begins to oxidize at 350 degrees Centigrade, according to Earth Island Journal. What was the temperature of recent controlled burns at Schofield in the areas where spotting rounds were found? [Earth Island Journal, winter 1999-2000]

Response: The Army has conducted testing during prescribed burns and there was no indication that DU was present in the air. DU only aerosolizes at a very high temperature, much higher than temperatures produced by brush fires or exploding munitions. No DU was detected in air during prescribed burns. DU has not been detected outside of the impact areas at Schofield Barracks or PTA, and it is highly unlikely that it will migrate off the impact area. Nevertheless, the Army will monitor these ranges for DU releases for some time in the future.

Are there any activities (past, present, and/or planned) at Pōhakuloa that could result in airborne DU hazards?

Response: Because Army Regulations prohibit use of DU in training, the Army does not use munitions that contain DU on its training ranges in Hawai'i. There are no planned uses that could conceivably result in airborne DU hazards.

The migration of DU off the military installation is highly unlikely. Studies have shown that DU transport is limited and that it is unlikely to move from the range under most conditions. Studies also have shown that the DU fragment size and the environmental conditions at the ranges in Hawai'i serve to prevent migration, including by air. The Army will, however, monitor these ranges to determine whether migration occurs. Ongoing air testing will provide information to determine whether DU dust is transported outside the impact areas.

Depleted Uranium. What weapons tests might be causing high radon readings at Mauna Loa Observatory? "The radon record at MLO is peculiar, with several briefly high episodes that likely stem from weapons tests, only some of which are cataloged in the open literature" according to an atmospheric scientist who is assisting the Sierra Club.

Describe past, present, and/or planned use of radioactive substances at Pōhakuloa.

Response: None of the Army weapons used at Pōhakuloa Training Area would have resulted in changes in radon levels at Mauna Loa Observatory. Radon levels do fluctuate naturally, which is the likely cause of higher than normal radon readings at that location.

If non-Army entities used DU or other radioactive materials at Pōhakuloa, who would have records? (Navy, Marines, Air Force, National Guard, private contractors, or others)

Response: Each military service maintains their own records regarding the use of radioactive materials.

The Navy is licensed to store DU at Lualualei Naval Magazine. Strykers will use ammunition from this magazine. Is there any Stryker use of DU and/or radioactive materials (past, present, and/or planned)?

Response: AR 385-63, Range Safety, prohibits the use of DU ammunition for training worldwide. This policy has been in effect for over 20 years.

Depleted Uranium. Is the original weight and volume of DU still in the spotting rounds found at Schofield and Pōhakuloa? If the Army did not check, does it plan to? If the weight and volume are less, how will the Army determine where the missing DU went?

Response: It is not feasible to determine the exact weight and volume of DU remaining in the impact areas. The characterization studies focused on physical characteristics that the Army could measure, such as radiation exposure levels and soil concentrations.

Depleted Uranium. When the May 2004 Stryker EIS was being prepared, dust samples were gathered from Pōhakuloa, but not tested for DU till just recently. Why the delay?

Response: The purpose of that study was to monitor concentrations of total suspended particulate matter and particulate matter (US Army and USAEC 2008). In 2004 the Army was not aware DU was present therefore the Army did not analyze air samples for DU.

Depleted Uranium. Regarding a 24-hour urine test for DU for any military personnel, civilian personnel, and/or private contractors from any Hawai'i bases – is there any past, current, and/or planned testing?

Response: The levels of DU at PTA are far below those requiring DU screening

Depleted Uranium. Regarding testing tree bark, animal droppings, and vehicle air filters for DU – is there any past, current, and/or planned testing?

Response: At this time the Army does not have plans to test tree bark, animal droppings, and vehicle air filters for DU.

Depleted Uranium. 714 Davy Crocketts were shipped to O'ahu in the 1960s. [Big Island Weekly 7-4-07 p. 5] Where is each of them, and their M101 spotting rounds with DU, now? How many remain unaccounted for? What is the plan for locating them?

Response: It is not feasible to determine the exact location of every M101 spotting round used during training in Hawai'i. There is no plan to identify individual M101 spotting rounds, instead, the characterization studies focused on physical characteristics that the Army could measure, such as radiation exposure levels and soil concentrations.

Depleted Uranium. Follow-up on a November 18, 2007 request from the Sierra Club to provide more specific Air Monitoring data at Pōhakuloa, with specific reference on depleted uranium:

- Collection schedule and locations of filters?
- Filter substrate materials, manufacturer, and specifications?
- Sample collection times (starting & stopping)?

Volumes of air collected (liters/minute at beginning and end of sampling period)?
Particle sizes collected and how measured?
Whether there are duplicate monitors?
Wind directions and velocities?
Criteria for choosing which filters to analyze?
Description on how filters will be analyzed and reference to standard method(s) used?
Output data with estimates of precision?
Calibration and reference standards?
Comparisons of duplicate analyses?

Cory (Martha) Harden

Response: The Army continues to conduct air quality studies with focus on DU. A formal report that provides the data collected will be made available to the public once finalized.

38. Gail S. Hunter

I will waste no time again reviewing the history of Mākua valley as I have done in prior testimony as it seems that the history of this place and the importance of it to the people of my home mean absolutely nothing to you. I will therefore begin by saying (again) that your need to train is done without debate. The fact that you choose to harass this community over and over again with your proposed need to train in Mākua deeply saddens me.

From a tactical standpoint it makes no sense to use Mākua. You can train at Pōhakuloa. You can train at Schofield. You have countless MILLIONS of acres to train on the mainland and worldwide. How many acres are enough for you to train on? How much land must you destroy before the communities in which you train in are allowed to say enough? How about using some of the military golf courses? In an island environment land is utilized to sustain the people that inhabit it. When someone abuses the land which feeds the people are the people wrong to speak out against the abuse? When someone pollutes and sets fire to the land in the civilian culture they are fined and prohibited from using that land again, why does this not apply to the military? The fact that you choose to continue to on a regular basis “call for testimony” regarding the use of Mākua and then choose to ignore it is, in my opinion no less than harassment. If it were up to me I would obtain a restraining order to prevent the ongoing harassment against my community by the US Army.

Response: The EIS considers conducting required training at sites in the continental United States at Section 2.5.3. To be carried forward for full evaluation, all reasonable alternative training locations must meet the Army’s four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5.3. The continental United States alternative would not meet the purpose of the proposed action.

The people of the Leeward coast have very few places where families can get away from the stress of modern life. Very few places in which to return to the land and reconnect with their land and their ocean. Mākua is that place. A place where healing can take place for families. A place to return to the ways of old which bring solace in times that are uncertain at best. I has been explained to you the numerous ways on countless occasions that Makua is sacred. Does the current leadership not consult with the old leadership in the Army. Do you not pass down words and guidance to one another? We have certainly done this before...this “public calling of the

people for their input...an invitation to give our views.” How have you ever even once take the viewpoint of this community and used them in a constructive way? Has the Army EVER considered downsizing their training areas? Downsizing and realigning the way they train? The way everyone in the rest of the community and in fact the county has had to do? This is the time to act. Do not “call for opinion” when you have no intention to follow through with suggestions so gracefully shared with you. It is disrespectful. It is harassment. Stop all training in Mākua. Return the land.

Gail S. Hunter

Response: The U.S. Department of Defense is currently implementing Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC 2005) recommendations to reorganize its installation infrastructure to more efficiently and effectively support its forces while pursuing the reduction of excess capacity and capturing greater operational efficiency. The Army is implementing BRAC as part of the Army’s Transformation to a more Modular Force.

The Army has provided the public opportunity to review the Army’s analysis and submit input. Most changes made to the SDEIS since public distribution of the DEIS were in response to public and agency comments on the DEIS and subsequent studies. There are greater discussions on the current status of historic properties and cultural resources and the results of endangered species consultations. There is also the incorporation of the marine resources study and other studies, surveys, and reports done since the issuance of the DEIS in 2005. Finally, the Army offered the public 75 days to review the DEIS; 60 days to review the Marine Life Study, Archaeological Survey, and DEIS in 2007; and 45 days to review the SDEIS in 2008. Substantial changes have been made to the EIS as a result of public input.

39. Robert Soares

Please give Mākua back to the residents of Hawai’i. Our island O’ahu, specifically, has got to be the most militarized real estate per square foot in America. Why does Hawai’i need to bear the brunt of the burden. Train somewhere else. America is huge in relation to Hawai’i. We already have our natural resources spread thin, and is the extinction capital of the world, with so much of our native species in peril. This includes many species found nowhere else but Mākua. We already know what a lousy steward the military has been to our environment on O’ahu, let alone Hawai’i. Bombing of Kahoolawe has been to our environment on O’ahu, uncontrolled fires at Mākua, just to name a few.

In closing, I’m not sure what public commenting is for, when whatever the US military wants to do something in Hawai’i it ends up happening, comments notwithstanding.

Robert Soares

Response: The EIS considers conducting required training at sites in the continental United States at Section 2.5.3. To be carried forward for full evaluation, all reasonable alternative training locations must meet the Army’s four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5.3. The continental United States alternative would not meet the purpose of the proposed action.

The Army is a dedicated steward of the land at MMR. This is evidenced in our award winning natural resources management programs (for example, the 2006 and 2008 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Military Installation Conservation Partner Award). The Army spends millions of dollars annually on the conservation and management of endangered species, cultural resources, and clearance of unexploded ordnance to promote cultural access. The Army also monitors the land at MMR for potential transport of pollutants caused by military actions, which is evident by the Army's Marine Resources Study, Hydrogeologic Investigations, and the Army's Operational Range Assessment Program.

Kahoolawe is not within the scope of this EIS. The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been included in the administrative record for this process.

40. Kent West

Aloha and Mahalo for this opportunity to give voice to this subject. I am not a supporter of this venture for live munitions training, not on O'ahu, nor on any of our other precious aina's. I invite each and every individual to reflect on the eternal destruction and change that the military is responsible for, on the precious island of Kahoolawe.

The environmental everything of Kahoolawe has been altered forever and ever, as a direct result of the many years of live munitions training by the military.

It used to rain over Kahoolawe. There used to be vegetation on Kahoolawe. There use to be life on Kahoolawe. Not anymore. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure that one out. We can all extend our thanks to the military for this.

And any person who is spirit enough in their being to understand this, will know that it is simply the truth.

So, NO!! NO!! NOT!! And ABSOLUTELY NOT, to live munitions training in Mākua valley. This mentality of the military, is a direct reflection that there is NOTHING, and I mean NOTHING SACRED to them anymore. The military DOESN'T CARE. And like the island of Kahoolawe. They will do whatever they have to, to take it. Read it in the history books.

So ask me now, how do I REALLY feel about live munition training anywhere on our precious aina's?!?!?!?!?!?

Kent West

Response: Kahoolawe is completely isolated by water and is much larger than MMR. It is not comparable to Mākua.

41. John Doe

I am writing in regards to military activity on Mākua Reservation. I am against any military activity on this reservation because it is such a beautiful place and once it is gone it can never be reborn. Mākua Valley is very beautiful and should not be destroyed by the military. It is hard

for me to grasp the concept that US mainland has vast unused land and they chose to destroy our tiny little island. Something's wrong with the picture here. Is it the military is covering up something at Mākua Valley? I just don't get it.

John Doe

Response: The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS. The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

42. Alan Gormezano

It is time to stop destroying Hawai'i as practice to destroy other lands and peoples. This land and the people of this land have been crying out for this to stop, and instead it is being proposed to be increased.

How can you be the protectors of freedom, when the results of the actions of the military in Hawai'i have been to destroy the freedoms of the people of Hawai'i and of even the lands.

I ask you to show yourselves and the rest of us what freedom really means, and free this land from destruction once and for all.

Alan Gormezano

Response: The EIS considers conducting required training at sites in the continental United States at Section 2.5.3. To be carried forward for full evaluation, all reasonable alternative training locations must meet the Army's four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5.3. The continental United States alternative would not meet the purpose of the proposed action.

43. William Prescott

Aloha, I am William Prescott, a Native Hawaiian, US Army Retired, and as Commander, VFW Post 849 here in Waianae, I am here representing our 123 VFW members to testify in support of the recommendations contained in Chapter Two: Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives.

We support the Army's recommendation of Alternative 3 (Full Capacity Use with Fewer Weapons Restrictions). This alternative represents a maximum use capacity of Mākua Military Reservation and involves conducting up to 50 company-level CALFEXs over a 242-day training year.

This alternative would allow the Army to train its units with maximum realistic training with critical weapons systems on a live-fire assault course. Both daytime and nighttime training exercises would be conducted under this alternative.

In our experiences of defending our Nation in various hostile assignments beginning with WWII, we know conclusively our Soldiers must have the best training possible on O'ahu, to maintain combat readiness standards. The proposed alternative provides realistic company-level CALFEXs and convoy live-fire training in close proximity to the home-station for the units assigned to the 25th ID and all progressive live-fire training events preceding the company-level exercise.

This alternative ensures that Soldiers are not separated from their Families for unreasonable periods of time during their training, especially since world events require many Soldiers to deploy overseas for over a year at a time.

We must support our Soldiers, assure that they are properly prepared to meet the Army Campaign Plan, and assure that we reduce the stress of deployment on them and their families.

Providing the training our Soldiers need must take precedence over any other concern. Their lives and the accomplishment of their mission depends on it.

William Prescott

Response: The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS. The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

44. William (Bill) Prescott, Commander, Leeward VFW Post 849 (Written Comment)

I want to begin by thanking the Army for putting together an impressive EIS draft of the Mākuā Military Reservation. It shows that a lot of hard work was put into it. Well done Mahalo. Please know that I am especially motivated to make my comments known because my neighbor whom I have known since he was 10 years old, graduated from the Honolulu Police Academy last month, and who is now in Ft Hood, Texas training for deployment to Iraq. Training he could have possibly gotten less than 10 miles from his home and he wouldn't been separated from his wife and 1 ½ year old daughter. It's a shame.

To those who don't know me, I am a Native Hawaiian, and I'm here to represent as Commander, Leeward VFW Post 849. We, our members, are deeply disturbed by the action taken by a few to deny our Soldiers the use of the MMR. These few protesters have either been misled or are completely uninformed. Here are a couple of examples:

After reading a few protester comments it became clear to me, that it's not Mākuā that concerns them, but rather it's about having the military in Hawai'i. For example protester Mr. Kauai Amsterdam said "Militarism...is like placing a brothel in a church." "...soldiers are trained here in Hawai'i and go out and they kill..." Dr. Fred Dodge said, "...welcome to the warfare state," then went on agreeing with Mr. Amsterdam.

Comment: These protesters fail to understand the lesson the U.S. learned from the attack on Pearl Harbor, on December 7, 1941. The lesson was that the only way to deter and prevent wars is by having a strong, well trained and well equipped Armed Forces. That's right, our Armed Forces were weak and ill prepared for what happened.

Regarding the Kapu, Mr. William Aila, said "...the kapu were supposedly overthrown...continues today..." "I am kapus...I'm living proof that it hasn't gone away."

Response: Thank you for your comment. The Army is fully committed to the NEPA process and is dedicated to its responsibility to engage the public, in accordance with 40 CFR 1500.2(d).

Comment: Mr. Aila refuses to accept the fact that Kamehameha II did indeed abolish the Hawaiian religion and the kapu that supported it. He did it to end the killing of innocent Hawaiians who unknowingly or knowingly for good reason broke the kapu. Death was the penalty for breaking the kapu. Since Mr. Aila believes in this outlawed practice, I wonder how many lives he has forfeited.

Here's some little known information about Mākuā. During WWII, Hawai'i was under Martial Law and Mākuā Military Reservation was deemed essential for our Armed Forces to train in. It was used extensively by Navy gunships, bombings by aircraft, Army's artillery, infantry units firing all types of weapons in there. This training in Mākuā was, without question, justified because we were at War. And now our Army is being sued for what was done to the environment while under Martial Law, and during the years they continued to train to fight in Korea and Vietnam. It angers us, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, to think these few who believe that the environment which has been used for over 60 years by our Armed Forces to prepare for combat in order to protect our freedom, now suddenly takes precedence over the lives of the men and women many of whom are our ohana (family), friends and neighbors. These protesters are without conscience.

Ref: Chap 3 & 4. Request that all references to "Oral," and "Oral History" be deleted from the report.

Many of the supposedly cultural sites have been identified through oral history. What isn't known is that "Oral History" references the manner in which Hawaiians 189 years ago preserved their history, a time when they did not have a written language. It was also a way of recording their ali'i's ancestry. Individuals were selected and trained in this skill which required them to memorize through chants the information they were responsible for. It was a responsibility in which errors were not tolerated and were punishable by death (Voices of Wisdom, MJ Harden). What the EIS is alluding to is not "Oral History" but rather "word of mouth" about what is remembered. This form of information is often contradictory and misleading.

Response: Most of the archaeological sites at MMR have been identified through reconnaissance surveys (on the ground) by qualified archaeologists, and not through oral histories. Oral histories\ethnographic surveys done for MMR have yielded very little information about cultural sites. The presentation of oral histories in the cultural resources section of the EIS were requested by the community and come from documented academic sources. In addition, the NEPA process invites public input into the EIS.

Ref: Chap 3 & 4. All references to Hawaiian religion, Hawaiian gods, and references to sacredness attributed to them be deleted.

Much of what is referred to as culturally sacred has no connection to any religion or god. Rather, it is just someone's own personal opinion. In 1819 Kamehameha II purposely broke a sacred kapu by sitting down and eating with his mother and some other women. He followed this act by ordering the Hawaiian religion and the kapu that supported it to be abolished. (Ref: Hawaiian Journey, Joseph G. Mullins). And the god idols be burned and heiaus on all islands be demolished. The order was supported by all of the Kahunas (priests) even to the extent that Chief Kahuna Hewahewa destroyed his own Heiau. This order removed any and all references of sacredness attributed to the religion and its gods. Furthermore, the practice was never restored by any of the succeeding Monarchs. It should also be noted that the reason for his order was due to the cruel punishments inflicted by the religion's kapu. Kapus (that which were prohibited) were of many types and Hawaiians who violated them were put to death. (Ref: Hawaiian Magic & Spirituality, Scott Cunningham).

Response: The Army conducts the treatment of cultural resources in accordance with Executive Order 13007, which concerns access to sacred sites and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act. The Army thanks you for your comment, but no changes will result to the document as a result of this comment. Your comment will be included in the administrative record for this EIS.

Do you know when news reached the maka'ainanas (commoners) about the King's decree and that the King had broken the sacred kapu, they were overjoyed and celebrated. They felt at last free from fear of the kapu and to be able to live life unafraid for the first time, for themselves and their families.

In 1820 Christians arrived, and in time, Hawaiians were drawn to this new god, a god of love and forgiveness. It is to this culture we Hawaiians have belonged to for over 170 years.

Furthermore, the only sacred bones in Mākua are those above the ground and not below it. For confirmation ask any soldiers' mother, or father. You don't have to be dead for your bones to become sacred.

Protesters who choose to resurrect the practice of praying to outlawed gods of Hawai'i's past should not be allowed onto Mākua Military Reservation. Especially if they include practicing the kapu. And while protesters are free to practice the religion of their choosing, they should not be allowed on military property to practice a religion our Hawaiian ancestors deeply feared. And lastly, its authenticity as an acceptable Hawaiian practice is questionable inasmuch as it is being performed by a self appointed Kahuna (priest) one without and qualifications, who's members are largely Christians who believe it's okay to pray to both gods. Their ceremonial actions are more like a stage play. Hawai'i has no Church where praying to Hawaiian gods exist which brings more questions and doubt as to their legitimacy as an acceptable Hawaiian cultural practice covered under the American Indian Freedom Act AIRFA. 42 USC Section 1996.

Ref: Chap 3 & 4. Prohibit any religious symbol from being placed on the MMR. The Kuahu (altar) that's been constructed on the MMR should be dismantled and removed. Inasmuch as the military was forced to remove a Christian cross at Schofield Barrack's Kolekole Pass, and at Camp Smith, in great measure due to the lawsuits demanding separation of church and state, it would be wrong to allow another religious symbol onto military property, especially one constructed on the false pretense that it's of legitimate Hawaiian cultural acceptance.

William (Bill) Prescott, Commander, Leeward VFW Post 849

Response: Cultural access to MMR and the placement of the Ahu were done in accordance with the 2001 Settlement Agreement.

45. S. Joe Estores

I do not agree to any military activity on Mākua Ahupua'a any more. The Army has not kept its promise to return that property to the rightful owners, which was supposed to be six months after the termination of World War Two in 1945. The Army evicted the owners as in a war attack, occupied the land and did immeasurable damage to the ecosystem, the Hawaiian sustainment system, the peace and tranquility of the valley and now, 63 years after WWII terminated, the rightful owners have passed on and their descendents are still waiting for the promise to be kept.

You do not intend to keep this promise by virtue of this SDEIS. You can no longer be trusted to keep any promise, therefore, now is the time for our people to demand the return to the entire ahupuaa under the following conditions that the owners specify: CONDITION ONE: Remove everything that was not there on the date you took possession of this land in 1941. All ammunition, bullets, shells, casings, targets, metals, plastics, leather, weapons, lumber, poles, military structures, buried garbage, buried trash, ETC. with the exceptions as stated in CONDITION THREE below. CONDITION TWO: Restore the land topography to the condition it was in when you took possession, to include replanting of trees and ground cover that was present at the time. This also includes restoration of any stone walls, structures, terraces, water ditches, pathways, burial sites. CONDITION THREE: EXCEPTION: Leave the fences and gates you have erected on the land as a gesture of good will and because it is now on our land and anything you have built on it rightly belongs to us. CONDITION FOUR: Make reparations to the rightful owners for the loss of their residences, personal properties, use and damages to the land, its ecosystem, to the water system and for unpaid rent starting in 1945 until the day our people have agreed that the land is acceptable and formally returned without further dispute over the violent abuse of the people who suffered and endured this injustice.

Response: The Army presents a brief history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. The long-term status of MMR and legal title to it are beyond the scope of this EIS.

In addition, cleanup of Mākua (except as part of regular training procedure described in Section 2.4.3), restoration/cleanup of MMR or other sites is not within the scope of this EIS.

My comment on your SDEIS and the whole process is that you have wasted an exorbitant amount of our tax dollars over the past years in this dispute. The document is not worthy of time and effort to read through it. Your charts are not complete with information relative to the Korean War and the Vietnam War periods as pertains to the usage and violent destructive actions during those two conflicts.

Response: The Korean War and the Vietnam War periods are not relevant to the purpose and need of the proposed action and therefore are not within the scope of this EIS. The

charts shown at the public meetings are not designed to replace the analysis in the EIS.

The entire document is designed to disclose only those factors that will result in favor of continued use of the land in spite of the fact that there are other alternatives that are not mentioned e.g., move the troop units back to the Continental US where there is more adequate space for contiguous cantonment and modern designed training sites for the future fighting forces.

Response: All reasonable alternatives considered must meet the four screening criteria developed in this EIS; these are training capacity, range design, time and cost, and quality of life (proximity to home station). There were no locations outside of Hawai'i that could meet all four screening criteria. Other locations considered included Fort Irwin, California, Yakima Training Center, Washington, and Fort Polk, Louisiana. Therefore these locations were dismissed and not considered for further evaluation. Restationing the 25th ID outside of Hawai'i is beyond the scope of this document.

Your tactics of overwhelming the average person, the common people of this land is clear with the voluminous, costly bureaucratic product that reads like pages and pages of commercials that in fact intimidates the masses. This fact plus the short period for reading, lack of access to hard copies, and lack of broadcasting this important dispute in all the media further fuels the distrust of your intentions and makes a mockery of the EIS process.

Response: Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.10, the Army has met its obligations under NEPA regulations regarding public review of the Supplemental Draft EIS. In addition, the Army distributed dozens of hard copies and hundreds of CDs of the EIS to all individuals and organizations who specifically requested these materials. We have to balance the need for comment, and the need to perform our mission, and regret that we could not provide more time for the public to read the document.

The charts do not show, by overlay, the firing lanes, impact zones, buffer zones, and maneuver areas for the mechanized forces to meet range design standards and the maintenance requirements for recovery of the land after so many cycles of combat training. The Army Training Range configuration and design standards specify the total land area, safety zones and all the facilities required for a company and battalion CALFEX complex. It does not appear that Mākua has sufficient flat, maneuverable terrain to meet design specs especially when the cultural boundaries are drawn on the ground. It is not clearly proven that all of the Army Training Range specifications can be met for such training.

Again, quit your attempts to resume any activities in the Makua Ahupuaa, clean up the mess, restore the land, trees, streams, water system, the ecosystem, rock walls terraces, and make reparations for the use and abuse of this land over the past 63 years. Enough is enough.

S. Joe Estores

Response: The BO and the Final EIS has the surface danger zones for all weapons systems that are authorized for use.

46. Rob Biggerstaff

Aloha. My home is in Hawai'i. I want to feel safe living here, knowing that the United States Military is there to protect me and help me if I am in a disaster. They have done this in the past and helped my neighbors in their times of urgent need.

They need to have updated knowledge of what weapons they might need to use if they ever have to protect Hawai'i from an Invasion. Hawai'i is one of American's stronghold in the Pacific and needs to be defended. As they are proud of the very land that they strive to protect, I am assured that they will protect its residents, their own lives and health, and our environment.

I'm proud that they serve in unimaginable conditions and sacrifice their own lives for my freedom. They diligently serve in hostile conditions that arise in combat. The groups that complain about them would have a different opinion if they needed to be helped in a crisis situation, like a severe hurricane or a massive earthquake.

I can only share my gratitude in what you do for me in Hawaii, and offer my support for your use of the Mākua and Pōhakuloa Military training areas.

Rob Biggerstaff

Response: The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

47. COL Joe Logan, HIARNG Chief of Staff

On behalf of the Adjutant General, MG Robert Lee, of the Hawai'i National Guard we emphatically support the Mākua Range EIS and the use of Mākua Range for training of our Hawai'i based military and National Guard units to better serve our nation, state, and communities when called upon.

COL Joe Logan, HIARNG Chief of Staff

Response: The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

48. Richard Sasaki

I am retired from the Hawai'i Army National Guard and know first hand from training at the Kahukus, East Range, Pōhakuloa, etc that the Army is an excellent steward of the land. Mākua should be used for fire and maneuver training so the young infantryman's life would not be lost thru lack of training.

Richard Sasaki

Response: The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included

as part of the administrative record for this process. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

49. Erik Ramseyer

Using Mākua Valley as a practice zone for the Stryker Brigade is a bad idea. The Army claims it to simulate a war zone in Iraq. Well hello? Iraq is a desert, and Mākua is like a forest. If anything, go to the Mojave Dessert! Don't screw up our land any more like you guys did with Kaho'olawe. I do support the troops, but I do not support degrading our land. Go some place else.

Erik Ramseyer

Response: Use of the Stryker vehicles at MMR will be limited (up to five vehicles) to existing roads and stationary firing from fixed positions. Without training at MMR, the Army has been able to mitigate its training needs; however, these solutions are not sustainable over the long term. Over the past several years, deployments have meant that there is usually only one brigade of the 25th ID either prepared to conduct the type of training in the proposed action or in Hawai'i. We cannot expect this situation to last forever, and the time will come when the Army must train both brigades simultaneously for deployment world-wide.

50. Sandra Gray

The United States Military being in Hawai'i and on the Big Island gives me the sense of security that allows me to live here in the middle of the Pacific with peace of mind.

To expect our Armed Forces to fight in any battle without adequate practice and a thorough knowledge of the weapons they will fight with is ludicrous. I expect that all care will be taken to protect the lives and health of the soldiers and the civilians and also the environment.

I realize that it is difficult to do the work that the Military has to do in the conditions in which it has to be done, it is not pleasant to work in a hostile environment. The bozos whom one sees sitting around Borders yapping about the military will have a different story if they need to be rescued from a hurricane or earthquake.

I appreciate what you do and thank you.

Sandra Gray

Response: The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

51. Frederick A. Dodge, MD; Karen G. S. Young, APRN, MSN, MPH

Because the latest version of the Mākua EIS is so large (now 5 volumes, an increase of 2 volumes since 2005--and now greater than 4500 pages), it is unfair to allow only 45 days to review and submit comments. A minimum of 120 days would show more aloha & be fairer.

Response: The Army has provided the public opportunity to review the Army's analysis and submit input. Most changes made to the SDEIS since public distribution of the DEIS were in response to public and agency comments on the DEIS and subsequent studies. There are greater discussions on the current status of historic properties and cultural resources and the results of endangered species consultations. There is also the incorporation of the marine resources study and other studies, surveys, and reports done since the issuance of the DEIS in 2005. Finally, the Army offered the public 75 days to review the DEIS; 60 days to review the Marine Life Study, Archaeological Survey, and DEIS in 2007; and 45 days to review the SDEIS in 2008. We have to balance the need for comment, and the need to perform our mission, and regret that we could not provide more time for the public to read the document.

Community meetings were poorly done. They should be held toward the latter part of the comment period. They should be held in a venue that provides adequate time for all to speak, i.e., at least 4 hours total time and/or no "curfew." The 4 minutes time limit per speaker is too short. Also at Nanakuli, the PA system malfunctioned for about the first half of the meeting. All this, especially the time issues, gives the appearance that the Army is denying full community input.

Response: The 15 days notice in advance of public meetings are in accordance with 40 CFR 1500.6(c)5.

Public meetings are designed so that the Army may receive oral input from the public. The facilities used by the Army for these public meetings operated under imposed time limitations on facility use in accordance with their standard management policies. The Army facilitated time limits on speakers to ensure all participants were allowed equal time to speak while guaranteeing the facility was cleaned and empty by the facility deadline.

All speakers were allotted four (4) minutes to provide comment. The Army ensured that the first twenty-five (25) public participants to sign-in to speak were fairly allotted four (4) minutes to speak. The Army also provided time for standby speakers to provide public input (time permitting). During the night of the first public meeting, held October 6 at Nānākuli High School, thirty (30) individuals provided public input. Each meeting held thereafter (October 7-9) ended with fewer than twenty-five (25) speakers. The Army encouraged members of the public who felt they were not allotted sufficient time to speak, to provide oral input more than once. During public meetings, the Army additionally encouraged attendees to provide comment to the court recorder prior to the open mic phase of the public meeting; and, a second court recorder was available to register public input privately during the open mic phase of the public meeting. Members of the public were also provided blank public comment forms in order to register their input. Finally, written comments were accepted via mail, e-mail, and facsimile; and oral comments were accepted via voicemail throughout the 45-day public comment period.

The impacts of training in Mākua, cumulative and otherwise, are major and many, including significant and non-mitigable ones. These include wildfires, socioeconomic & environmental justice, cultural (archeological) resources as well as Areas of Traditional Importance (ATIs), biological resources, geology & soils, water resources, noise, conflicts with existing or planned land uses, & recreation. Also of great concern are the significant & non-mitigable impacts involving access to ATIs & archeological sites.

These impacts underscore the fact that Mākua is an inappropriate place to train!

Response: If one of the alternatives involving MMR is chosen, the Army has identified an extensive number of mitigation measures that will help reduce the overall environmental impacts of the proposed action. The Army is reviewing all these proposed mitigation measures and will select a number of the measures to implement. The selected mitigation measures will be identified in the Record of Decision.

In addition, the Army lacks a basic understanding of Hawaiian Culture and the effects of training impacts on this Culture. This is documented by the testimonies of Ty Kawika Tengan (page K-75), Davianna McGregor (page K-197), William Aila, and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) (page K-51).

Response: The Army derived its basis for the archaeological and cultural resource analysis from site specific baseline reports from cultural resource firms with extensive local experience, archival research, as well as from oral histories, public meetings and interested individuals. In addition, the Army encouraged the public and Native Hawaiians to share their knowledge of resources present at MMR and incorporated this information into the Draft EIS. The Army has always included the community, including in its Section 106 consultations. The Army will continue to consult with any Native Hawaiians having lineal and/or cultural ties to Mākua who wish to work with us in the identification, determination of significance and evaluation of sites at Mākua.

There are over 40 endangered species as well as critical habitats in Mākua. Your preferred alternative # 3 has the highest chance of starting fires. This does not make sense. Even Patricia Sanderson Port, Regional Environmental Officer, U.S. Dept. of the Interior, states on page K-2: "For these reasons, the Department, through its Service...Mākua SDEIS Page 2 (Fred Dodge)...recommends the Army select another preferred alternative that does not impact the Department's resources so detrimentally in the final EIS." The Army's response (F1-1) didn't address this recommendation except to say it added another alternative (Pōhakuloa). This avoidance type of response by the Army is common. It appears that the Army is hell bent on training in Mākua no matter what the cost or the valid opposing opinions of Federal and State agencies, experts and concerned individuals.

Response: The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

The valleys of Kahanahāiki, Mākua & Ko'iahi, collectively referred to as "Mākua," are very rich in archeological (cultural) sites, over 100 with many, many features. In fact I've been told that

this year, the Army applied for the designation of an Archeological District for Mākua. Again this is an inappropriate place to train.

Response: In Section 4.10 of the SDEIS, the Army assessed impacts to all cultural resources consistent with NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

The Army has not applied for a designation of MMR as an archeological district, but is continuing to work with the native Hawaiian community *in the identification, determination of significance and evaluation of sites at Mākua.*

The Biological Opinion in several places refers to “weapons restriction,” e.g. the bottom of page 611: “2.1 Prior to initiating live-fire training at Mākua, an appendix to this Biological Opinion will be prepared, detailing and clarifying, in text format, the weapons restrictions summarized in Table PD 2.” Has this been done? If so, where is Table PD 2? If not, how soon will it be done? Please send a copy to me.

The final weapons restriction information must be part of the SDEIS, subject to review.

Response: Table PD 2 is found within the same document referenced by the reviewer, Biological Opinion, Appendix H, Section 2.5 Weapons Restrictions, pg 22.

The additional marine study on shellfish from the muliwai and near ocean fronting Makua (in progress) should also be included in the SDEIS.

Response: In accordance with Settlement Agreements between the Army and Malama Makua the Army included results of the Final Marine Life Study in the Final EIS. The full text of the Marine Life Study will also be available as an appendix in the FEIS.

There were 272 fires in the 10 year period between 1989 to 1998 (data obtained by FOIA from the Army). Because of the increased danger of fires, the Army stopped using tracers, TOW missiles, and rockets for the last 10 years. Yet alternatives 2, 3 & 4 use some or all of these weapons plus the Javelin to replace the Dragon anti-tank missiles. If these alternatives are initiated, there will be fires, including extensive ones, in spite of your fire prevention and suppression plan.

Response: The Army recognizes the risk of these weapons and has evaluated the wildfire risk related to each alternative in Section 4.14. The Army has worked with USFWS to develop minimization measures and controls that are consistent with the Endangered Species Act. The USFWS issued a non-jeopardy opinion covering Alternative 3 (preferred Alternative) of the EIS. No training at MMR would occur without compliance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

So how did the Army arrive at its choices of alternatives? You did not include an alternative based on the training that occurred between 2001 to 2004. The settlement Agreement allowed

you to do 37 Calflex's in 3 years. You did only 26 by our count and only 21 by your count. That should have been one of your alternatives. Now your preferred alternative is asking for 50 Calflex's over 242 days plus another 200 days of live-fire convoy training! This SDEIS should have realistic estimates.

Response: The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried forward for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5. This section discusses the reasons the Army considered but eliminated other identified alternatives. There were no locations outside of Hawai'i that could meet all four screening criteria.

The Army's approach has been to look at the highest level of activity under each alternative, with the likelihood that the actual intensity and frequency of training may be below that level. For this reason the preferred alternative has not been modified in the EIS. The Army will consider this recommendation in developing its Record of Decision for this project.

It should take into consideration the results of the burn index and how it will limit training, as well as the time it will take to put protections of cultural sites and endangered species into place.

Response: In Sections 4.9 and 4.10 of the SDEIS, the Army assessed impacts to all natural and cultural resources consistent with NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

There are further comments that could be made but the time allowed to review this huge document was not adequate.

Makua SDEIS Page 3 (Fred Dodge)

In summary, this SDEIS reveals multiple significant impacts, often non-mitigable, to at least nine areas. There are areas where information is lacking or pending, which should be included in the future draft.

Though all impacted areas are important, of particular concern are the areas of endangered species, Cultural Sites and ATIs, as well as the significance of these to Hawaiian Culture. Also of great concern is the threatened ACCESS to these sites and to the 'AINA (land) of Makua itself.

The conclusion for anyone who truly cares about Hawaii is that Makua is an inappropriate place for the military to train!

Frederick A. Dodge, MD; Karen G. S. Young, APRN, MSN, MPH

52. John Stimson

One of the purposes of an impact statement is for the reader to be able to evaluate the evidence and assess the impacts of a proposed action and its alternatives. This DEIS makes it difficult to

find the relevant information about impacts and omits important information. Therefore it is difficult to assess the impacts of the Army's re-use of Mākua Valley for live-fire exercises.

Response: A table of contents is provided at the beginning of Volume 1 of the EIS. The potential impacts associated with each alternative as they related to the proposed action, is found in Section 4 Environmental Consequences.

Locating information in the DEIS.

The appendices which include the Biological Opinions of 2007 and 2008 are very difficult to deal with. The Biological Opinions have been broken into many separate PDF files with no indication of what page numbers are within each PDF or what BO sections are in each PDF. This presentation makes it very time consuming to find information. The authors and reviewers of the EIS are discouraging review and comment either inadvertently or by design.

Response: A table of contents is provided at the beginning of Volume 1 of the EIS. A Table of Contents will be added to each volume of the FEIS. There was certainly no intent to discourage comment.

Important data is missing from the opinions and the draft EIS concerning fires.

The record of the location and extent of past fires is never given In the DEIS. Admittedly some of this data does appear in "Analysis of fire management concerns at Mākua Military Reservation", Beavers et al (1999), but the location information is not very useful; the grid coordinates refer to 100 x 100 m areas and it is not clear whether the grid coordinate refers to a point of origin of a fire, the center of a fire or what. Use of the Army's grid coordinate system instead of more generally used latitude and longitude values does not help either. It is not possible to map the fires from the data given. The DEIS does not give figures for the area of Mākua Valley burned by fires while the valley has been used for live fire exercises. What proportion of the valley has been burned each year? The DEIS gives a frequency distribution of fire sizes and Beavers et al (1999) give the sizes of individual fires, but neither of these sources reports the area of the valley burned each year. One could add the sizes of all the fires in a year (Beavers et al 1999) and assume these estimate the total area burned each year because an area burned once in a year is unlikely to burn again. Because the DEIS does not present them, I include figures for the approximate acreage of fires each year while Mākua was managed for live-fire training by the Army.

| Year | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 |
|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Acres burned | 750 | 365 | 1367 | 783 | NA | 500 | 541 | 2760 | 3 | 63 | 990 |

The area of Mākua Valley from the DEIS is 4,190 acres (Page 7-27). These tabulated figures show us that possibly more than a tenth of the valley is burned each year when the valley is used for live-fire training. The EIS fails to tell us this.

Response: The Army does not have accurate data concerning the areas burned historically. The Army has instituted the use of GPS to track the footprint of future fires outside the firebreak system and in offsite endangered species management units.

On page 1-4 it is stated that the Army finished the construction of a CCAAC facility in 1988, presumably for live-fire training. This section leaves the impression that the valley was not used for live-fire training before 1988. This is evidently not true according to Beavers et al (1999), for they present fire records for some years going back to 1970 and list the cause of most of these fires as munitions.

Response: This is an incorrect assumption. In fact, the Army presents a factual history of military use of MMR in Section 1 of the EIS.

The acreage burned for the years reported before 1988 are:

| | | | |
|------|------|------|------|
| 1970 | 1973 | 1983 | 1987 |
| 1525 | 370 | NA | NA |

From Fig 4 Chap 7 it can be estimated that a total of about 10,750 acres of fires occurred, presumably in Mākua Valley (MMR) in the period of 1970 to 1998. The area of the valley is 4,190 acres. Obviously these fires overlapped. What is the proportion of the valley which has been burned each year while under Army control? This figure is never given. It is important because the record of the fires while under Army control is pivotal for anyone commenting on the wisdom of the Army's proposal to re-institute live-fire exercises.

Response: The Army does not have this data.

The importance of maps of fires

A map of the extent and dates of past fires would be very useful. This would show: how much of Mākua Valley has been burned, how many fires have occurred outside the training/impact area, the extent of past fires, the proximity of past fires to the present ranges of endangered and federally listed species, the extent to which past fires might be responsible for the present ranges or boundaries of endangered or federally listed species. Such maps could well show that fires have caused the present restricted distributions of endangered and federally listed species. Maps of past fires would show the degree to which fires have impacted or threatened the natural area reserves surrounding the MMR. Finally, maps of past fires would show the total area of the valley which has been subjected to fires while the Army has been in control of the Valley.

Response: The USFWS has analyzed the impact from fire to threatened and endangered species in the 2007 and 2008 BOs. They believe implementation of the fire minimization measures will adequately reduce the threat to endangered species, so as to not jeopardize the continued existence of threatened and endangered species into the future. In addition, the Army has extensive off-site endangered species management areas ensuring that no species would be lost by a single fire event.

It should be noted that the lower elevations of Mākua valley were actively grazed for years (See Historical Overview, Section 3.10.3) before the Army began using this area for training. It is a well known fact that ungulates are responsible for limiting the distribution of endangered species in Hawai'i. In addition, the grasslands created by grazing set up a fire prone environment, also not conducive to endangered species survival.

Maps of the location of fires would also show to what extent the location of fires corresponds to the location of the training and impact areas. How many fires occur outside the impact area. At the moment this is unknown to readers and hence they can not evaluate the Draft Statements assessment of the impact of future fires.

Response: This data is not available to the Army.

The data on the frequency and size of fires is presented (Sect 7) without any reference to the intensity of training at the times of the fires. In order to assess impacts, It is necessary to have the frequency of fires expressed not only as a function of the year, month and time of day as in Chap 7, but also per unit of live fire training, eg. fires per man day of training, or fires per ton of munitions expended per day. It is not clear whether fires are low in frequency in a given month or year because there were no or few training exercises in that period, or because of the state of the vegetation or the weather. It is interesting to note that fires dropped to essentially 0 over the 4 years after training stopped in 1999 (Chap 7 Fig 1). It is planned that the Valley will be used 242 days out of each year. Is that the level of training which has been carried out in the 1988 to 1998 period for which Beavers et al (1999) give fire records? Or was the level of training lower, or higher? I do not want an answer to that question, its rhetorical. I want a more thoughtful assessment of the risk in the EIS.

On page 4-231 the Draft Statement says that most fire history records were destroyed after five years in accordance with modern Army Record Keeping System. Taken at face value, this means we would now have no records of fires in Mākua because training stopped in 1999. Some sort of records prior to 2003 are available. They were presented in Beavers et al (1999), and this data is used in Fig 1 through 6 of Chap 7. If despite the Army's propensity to throw out records greater than 5 years old, Beavers et al (1999) were able to find 7 pages of data on Mākua fires dating back to 1970, might there not also be maps or aerial photos of fires around? They would be very useful in further analyzing the potential impact of reinstating live-fire exercises at Mākua and improving the information content of the DEIS.

Response: There are no maps available or aerial photos.

If records of fires prior to 2003 have been thrown out, then the records evidently exist somewhere, because of the agreement the Army made with USFWS in 1991. On page 3-166 it says the Biological Opinion of 1991 said there would be "no Jeopardy" to endemic tree snails if the Army agrees to "Produce semiannual reports of fires that escape control". There were fires between 1991 and 1998, so where are these reports? They might be useful in reconstructing the magnitude and extent of fires in the 1990s. Why don't you ask the USFWS? As a matter of logic, it is not clear how filing a semiannual report on "out- of- control" fires would bring about a "no jeopardy" status for native species.

Response: The Army is not revisiting the validity of the 1991 BO. The 2007 BO, however, provides very specific guidelines for minimizing the impact of fire and managing endangered species.

Figure 1 of Chap 7 shows that after live fire training was suspended in 1998, fires dropped from an average of about 25 per year to perhaps 1 in 4 years (1999 to 2002). If the Army is not using Mākua there is a substantially reduced risk of fires and less risk to native species.

Response: Yes, while this is true it should be noted that on average, there is at least one fire started off the installation that spreads to the installation.

Biological Data

It is not clear how to evaluate the information about the distribution and abundance of plant and animal species presented in maps in this DEIS (eg Fig. 3.9-5), because we do not know the sampling design. If species are indicated to be absent from an area, is it because the area was not sampled or because the area was sampled and the species was not there. The reader has no way of telling. For example, endangered species are not shown extending down the steep slopes at the head of the valley. Were these slopes sampled? If so how? If they weren't, the species may be present and their distributions may extend closer to the impact areas than suggested in maps. Without knowing the sampling design we can't evaluate the limited data presented. Part of the importance of knowing the sampling design is that it would give us dates on which the sampling of the "sensitive" species was carried out. Neither the text of the DEIS or figures such as 3.9-5 give us a date. Without a date we have no way of evaluating the relationship between the Army's activities in the valley and the distributions of sensitive species.

Response: The Army has completed all their endangered species planning level surveys for MMR. In addition, the Army's Natural Resource program continues to survey for endangered species in areas that contain potential habitat. Further, the Army has surveyed the cliff faces of Mākua valley on rappel (using ropes), and is aware of many pockets of endangered plants in these areas. These areas are managed as part of the Army's conservation program, and monitored on an annual basis.

Sect 4.9.4 Summary of Impacts

This section begins with the statement that "Military training at MMR would have an overall adverse impact on biological resources". (I am aware of the statement on page 4-2 of the use of the term "would" in this Draft Statement.) It is not clear what the processes were for reaching this conclusion or the conclusions about the impacts on biological resources in the Table on pg 4-140.

The summary table on pg 4-140 contains symbols representing different degrees of impact on biological resources. The most severe impact level is "significant impact". This has been assigned twice to the "No action alternative", once for the impact of fire on sensitive terrestrial species and habitats, and once for the impact due to the introduction and spread of nonnative species. As pointed out above, when MMR was not used for live-fire training in the period 1999 to 2002, there was one fire in 4 years (Presumably there was no active fire suppression in the 1999 to 2002 period because there was no live-fire exercises in MMR), a much lower level than during training, about 25 fires per year in the period 1987 to 1998 (Fig 1 Chap 7), thus it is not clear how this first "significant impact" designation could have been assigned. The assessment that there would be a significant impact because of the introduction of non-native species seems to come about in the following way. Under the "No Action Alternative" the valley would evidently be used for training, but without live-fire exercises. Troops who enter the valley would not be required to clean their equipment to prevent the inadvertent transport of the seeds of non native species, even though these troops could have perhaps returned from other countries. At the top of pg 2-16 the Draft Statement says, essentially, if the Army does not get permission to resume live firing, a reduced level of management would be "required". This section goes on to suggest under the reduced level of management, soldiers would not be required to clean their boots and non-native species will get in, hence the assignment of the "significant impact" assessment for

the threat of non-native species in the “NO Action Alternative”. This seems outrageous. It is certainly a “significant impact mitigable to less than significant”, all they have to do is wash off their boots and equipment before going to MMR. That would surely cost less than the cost of preparing this Draft Statement. I think this section on page 2-16 and the assignment of effects in the table on page 4-140 verges on blackmail. If you do not let us use this valley for live-fire we will not suppress fires and will allow non-native species to be transported into the valley. Surely there is some issue of stewardship of these lands on the part of the Army involved here.

The table on page 4-140 has additional assessments which could be disputed because it is not clear where the evidence is presented which led to the assessments and how diverse information is integrated and reduced to these symbols. One is left with the impression of extreme subjectivity where it does not belong, i.e. in an impact statement. I may not disagree with many of the assessments in this table, but I have not seen how the symbolic assessments were arrived at.

Response: Section 2.3 should not be read to imply that Soldiers would not be required to clean their boots. The reason why the current level of management would be reduced is that the threat of fire would be greatly reduced if there were no live-fire.

There is a standard operating procedure for Soldiers to clean their boots and equipment prior to moving onto MMR. Fire control measures and non native species control are part of the USFWS approved conservation measures contained in the BO for live-fire training in Mākua valley.

Summary

Makua Valley is the wrong place for this kind of live-fire training; It is small, fire prone, harbors endangered species, is surrounded by natural areas and contains archaeological sites.

As pointed out above in my statements about the analysis of the history of fires and the methodology of analyzing the distributions of species, this Draft Statement is not adequate to chose among alternatives. One gets the impression that this Draft Statement is a pro-forma exercise. It was written to fulfill the law, but it has very limited usefulness in deciding among alternatives because it lacks essential data.

In conclusion, do not bother to annotate these comments with your stock responses used in dismissing comments in the 2005 Draft Statement:

“The EIS was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and with applicable Federal and Army regulations. Review of the Draft EIS by the US Environmental Protection Agency found the document to be adequate.”

“The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your recommendations and will consider them as it moves forward with the NEPA process.”

Such statements leave the impression that the Draft Statement is a pro forma exercise and the conclusion forgone, and the first statement implies that if you find fault with the Draft Statement it is not serious, because the EPA said it was adequate. So why bother to ask for public comment?

John Stimson

Response: The Army takes all public comments seriously, even statements of general opposition or support. The EIS is not a pro forma exercise and will serve as the basis of the Army's decision.

53. William and Melva Aila

The purpose and need is so narrowly defined as to insure that training at Mākua is the only option.

There is inadequate analysis of the SBMR options, no where in the purpose and need is it mentioned that training has to be limited to areas near SBMR but in sec. 2.5.4 and 2.5.5 those options are rejected because they would not provide company-level training areas close to SBMR.

Response: The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

In sec. ES-4 the Army states that it has not yet finalized the minimum design standard for convoy live fire training ranges but analyzes and rejects several alternatives because it doesn't meet needs. This rejection comes even before the minimum design needs have been determined!

Response: Convoy live-fire is described in the SDEIS from page 2-36 to 2-39. Although the Army hasn't established a standard size for a convoy live-fire range, the EIS lays out the mission requirements. For instance, the route must be of sufficient length that an attack comes as a surprise.

In section ES.3, the needs section, the Army refers to each Infantry Rifle Company (IRCO) needing Calflex training annually but doesn't identify how many Infantry Rifle Companies it has stationed here. If there are nine IRCO's here, why does the army need 200?

Response: Section 1.1 states that "Each Infantry Battalion contains three infantry rifle companies and one headquarters company." and "Under the current force structure, the 3/25th IBCT (currently 2/25th SBCT) has nine infantry companies that require CALFEX training." The EIS also states that other services will use MMR for training. Many other Army units require convoy live-fire training.

In section 1.0 the Army details where Calflexes were conducted both in State and many out of State for 2001-2004, but from 2004 to present no discussion of locations of Calflexes. Where did the training occur and why is the SDEIS not documenting the locations? How did all of the companies not trained at Mākua achieve certification and was that certification any different or modified from Army requirements? What was the basis for any differences?

Response: Section 1.1 states why CALFEXs have not been conducted for the past several years. It also makes clear that the Army will ultimately have to shift its emphasis back to training for conventional warfare and major combat operations.

In section 2-65 the Army admits to conducting Calfexes at SBMR but provides no analysis of its rejection of training at SBMR with proper scheduling. With deployments of one brigade, while the other is at home there should be an analysis of training with proper scheduling at existing training ranges at SBMR.

Response: Following completion of the battle area complex (BAX), SBMR would not have sufficient acreage adjacent to the current impact area to construct a replacement training facility that could support company-level CALFEXs; accordingly, the cost and schedule for this option were not estimated. The EIS makes clear that only modified CALFEXs could be conducted at the SBMR BAX. Previous CALFEXs conducted at SBMR were limited in scope.

In section 3.8.3 there is no mention nor is there any analysis of the impacts of Medical wastes being disposed of at MMR. There is also no mention of ICM uxos found at Mākua. This brings into question the accuracy and integrity of the SDEIS and the completeness of the Geotechnical and Structure Laboratory Study in 2002.

Response: A number of studies have been conducted to identify the types of materials that were used and disposed of at MMR, including materials that were burned in the OB/OD area. These findings are documented in the Hydrogeologic Investigation Report in Appendix G-1. No biomedical materials or infectious waste were discovered during these investigations (USACE 2006), and no such disposal or usage has been reported at MMR. Additionally, infectious waste has never been reported as being disposed of at MMR (Char 2003; Kim 2003). For these reasons, biomedical waste, lead-based paint, asbestos, and radon are not included in the impact analysis.

Regarding Improved Conventional Munitions (ICM), Figure 3-24 has been revised to reflect current improved conventional munitions (ICM) areas and impact areas. The Army has completed surface and subsurface archaeological surveys within the south firebreak road consistent with its legal obligations. To the extent permitted by law, the Army has included such survey results in Appendix G-9.

In section 3.10.8 Army refers to formation of Cultural Advisory Committees but fails to describe who participates, what the procedures are, and what are they tasked with? Where is the evidence of participation and consultation under NHPA?

Response: Cultural advisory committees were formed on the island of Hawai'i and O'ahu during preparation of the EIS for Transformation of the 2nd Brigade to a Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT). The cultural advisory committee on the island of Hawai'i has continued to meet on a continual basis for the last seven years. The cultural advisory committee on the island of O'ahu became the cultural monitors on the SBCT projects. Section 3.10.8 has been updated.

The findings of the CR mitigation plan is flawed, the areas immediately adjacent to the target areas and objectives have not been surveyed for either CR's or BR's and given the fact that large munitions have been observed fired beyond the surface danger zone and in fact outside of the firebreak road, the analysis that cultural sites and endangered species will not be harmed is flawed, because those areas where the large munitions have been fired outside of the SDZ and firebreak roads have not yet been surveyed!

The Army's characterization that cultural access is being expanded is a lie. compared to past access, the current access is extremely limited and not just for safety reasons.

The Army dictates to Hawaiian Cultural Practitioners, like myself where we can put our religious offerings, violating our religious beliefs and rights.

Response: The areas immediately adjacent to the objectives and target areas have been surveyed. Areas outside the firebreak road have been surveyed for cultural resources whenever health and safety requirements could be met. Surveys for biological resources were conducted adjacent to the target and objective areas as well as outside the firebreak roads. The EIS actually states that training at MMR could have significant impacts on cultural sites and endangered species. The Army is attempting to expand cultural access under the standards recently placed on the garrison by the Department of Defense Explosive Safety Board (DDESB).

The only restrictions the Army has placed on locations for leaving offerings come from health and safety requirements.

The Army fails to mention that the Marines conduct Calfexes at Pōhakuloa regularly and that the Army could also except for its analysis which is biased a preference to train near to SBMR.

Response: The Army is considering each of the alternatives presented in the SDEIS. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publication of the Final EIS. Alternative 4 uses PTA.

The Army disqualifies different range options at Pōhakuloa with out providing a complete and unbiased analysis. An example of this bias is that the Army rejects training at Pohakuloa because of the potential for SDZ's to overlap but readily accepts the overlapping SDZ's at SBMR.

Response: Unlike MMR, PTA does not currently present the phased restrictions that arise because of the threat of fire or the presence of endangered species, contained in the 2007 Biological Opinion. The Army looked only at the full range of training it would need to perform in the PTA alternative. If PTA were selected as the preferred alternative rather than MMR, it would have generated additional information such as a Biological Opinion. This, in turn, might have produced phased restrictions on training. Meanwhile, it was important to analyze a PTA alternative that would provide the same training opportunities as the full capacity use of MMR. Otherwise, there would be an uneven comparison and the decision-maker would not reasonably be able to select the PTA alternative.

In section 10.0 only 3 of the 192 terms defined are Hawaiian terms, that is less than .015%. This is a clear bias against Hawaiians, to achieve the predetermined outcome of training at Mākuā, how else do you explain this discrepancy against, things Hawaiian?

Response: Hawaiian terms are explained throughout text where first employed. For example see chapter 3.10.4, where several paragraphs explain terms within text.

There is no mention of the leased portion of Mākua valley, expiring in 2029 and the impacts its expiration, could have on MMR. This again biases the decision to continue training at Mākua, with out a complete analysis of other alternatives in other areas where CIP improvements may prove to be a better long term investment.

Response: The Army presents a brief history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. The long-term status of MMR and legal title to it are beyond the scope of this EIS.

The SDEIS fails to provide any studies or evidence to quantify the quality of life issues brought up as a issue for soldiers, nor does it recognize impacts on the quality of life issues to the Hawaiian and local communities.

Response: The lack of home-based live-fire training capability has an impact on Soldier morale as more time is spent away from family, which is not quantifiable in Unit Status Reports; however, reduced time with family is clearly identified as reason for Soldiers not re-enlisting during exit interviews.

The SDEIS fails to include Public Law 103-50, which found the federal government partially responsible for the illegal overthrow of the Internationally recognized Hawaiian Kingdom Government, finding that Native Hawaiians never relinquished their Sovereign Rights. This has bearing as to the ownership of ceded lands and the resources at MMR.

Response: Section 3.10.3 of the EIS has been adjusted to include this text.

Why are the recommendations of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and the State Historic Preservation Office not recorded and reflected in the SDEIS?

Response: All comments received from state agencies on the DEIS were included in Appendix K of the SDEIS. There are no further recommendations received from these agencies.

For the record both Agencies have gone on record to say that training somewhere other than Mākua was the preferred alternative for mitigating damage to CR's at Mākua. Its apparently a biased action by the Army to over look the recommendations from two state Agencies that the Army is required to consult.

One final comment, Steve Wonder and Ray Charles could see the bias in the narrowly defined scope and need. They also could see the bias in the analysis of alternatives. I don't think that this SDEIS complies with either the letter nor the spirit of NEPA and everyone on the team that wrote the SDEIS should be made to take an ethics class.

Mahalo for the opportunity to comment on this seriously flawed and incomplete SDEIS.

William and Melva Aila

Response: We do not believe that anyone connected with the preparation of the EIS behaved unethically. These people are honest professionals who are dedicated to their work.

Private Testimony

54. Mr. Kaiana Haili

Aloha. My name is Kaiana Haili. I am an instructor at Hawai'i Community College in the Hawaiian Studies Department and in the History of Hawai'i Department. I have also been working for the Department of Public Safety Corrections Department for the last ten years. I am the spiritual advisor to the Saguaro Correctional Facility in Eloy, Arizona. I am here tonight as a spiritual advisor. I spent over 25 years working with Protect Kahoolawe Ohana, and what I see here at Mākua is exactly the same problem. I know many native Hawaiian practitioners that are practicing their spirituality in Mākua Valley and that needs to be recognized as our religious right. We are protected to practice our religion. And for Hawaiians, it was on their land in the sacred valleys and mountaintops that we defined. Many kapuna back in the day of the late '70s on Kahoolawe and the elders were very comfortable walking in both their Christian and their Hawaiian heritage. We defined what we were doing as cultural with respect for those elders that were teaching us the way.

Today is another matter. Today we need to utilize our religious protection under the Constitution so that we can protect our land and our water, our oceans. We need to protect these sacred sites that are continually being attacked for our children's children. I was taught by my elders and my kumu, my teachers, that everything that I do here today comes from seven generations behind me. And everything I do here today I do for seven generations in front of me. I am only the vehicle between the generations that have been taught that our spiritual practices first and foremost are to protect the land, malama 'aina.

So tonight, Mākua Valley, its very name states that it needs that reverence of the parental generation. This is a place where we go for knowledge, to our parents. The land is our parent. This is the same thing that we fought before here in Hawai'i when they are misusing the land. The land is not something estranged to us. It's where we come from and where we return to. It is our mother. It is our father. It is our elder. It needs to be respected the same way we are told to respect our mother and father.

So as a spiritual advisor, I am here tonight to talk about the fact that what is happening in Mākua from native Hawai'i practitioners is that spirituality connection back to their lands. They keep saying that Hawaiians are people without an identity. We have our identity, but it's being taken from us and it's being taken in Mākua with the bombing and the desecration of the land. Mahalo for this opportunity. Aloha.

Mr. Kaiana Haili

Response: The Army is dedicated to fulfilling its responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. The Army has conducted extensive research on the cultural resources at MMR. The results of this research are found within Section 3.10 of the EIS. The Army has based the analysis of potential impacts of the proposed action in part on this documentation. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS. The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

55. Pueo McGuire

My name is Pueo McGuire. I am here to testify on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Mākua Reservation Project that they are proposing. I strongly oppose this action. The environmental, cultural, and social economic impacts due to this proposed project are not sufficiently addressed in the EIS. The cultural significance of Mākua Valley cannot be accurately assessed by the military in that their perspective is inherently biased. The environmental impacts of live-fire training in the area will be far more detrimental to the ecosystem than what the DEIS says. The First Amendment rights in the U.S. Constitution prohibits government from implementing and establishing projects such as these, activities such as the military training at Mākua Valley. This prohibits U.S. citizens from practicing their religion in their church. The EIS does not significantly address those First Amendment violations. It is impossible to mitigate the impacts of live-fire training and bombing of a church.

Response: The Army strives to protect cultural sites at MMR through site protection measures, avoidance, and changes to training scenarios. In Section 4.10 of the SDEIS, the Army assessed impacts to cultural resources consistent with NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

The proposed DEIS doesn't significantly address burial rights guaranteed by NAGPRA, the Native American Graves Repatriation Act.

Response: The Army feels it has thoroughly considered the environmental impacts of its proposed actions and alternatives. The Army has provided for cultural access and has sought to accommodate the practice of religion involving Army lands in Hawai'i to the extent practicable due to human health and safety concerns and the conduct of training to support the readiness and well-being of our Soldiers in fulfilling the Army mission.

The term cultural resources in the EIS includes cultural items defined under NAGPRA. These include human remains, associated and unassociated funerary remains, sacred objects, and cultural patrimony objects. Impacts to cultural resources, and thus cultural items under NAGPRA have been thoroughly assessed in this document.

Also there is the risk of spreading depleted uranium that the Army has confirmed occurs in the scope of the training range. The National Academy of Sciences has recently released a study stating that the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs are using insufficient methods of testing for reading levels of radiation caused by the depleted uranium. You are bombing a church.

Mr. Pueo McGuire

Response: The Army needs to know what particular National Academy of Sciences report is being referred to here. Here are two NAS reports the Army found. Neither seems to directly address the individual's concern:

1) Gulf War and Health: Updated Literature Review of Depleted Uranium (July 30, 2008)

- “In this most recent report, Gulf War and Health: Updated Literature Review of Depleted Uranium, the committee concluded that there is still not enough evidence to determine whether exposure to depleted uranium is associated with long-term health problems.”
- Epidemiologic Studies of Veterans Exposed to Depleted Uranium: Feasibility and Design Issues (July 30, 2008)
 - “The study committee examined several options to study health outcomes of depleted uranium exposure in military and veteran populations and concluded that it would be difficult to design a study to comprehensively assess depleted uranium-related health outcomes with currently available data. The committee further concluded that the option most likely to obtain useful information about depleted uranium-related health outcomes would be a prospective cohort study if future military operations involve exposure to depleted uranium.”

2) An additional report was published by the Department of Veteran’s Affairs Research Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans’ Illnesses, “Gulf War Illness and the Health of Gulf War Veterans” (November 2008). In addition to calling for more research, the report states:

“Other wartime exposures [pyridostigmine bromide and pesticides] are not likely to have caused Gulf War illness for the majority of ill veterans. For remaining exposures, there is little evidence supporting an association with Gulf War illness or a major role is unlikely based on what is known about exposure patterns during the Gulf War and more recent deployments. These include depleted uranium, anthrax vaccine, fuels, solvents, sand and particulates, infectious diseases, and chemical agent resistant coating (CARC).”

Comments

Responses

6 October 2008 Public Meeting

1

1

2

3

4

5 In Re:
6 Supplemental Draft
7 Environmental Impact
8 Statement for Military
9 Training at Makua
10 Military Reservation

8

9

10 TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING

11

12 Held on October 6, 2008, at Nanakuli High and
13 Intermediate School, 89-980 Nanakuli Avenue, Nanakuli,
14 Hawaii 96792.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Comments

Responses

2

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|------|
| 1 | INDEX OF EXAMINATIONS | |
| 2 | Speakers: | PAGE |
| 3 | Richard Pomaikaiokalani Kini | 10 |
| | Granny Grace | 12 |
| 4 | Henry Ahlo | 14 |
| | Bill Prescott | 16 |
| 5 | Bill Hambaro | 20 |
| | Fred Dodge | 22 |
| 6 | Kevin Milnes | 25 |
| | Mary Pestana-Young | 27 |
| 7 | Pat Patterson | 29 |
| | Wyatt Lee | 30 |
| 8 | Pono Kealoha | 31 |
| | Kukui Maunakea-Forth | 32 |
| 9 | Kealohi Maunakea-Forth | 35 |
| | Kauhi Maunakea-Forth | 37 |
| 10 | Gary Maunakea-Forth | 38 |
| | Melva Aila | 41 |
| 11 | Butch Detraye | 45 |
| | Ikaika Hussey | 48 |
| 12 | James Manuku, Sr. | 51 |
| | John Carroll | 54 |
| 13 | David Henkin | 57 |
| | William Aila | 61 |
| 14 | James Cowles | 66 |
| | Henry Pelekai, Jr. | 68 |
| 15 | Marti Townsend | 70 |
| | Albert Silva | 72 |
| 16 | Dr. Kit Glover | 75 |
| | Marti Townsend | 75 |
| 17 | William Aila | 76 |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |

Comments

Responses

3

1 -oOo-

2 FACILITATOR GOMES: Aloha. Aloha. My name is
3 Ku'umeaaloha Gomes. I'm the facilitator for tonight. I
4 want to make it clear that my role is to focus the process
5 and to assure that everyone's voices are heard. This
6 is -- tonight is the Makua EIS hearing, public hearing.

7 We need louder?

8 Is this better? Can everybody hear? Can I
9 continue? Can you hear back there? Can you hear?

10 All right. My name is Ku'umeaaloha Gomes and I'm
11 the facilitator for this evening -- excuse me. Can we all
12 focus up here? Can we ask for our focus up here, please.
13 Thank you.

14 I just want to say that I'm focused on the process
15 for this hearing, so my role is to help to make it
16 possible for all of you to give testimony in a very
17 respectful way. Meaning that you'll have a certain time
18 to do it and come up here so that you can be heard. This
19 is not -- this is a public comment session. Meaning that
20 although Colonel Margotta and Paul Theis is seated at the
21 front table here. They're here to listen to your comments
22 and not to answer any questions. So there's no back and
23 forth question and answer.

24 There are several ways for you to give testimony.
25 And if you haven't already done so, I encourage you to

Comments

Responses

4

1 please sign up in the back of the room so that we may go
2 on to that list and you will be allowed to give testimony.

3 The testimonies are for four minutes per person
4 tonight. And there's several ways to give testimony. One
5 is that you can write your testimony on the forms that are
6 over there where the blue table is. There's some
7 testimony response forms. If you want to write your
8 testimony, you can go there to do it.

9 Another way to do it is you can e-mail. If you
10 want to do it later on this evening, you can do it e-mail.
11 And the e-mail address is on that response form.

12 Another way to do it is that we have several court
13 reporters who are here. There's a court reporter -- raise
14 your hand -- in the back of the room. And if you want to
15 give your testimony directly to her, not to come up here,
16 you can do that.

17 Then we have a video camera that's set up right
18 here. Can you raise your hand, video man. Thank you.
19 The video camera right there. If you want to give your
20 testimony and have it videoed over there.

21 We also have a Hawaiian translator, Maria Morales.
22 Malia, can you raise your hand, please. Mahalo. Malia is
23 there for anyone who wants to give their testimony in
24 Hawaiian, she will do the translation. You can also
25 submit your testimony anyway and she will do the

Comments

Responses

5

1 translations so it gets recorded in Hawaiian and in
2 English.
3 As the facilitator, I will indicate to you your
4 time and I will show you a little card that will say "One
5 minute" and another one that will say "Pau." Okay? And
6 I've got to make sure that you are pau. And the reason
7 for that is to allow for everyone in the room to be able
8 to give testimony in the short time that we have.
9 There's some kind of feedback here.
10 Is that okay? No, it's not okay.
11 Okay. Is that better? No. That's better. Is
12 that okay? Back there, can you hear? Okay. Can people
13 hear. Okay?
14 Did you pretty much hear what I said at the very
15 beginning or do I need to repeat it?
16 I want to stress especially the part about that
17 this is a public comment session for the EIS for Makua.
18 And that it's not a question and answer session.
19 So Colonel Margotta and Paul Theis are here to
20 receive your comments and not to engage in a question and
21 answer session.
22 Also, that each speaker will be given four minutes
23 to allow for everyone to have an opportunity to speak. So
24 I ask you to monitor yourselves so that everyone will have
25 an opportunity to come up here. I also will help you with

Comments

Responses

6

1 that by giving you some cue cards that will help you to
2 note the time first to the minute and then when you pau.
3 And again, be sensible so that everyone will have an
4 opportunity to testify because we have to be out of here
5 by 9:30.

6 I know it's kind of -- we don't have the best
7 technology tonight and this is the best that we can do.
8 So hopefully, we can proceed with this.

9 So I've been told people can't understand what I'm
10 saying. Hopefully, hopefully, we're going to have to
11 manage this in a way that others will be able to speak too
12 and be heard. But we will follow the same process. And
13 as the facilitator, I will let you know that you have four
14 minutes and when your time is up. Okay?

15 Again, I want to reiterate that this is not a
16 question and answer period. This is a time for the Army
17 to receive comments from you. This is your time to give
18 those comments. And I expect that they will be very
19 respectfully done.

20 As the facilitator, I'd like to encourage our
21 people to be very respectful and I will not condone
22 swearing from anyone, 'cause I think our people can be
23 very respectful and let the Army know what it is you're
24 thinking and be done in a very powerful way.

25 Okay. The other thing is -- and as I said,

Comments

Responses

7

1 there's several different ways to give testimony. Right.
2 There's the video camera over there. There's the court
3 reporter over there. Malia Morales is back there, if you
4 want to do your testimony in Hawaiian. And also, there's
5 the written response table over there where you can pick
6 up the forms over there and respond; or you can do an
7 e-mail, and that e-mail address is on the paper there.

8 We will stop at 9:30 and that's because we have
9 restrictions, the DOE restrictions about the place, about
10 the use of this facility. So we have to stop at 9:30.

11 Okay?

12 The other thing, finally, is that there's water
13 back there and I'm glad there's water because it is hot.
14 So please help yourself to water. And in the interest of
15 environmental consciousness, there's also the disposable
16 bin back there.

17 At this time, I'd like to call on Colonel
18 Margotta, Garrison Commander for the U.S. Army to say a
19 few words.

20 COLONEL MARGOTTA: Good evening, everyone and
21 welcome. Thank you all for attending.

22 I don't need a microphone, anyway.

23 Good evening, everyone. As I said, my name is
24 Matt Margotta, Garrison Hawaii Commander. I would like to
25 welcome you all to tonight's public meeting. I know that

Comments

Responses

8

1 we're behind schedule so I'll make these remarks rather
2 short.

3 There's a couple of purposes behind the legal
4 process I just want to mention to you. The first one is
5 to make sure that sufficient information is provided to
6 the government for informed decision-making. The second
7 purpose behind the legal process is to ensure that the
8 public has a chance to participate in those
9 decision-making -- that decision making board. That's why
10 we're here tonight, is to solicit the feedback and get the
11 comments from the community on the use of Makua.

12 Now, let me stress that the feedback and the
13 comments that you provide here tonight are important to
14 the Army and they are considered in those decisions. This
15 is an example, if you take a look at the draft EIS right
16 now, there's 750 pages in that document that's devoted to
17 Army responses to comments that have been given to us
18 previously. So the Army does consider your comments and
19 does take it into consideration. We do think it's
20 important.

21 The other piece I wanted to reiterate to everyone
22 is there's been no final decisions with regard to the use
23 of Makua. The Army will not make a decision on that until
24 we hear your feedback. And that information is put all
25 together to allow the decision-makers to come to an

Comments

Responses

9

1 informed decision. No decisions yet.

2 Forth point: Please keep your comments related to
3 Makua. All right? There's no way we can stop that
4 tonight, but that's what we're here to find out. We're
5 here to hear comments about the Army's use about Makua,
6 not about other things.

7 Lastly, what I'll ask you all to do is to respect
8 the other members of your community. You're going to be
9 given four minutes each to get up and make comments. Past
10 history, that's sufficient time for everyone to make
11 comments. The only reason I say that I ask you to respect
12 your community members, if you take longer than four
13 minutes, potentially some other community members may not
14 have the opportunity to get up and speak.

15 As the Facilitator mentioned, we will close this
16 at 9:30 tonight. We've got about two hours and 20 minutes
17 to get comments. That should be sufficient time. So once
18 again, I thank you all for participating in this process.
19 We look forward to hearing your comments.

20 FACILITATOR GOMES: Thank you, Colonel Margotta.

21 We're going to get started. And the first person
22 is Pomaika'i followed by Granny Grace. Because the mic --
23 Pomaika'i, because the mic -- I invite you to stand up
24 here. And because the mic isn't working the way we want
25 it to work, may I suggest you just talk. You can project,

Comments

Responses

10

1 yeah?

2 MR. KINI: Yeah.

3 MR. KINI: Aloha kakou, Everybody.

4 Aloha. Mahalo. My name is Richard

5 Pomaikaioikalani Kini. I served four years in the

6 military. I joined in 1958. So I'm not anti-military.

7 I'm not even anti-America. Lot of the young people I hang

8 around today with me can't understand that I enlisted in

9 the military at that time. I say at that time, when I was

10 in the military, John F. Kennedy was the president.

11 Marilyn was the Queen and Elvis was the King compared to

12 the jerks we got in office right now.

13 But the thing I really want to hit, I'm 69 years

14 old. I was raised in the family, raised in the world that

15 it is a sin to tell a lie. And I could not understand

16 that, that even in the ten commandments, thou shall not

17 lie, 'cause everybody around me was telling me a lie. And

18 I can't believe that after, what, six, seven years, the

19 lie about why United States is at war in Iraq all over the

20 world is still a tremendous lie. Hitler said, "When you

21 tell a lie, tell a big lie 'cause the greater the lie, the

22 more the people will believe it."

23 When I came to the second reading over there to

24 talk about the military involvement and training in 1943,

25 that's a lie. Another lie. It began in 1929. Right

PT1

PT1

A historical record of military use of Mākua is presented at the beginning of Section 1.1, and in Section 3.10.3 of the EIS. Prior to 1941, the military used portions of Mākua Valley for training. The poster referred to by the commenter listed the history of live-fire exercises at Mākua.

Section 1.1 states "Private parcels within that property were purchased from their owners or obtained by condemnation, whereas territorial lands were conferred by the territorial governor's consent."

The church at Mākua is discussed in Section 3.10.3

Comments

Responses

11

PT1

1 after the attack of Pearl Harbor in 1941, prior to that,
 2 they had over 2000 people living in Makua, farmers that
 3 were growing food to go to Honolulu at that time. Right
 4 after the attack, they were given notices that they were
 5 being evicted out of Makua, forced by the military.
 6 And in those days and especially after the war,
 7 nobody questioned the military. The people there painted
 8 white crosses on their homes. They had a church over
 9 there. And guess what happened, the old military pulled a
 10 December 7th on those people's homes and bombed every
 11 one of those homes that had a white cross and bombed the
 12 churches.

13 You know, enough's enough. I think it's a
 14 greatest sin to expect the youth of the American people to
 15 go die for a lie. I understand that when your country,
 16 your nation is under threat, you need a military force to
 17 defend us. But for a lie, no. Shame. Shame.

18 Makua to me is too special. There's too much
 19 historical native things there, whether it's the plants,
 20 whether it's the snails, or whether its even the heiau
 21 area. Too special. So I didn't want to bore anybody.
 22 I'm not anti-military. I'm pro-Hawaii. But I'm very,
 23 very anti- telling a lie. And it bugs me -- bugs me that
 24 so many American people continue to live a lie, of a
 25 presidential lie. To me, President Bush, Mr. Bush should

PT1

A historical record of military use of Mākua is presented at the beginning of Section 1.1, and in Section 3.10.3 of the EIS. Prior to 1941, the military used portions of Mākua Valley for training. The poster referred to by the commenter listed the history of live-fire exercises at Mākua.

Section 1.1 states "Private parcels within that property were purchased from their owners or obtained by condemnation, whereas territorial lands were conferred by the territorial governor's consent."

The church at Mākua is discussed in Section 3.10.3

Comments

Responses

12

1 be put under house arrest and tried for crimes against
 2 humanities. That's how serious I am about this. Thank
 3 you very much.

4 FACILITATOR GOMES: Mahalo.

5 The next person is Granny.

6 MS. GRACE: Aloha everybody.

7 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

8 MS. GRACE: My thing is that the Army had it for
 9 over 60 years and I'm trying to teach my children how to
 10 respect the culture, love each other. But how can we do
 11 this, and yet the military is trying to cut our line, you
 12 know. Love them. Love. Respect them. I still say we
 13 should respect each other. The war pau already. The war

14 is some place else already. Give us back what is ours so
 15 we can teach and train our children what's going on on our
 16 land.

17 And for 63 years and just leave it like that, it's
 18 shameful. Shame. Hilahila. You know, it shouldn't be
 19 like that.

20 But this is what we're faced with. And I cannot
 21 do it alone. Myself and my family cannot do it alone.
 22 Myself, my family, and my friends cannot do it alone. But
 23 as a community, we all can do it. We need to get it back.
 24 Sure, we chase the Navy out of Kahoolawe, but that was
 25 necessary. We're trying to teach our children what our

PT2

PT2

Thank you. Paradoxically, a strong military deterrent can lead to peace.

Comments

Responses

13

1 Hawaiian culture was; where our people is, where our piko
2 going. All my grandchildren, great grandchildren, all my
3 children's piko is on the city of refuge.
4 Why? Because I fear what's happening in our world
5 today, especially the Hawaiian islands, we need to put it
6 in a safe place. And how can we say the military -- my
7 father was in the First World War, Second World War, and
8 he went to Germany. He also in the Second World War
9 served here. My uncle served here. My cousin. I even
10 lost a cousin who became a captain, and he died in the
11 Korean War, a senseless war. Yeah, we don't need any more
12 wars. If they want to fight each other, hey, let them
13 fight each other.
14 We are taught to love each other no matter what.
15 Can be somebody huhu with us, we still going love 'em.
16 Because we were trained to do that. And we were trained
17 to respect people. We were trained to respect our
18 government. But how can I tell my great grandchildren?
19 I have six children, 20 grandchildren, 17 great
20 grand and three in the oven, so I need to train them. And
21 somebody said, oh, how old you was when you had your first
22 child?
23 And I said, well, I think I was old enough to have
24 a child then.
25 So they said, well, you look like you only 65.

Comments

Responses

14

1 And I was maybe 13 years old when I had my first child. I
2 said, no, I'm 70. But I'm proud to say, if we teach our
3 people today to love each other, to respect each other,
4 then we can go a long way. But it has to be with
5 government. One minute. Okay. Aloha.

6 FACILITATOR GOMES: I wish I look that good when I
7 that old. You look so young.

8 The next person is Henry Ahlo. Henry.

9 MR. AHL0: My name is Henry Ahlo. I was raised in
10 Nanakuli. My whole life has been on the coast -- Waianae
11 Coast except for the time in the military. I heard a
12 person here saying he was 69. I am 76 years old. I was
13 raised by my grandparents, Patti and Robert Kuakini. They
14 are from Kona. I've heard lot of stories about the area
15 here about the military. During the Second World War
16 after the start, we didn't know whether the Kepanese -- or
17 that's the Japanese, were going to land as the information
18 was on the Leeward Coast. So Waianae, Nanakuli, Maili,
19 Waianae, Makaha, Makua was flooded with military. And
20 they had the consensus of the Hawaiians out here who were
21 predominantly the population on the Leeward Coast. As, in
22 fact, the Filipino, the haoles, the Portuguese, and
23 Japanese were all working on the sugar plantation. They
24 were the farmers in the area.

25 But the military came in and asked permission and

Comments

Responses

15

1 gave information that they needed the area to prevent any
2 more problems with the war that -- as it started. So I
3 grew up with the military over here. I went to
4 Nanaikapono School -- or Nanakuli first, then Nanaikapono
5 then I went on to Kamehameha school. Then I joined the
6 Army, 27 years. I was in the Korean War in the infantry
7 at 18 -- 19, and I was in the Vietnam War for two and a
8 half years. I stayed there long time so the young guys
9 can get the training that I had. And believe me, the
10 training that I gave them over there, we -- I never
11 suffered any serious injuries on the platoon of night
12 patrol that I took up.

13 There's a person here that saw some of our
14 operations in Vietnam. I won't mention him. We're like
15 brothers today. But I want to say this, training --
16 training is essential. If you don't have proper training,
17 you can show your backside to the enemy. You got to have
18 it up in your mind and in your heart to be a good soldier,
19 a good serviceman, to fulfill your obligation.

20 We live in the free world. It's not going to be
21 free often if we get a problem here in Hawaii. I know
22 there are some special interest groups. I hear them
23 talking. They want all the land they can get here. It's
24 happening on all the islands. And then later on, they
25 find the iwis under the buildings that they're building.

Comments

Responses

16

1 It happens. It happens all over the world.
 2 But I would like to say, I do support the training
 3 that they have in Makua. I trained there in the '60s --
 4 or the '50s and '60s. And with a lot of the local guys
 5 trained there. I just attended the old soldiers' reunion
 6 in Tacoma, Washington. They were all brothers band were
 7 in the military. Then we brought it back to Waianae this
 8 past weekend. Because that's how formed a band of
 9 brothers in the military. You'll never experience
 10 anything when you form a band of brothers how we formed in
 11 the military.

PT3
 12 I would like to say again and reiterate, I support
 13 training in Makua or anywhere that we can train our troops
 14 before they go off to battle. Thank you.

PT3
 The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

15 FACILITATOR GOMES: Before we go on, I want to
 16 apologize to our recorder who I -- my oversight was in
 17 introducing her.

18 For those of you who don't know her, this is
 19 Leimana DeMate. And she is taking down your testimony as
 20 you speak, okay, on the news print, so that you can see
 21 that she's representing your words very clearly.

22 The next person is Mr. Bill Prescott.

23 And thank you, Uncle Henry.

24 Followed by Bill Hambro, Hambaro.

25 MR. PRESCOTT: Aloha kakou, everybody.

Comments

Responses

17

1 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

2 MR. PRESCOTT: You know, I'm especially motivated
3 this evening to make my comments known because my
4 neighbor, who I've known since he was ten years old, he
5 just finished -- graduated from the police academy last
6 month and who is now at Fort Hood, Texas, training to be
7 deployed to Iraq; training that he could have possible
8 gotten just down the road from us. And because of that,
9 he's separated from his wife and his baby daughter who's
10 just a year and a half old. And this is why I'm really
11 uptight about it. I'd like to talk on the subject.

12 To those who don't know me, I am a native
13 Hawaiian. I'm here to represent as commander our Veterans
14 of Foreign War post 849. And we of the VFW are deeply
15 disturbed by the action taken by a few to deny our
16 soldiers the training that they need. And, you know,
17 these protestors have either been misled or badly
18 misinformed.

19 For example, Mr. Cully Amsterdam said "Militarism
20 is placing a brothel in a church. Soldiers are trained
21 here in Hawaii and they go out and they kill."

22 Dr. Fred Dodge said, "Welcome to the warfare
23 state," and then he went on agreeing with Mr. Amsterdam.

24 And these are typical protester comments, and I
25 want to say these protestors fail to understand the lesson

Comments

Responses

18

1 the United States learned from the war and from the attack
2 on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. And the lesson was
3 that, the only way to deter and prevent war is by having a
4 strong, well-trained, and well-equipped Armed Forces.
5 And, that's right, our Armed Forces are a deterrent to
6 wars.

7 And let me ask you, how many of you would pick a
8 fight with somebody who's bigger, stronger, trained to
9 fight? How many of you would do that? Not very many, if
10 any.

11 On December 7, 1941, we were not prepared. We
12 were ill prepared for that war. We were weak.

13 Regarding the kapu, Mr. William Aila said the kapu
14 was supposedly overthrown, continues today. I have kapus.
15 I've living proof that it hasn't gone away. But Mr. Aila
16 refuses to accept the fact that Kamehameha II did indeed
17 abolish the Hawaiian religion and the kapu that supported
18 it. Why? Because the penalty for breaking kapu, as we
19 all know, is death.

20 During World War II, Hawaii was under martial law.
21 Makua's military reservation was desperately needed for
22 our Navy to practice ship-to-shore firing. Planes needed
23 to practice to fire on land targets. It was the only
24 suitable area for long-range artillery firing. We were at
25 war and thousands of lives were at stake. And now our

Comments

Responses

19

1 Army is being sued for what was done to the environment
 2 while under martial law. And during the years they
 3 continued to train to fight in Korea and Vietnam. This is
 4 what really angers us, the Veterans of Foreign Wars.
 5 Those few who believe that the environment now suddenly
 6 takes precedence over the lives of our soldiers, many of
 7 whom are our relatives, our friends, and our neighbors.

8 Regarding Chapter 3, it's -- I'm requesting that
 9 all references to oral and oral history be deleted from
 10 the report. Many of the supposedly cultural sites have
 11 been identified through oral history. Oral history
 12 references the manner in which Hawaiians 189 years ago
 13 preserved their history, a way of recording their Alii's
 14 ancestry. Why? Because they didn't have a written
 15 language. Individuals were selected and trained in this
 16 skill. They had to memorize through chants the
 17 information they were responsible for. Errors were not
 18 tolerated and were punishable by death.

19 What the EIS is alluding to is word of mouth about
 20 what happened. This form of information is often
 21 contradictory and misleading.

22 I also request that all references to Hawaiian
 23 religion, Gods and sacredness attributed to that be
 24 deleted. What is referred to as culturally sacred has no
 25 connection whatever to any religion or God. It is

PT4

Most of the archaeological sites at MMR have been identified through reconnaissance surveys (on the ground) by qualified archaeologists, and not through oral histories. Oral histories/ethnographic surveys done for MMR have yielded very little information about cultural sites. The presentation of oral histories in the cultural resources section of the EIS were requested by the community and come from documented academic sources. No changes to the document have been made as a result of this comment.

PT4

Comments

Responses

20

1 someone's personal opinion.

2 In 1819, Kamehameha II purposely broke a sacred
3 kapu by sitting down and eating with his mother and some
4 other women. He then ordered the Hawaiian religion and
5 the kapu that supported it to be abolished and that god
6 idols be burned in heiaus on all islands to be demolished.
7 The order was supported by all of the kahunas. And I'm
8 talking about the priests. Even to the extent that Chief
9 Kahuna Hewahewa destroyed his own heiau. This order
10 removed any and all references of sacredness pertaining to
11 the religion and its Gods. Furthermore -- I'm done.
12 Furthermore, the practice was never restored by any of the
13 succeeding monarchs.

14 FACILITATOR GOMES: Bill Hambaro and Dr. Dodge.

15 MR. HAMBARO: Aloha everyone. And I'd like to
16 thank the veterans and the people who spoke before. They
17 have very good points, and I respect the Army and all the
18 veterans and everybody who support this country. I think
19 we all agree, we support our country. No matter what,
20 Hawaiian, Japanese, haole, whatever, we all support our
21 country. We all love our country.

22 But I think that's not the issue we're talking
23 about today. We're talking about what is happening is
24 urbanization of this land here. 70 percent of the entire
25 population of Hawaii live on Oahu.

Comments

Responses

21

PT5

1 You know when the guys went take over Makua? That
 2 was long time ago. Now how many people live on the west
 3 side? They're talking about bringing more stuff over
 4 there to use it for ranges. And I agree. Hey, I agree,
 5 you guys need places for train. I was law enforcement for
 6 over 20 years, and the worst thing was trying to find a
 7 place for shoot. Because as cities go around, they shut
 8 down all the ranges. No more place to shoot your weapons.
 9 And, that's right, the Army needs a place to train. No
 10 argument there. No argument there.

11 But is it the right place? Considering all the
 12 needs of the people on Oahu. And they had it for how long
 13 already. There's other places for go. I mean, on the Big
 14 Island, big place and a better place to train. And, yes,
 15 the Army needs a place to train. Our troops need the best
 16 training. I agree.

17 They're talking about bringing more guys through
 18 here carrying explosives. And that was missing from the
 19 EIS -- in the EIS. They don't talk about all these --
 20 what if there was an accident? How many people live on
 21 Farrington Highway today as opposed to 1949? Plenty more
 22 guys. A lot of children. A lot of families.

23 The other thing, I want to really focus on the two
 24 things -- I didn't get the chance to read the really thick
 25 document. The two things caught my eye is the use of

PT5

Chapter 2 also presents the safety measures that would be employed to reduce safety risks associated with such action. The analysis of safety measures is found in Section 4.6 Traffic and Transportation, and 4.11 Hazardous Materials and Waste of the EIS.

Comments

Responses

22

PT6

1 hazardous materials. Basically, they were shooting --
 2 what was it -- depleted uranium. Just came out last year.
 3 Depleted uranium, they were shooting in Makua. And they
 4 don't know how much. They don't know how much is there,
 5 how this is going impact the environment and how -- it'll
 6 impact all of us if we go down there.

PT7

7 And they're talking about lead. They're talking
 8 about going down there and shooting over half a million
 9 rounds every time they go down there and shoot. A half
 10 million rounds. You know how much lead that is? That is
 11 a lot of lead. Where is that going? In the aina. Not
 12 coming out, brah, 'cause they not talking about taking 'em
 13 out.

PT8

14 Some day -- some day, you guys going give back the
 15 land. Some day -- some day, it's going to go back to the
 16 people. And my issue, you know, we're right at tipping
 17 point. You know, right at the tipping point. Because,
 18 from everything I read, the land, despite everything that
 19 we on, despite the bomb, the burn, it's still good. Most
 20 of it is still good. You go talk to ladies. Plenty still
 21 good. Now is the time to stop it. Now is the time.
 22 Thank you.

23 FACILITATOR GOMES: Dr. Dodge and Kevin Milnes.
 24 DR. DODGE: Aloha kakou.
 25 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

PT6

The types of munitions that are planned for usage at Mākuā Military Reservation do not contain Depleted Uranium. AR 385-63, Range Safety, prohibits the use of DU ammunition for training worldwide. This policy has been in effect for over 20 years. At this point the Army has been unable to confirm the presence of Depleted Uranium at Mākuā. Discussion regarding the historical use of munitions containing Depleted Uranium in Hawai'i is found in Chapter 3.11 of this document.

Although DU is slightly radioactive and is considered a toxic metal, such as nickel and lead, a wide range of governmental and independent non-governmental bodies have studied the environmental effects of DU for decades and indicate that the health risks associated with DU exposures are low. Uranium is a naturally occurring heavy metal that is mildly radioactive. Humans and animals have always ingested particles of this naturally occurring substance from the air, water and soil.

PT7

Based on the limited detection of lead on the range and the isolated areas where it was found, lead is less of a contaminant than expected. As lead does not appear to be a migrating contaminant, no mitigation or maintenance is necessary until the range is closed.

PT8

The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

Comments

Responses

23

1 DR. DODGE: First thing I want to do, since people
 2 may not know, Volume I, Volume II, Volume III, volume IV,
 3 Volume V. The first volume, I counted the pages. 986.
 4 Almost a thousand pages per volume. 5,000 pages, maybe

PT9

5 4999. I don't know. And we're expected to digest this --
 6 read it, digest it, and comment tonight. So my first plea
 7 to the military is: In the future, and I'm sure there
 8 will be opportunities, have these testimony hearings or
 9 whatever you call them, have them occur toward the end of
 10 the comment period, not in the beginning. Give us more
 11 time. And because it is so high, there is so much, we
 12 need more time. Forty-five days is not enough. Last time
 13 when there was even less material to go over, we had
 14 75 days. So I think at the minimum, the comment period
 15 should be at least 75 days long.

PT9

Cleanup after training exercises is addressed in Section 2.4.3. In response to your request for more time to review, pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.10 the Army has met its obligations under NEPA regulations regarding public review of the Supplemental Draft EIS.

We have to balance the need for comment, and the need to perform our mission, and regret that we could not provide more time for the public to read the document.

PT10

16 There's much to comment, I'm going to have to
 17 limit it. The history part in the first part of Volume I
 18 doesn't mention the overthrow of the Hawaiian Republic and
 19 the apology bill and the whole question of independence or
 20 at least some kind of controversy that occurs with this
 21 whole business of Hawaiian history.

PT10

Section 3.10.3 of the EIS now includes text referring to the apology bill (Public Law 103-150) and the overthrow of Hawai'i in 1893.

22 Also, at least this time, you did mention that the
 23 Army signed an agreement with the territorial government
 24 in May of 1943. This is after they had already taken over
 25 at Makua. And they did get permission to stay here until

Comments

Responses

24

PT11

1 six months after the war. But I wish you had included in
 2 your history part, the fact that that agreement also
 3 stated that Makua would be returned six months after the
 4 end of the war, and it would be returned in a condition
 5 agreeable to the then-government. You didn't include
 6 that. That's a very important part. And I hope that it
 7 is included in the future.

PT11

The Army presents a history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 on page 1-4 of the SDEIS.

PT12

8 Also in 1976, an environmental assessment was done
 9 on Makua. And the conclusion was that an EIS ought to be
 10 done. I have that EIS -- I have that copy of the EIS.
 11 And as far as I can tell, nothing came of it at the time.
 12 No EIS was ever done at that time. It was only done or
 13 agreed to be done in 2001, the settlement agreement, after
 14 Malama Makua sued by way of Earth Justice. And we did
 15 sign it where we allowed training -- limited training in
 16 Makua, which is what the Army wanted, in exchange for a
 17 number of things, including doing the EIS, which is why
 18 we're here today.

PT12

The lengthy EIS process is not designed to wear the public down. Rather, we are all trying to take a hard look at the affected environment and the impacts of the proposed action. The thoroughness of the document means that both the public is informed, and that the decision-maker can make an informed decision.

PT13

19 That agreement allowed for up to 37 CALFEXes over
 20 three years, starting in October 2001 to October 2004.
 21 And out of the 37 that were allowed, the military did 26.
 22 Now they want to do 242 days, if I recall, of CALFEX
 23 training, plus another 200 days of convoy-ambush training,
 24 which is, I think, more appropriate. And that adds up to
 25 442 days of training in a 365-day year. And it would be

PT13

The experience of the past decade should not be used to predict the required level of training. First because MMR was closed for much of the time, and second because units deploying to Iraq and Afghanistan did not have the opportunity to execute required training at MMR. In addition, the combination can be mainly CALFEXes and fewer Convoy training events, or vice-versa, in any event the total live-fire training will not exceed 242 days.

Comments

Responses

25

PT13

1 nice to know how you plan to do all that. It seems a bit
2 much.

PT13
The experience of the past decade should not be used to predict the required level of training. First because MMR was closed for much of the time, and second because units deploying to Iraq and Afghanistan did not have the opportunity to execute required training at MMR. In addition, the combination can be mainly CALFEXs and fewer Convoy training events, or vice-versa, in any event the total live-fire training will not exceed 242 days.

PT14

3 In any case, Malama Makua's position has been that
4 Makua is an inappropriate place to train. We're not
5 against training, but not in Makua. We're not against the
6 Army. We're for Makua. Makua is an inappropriate place
7 to train. And these five volumes detail why it is, with
8 all the endangered species, with all the cultural sites,
9 with all the... So, please, clean it up and then return
10 it to the community. Mahalo.

PT14
The Army is a dedicated steward of the land at MMR. This is evidenced in our award winning natural resources management programs (for example, the 2006 and 2008 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Military Installation Conservation Partner Award). The Army spends millions of dollars annually on the conservation and management of endangered species, cultural resources, and clearance of unexploded ordnance to promote cultural access. The Army also monitors the land at MMR for potential transport of pollutants caused by military actions, which is evident by the Army's Marine Resources Study, Hydrogeologic Investigations, and the Army's Operational Range Assessment Program.

11 FACILITATOR GOMES: Kevin Milnes and Mary
12 Pestana-Young.
13 MR. MILNES: Hi. My name Kevin Milnes. I live in
14 Waianae and I've been over in Hawaii since '79. And you
15 want to go back to about military experience, my family
16 got thrown of the Debtors Prison (phonetic) back in '72,
17 got mixed up in the Revolution, my great, great
18 grandfather. My other great, grandfather ended up in the
19 war of 1812, drug down to Louisiana somehow and ended up
20 in that war. And my other great grandfather fought in the
21 Civil War, lost his eye. Yankee -- I guess he was a
22 Yankee.

PT15

23 But, anyway, me, my dad got drafted and camp -- I
24 ended up born in Camp Gordon, Georgia, during the Korean
25 conflict. The Army got the rebate, drafted me in '72. I

PT15
The Army remains dedicated to the protection of natural and cultural resources at MMR. Pursuant to this cause the Army has adopted a number of resource management policies and procedures that it implements based on input from Federal and State agencies, and the public. Examples of these include the Mākua Implementation Plan, Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, Integrated Wildland Fire Management Plan, and Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.

Comments

Responses

PT15

26

1 had a delayed entry for a guaranteed station and a job
 2 that never happened. And, in fact, when I was in there,
 3 it was called OJT, on-the-job training. And that could
 4 take anywhere from two weeks to a month to be qualified as
 5 a scout recon or a tent gunner back in those damn days.
 6 Excuse my language.
 7 But, anyway, the fact is the military today wants
 8 to be here, they want to do their job, and they're very
 9 well-educated. And the only thing I ask you all as a good
 10 neighbor and part of this community, who would keep that
 11 beach clean that we can enjoy on the weekend and who would
 12 keep that hill properly and environmentally controlled. I
 13 ask you, who would do that?

PT15

The Army remains dedicated to the protection of natural and cultural resources at MMR. Pursuant to this cause the Army has adopted a number of resource management policies and procedures that it implements based on input from Federal and State agencies, and the public. Examples of these include the Mākua Implementation Plan, Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, Integrated Wildland Fire Management Plan, and Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.

PT16

14 If you gave it to the National Park Service, that
 15 might make sense. But I mean as far as OHA goes, I don't
 16 think any of the Hawaiians can agree who the hell is in
 17 charge.
 18 I mean, you know, so as far as I am concerned, I
 19 have three golden rules in this planet. Bury thy shit --
 20 excuse me. Bury thy garbage; don't steal anybody's stuff;
 21 and pick up thy crud. Okay? That's all I'm asking for is
 22 a good neighbor. And the military seems to be doing that
 23 quite adequately. And I enjoy that beach on the weekend.
 24 I know I can go there and it's clean. And I won't be
 25 harassed. And I know I can go somewhere on the weekend

PT16

The Army continues to use lead in much of its ammunition, however, the Army continues to evaluate replacement alternatives for the lead bullet. The Army has addressed lead from ammunition in sections 3.11 and 4.11 within the SDEIS.

Comments

Responses

PT16

27

1 without a bunch of homeless idiots dancing around out
 2 there. So if you can tell me that the Hawaiians can do
 3 better down there, I sure would like to see how. So my
 4 vote goes to the military 'cause I know they've done a
 5 good job up to this point.
 6 And they haven't made lead bullets since I was in
 7 the Army. It was mostly made of zinc when I was in. I
 8 haven't seen lead in a bullet in a long time, unless you
 9 make it yourself. I mean, ever since the Keth Roll
 10 (phonetic) maybe back in World War II. But since Vietnam,
 11 they haven't made it out of that. In fact, most of the
 12 bullets right now are made in Israel and London. That's
 13 where they're buying the bullets to shoot in Iraq and
 14 Afghanistan right now. We don't even manufacture our own
 15 dang bullets anymore.

16 So as far as polluting goes, they have got a whole
 17 bunch of people scrutinizing them, and I recommend that we
 18 keep the training up because some day we might need 'em
 19 instead of stupid Bush's war. Thank you.

20 FACILITATOR GOMES: Mary and Pat Patterson.

21 MS. PESTANA-YOUNG: I just want to make some
 22 comments about Makua that, you know, lots of families go
 23 out there to experience the peacefulness, you know, the
 24 solitude, the beauty of the place. And I used to go down

PT17

25 there every day. And then when they would have the

PT16

The Army continues to use lead in much of its ammunition, however, the Army continues to evaluate replacement alternatives for the lead bullet. The Army has addressed lead from ammunition in sections 3.11 and 4.11 within the SDEIS.

PT17

Noise associated with current conditions at MMR is described in Section 3.5 of the SDEIS. Section 4.9 includes a description of the potential disturbance to marine wildlife from military activities.

Comments

Responses

28

PT17

1 training, you would have all these helicopters and all
 2 this noise going on. And I'm in the water snorkeling and
 3 I can hear it. So what is all that noise? The pod goes
 4 on the beach, you know, you hear that. It's just -- it
 5 just seems so violent to have that kind of action going on
 6 out there.

PT17
 Noise associated with current conditions at MMR is described in Section 3.5 of the SDEIS. Section 4.9 includes a description of the potential disturbance to marine wildlife from military activities.

PT18

7 Also, as someone always being in the water there,
 8 all these munitions that are up there, when it rains, it
 9 comes down. It goes to the ocean. You know, what about
 10 the children. Do they have to swim in that water. You
 11 know, I used to go there daily after work. I used to work
 12 at a site facility where we used to take people down
 13 there. And I used to get so stressed out. I used to
 14 speed just to swim there. And that was my healing place,
 15 you know. To me, it was very healing for me.

PT18
 The hydrogeologic assessment represents a widespread evaluation of the potential for contamination as reflected in Appendix G of the SDEIS. Sampling was conducted of soil, sediment, surface water, and groundwater with no pattern of contamination that would impact off-site receptors (human health and the environment).

 In addition, there is no established pathway of substances from military activities at MMR in surface water or groundwater that would impact the ocean water beyond those associated with naturally occurring flow.

PT19

16 Also, let's see, watching the news, the State is
 17 going around citing private citizens for illegal dumping
 18 on their property and having them responsible to clean it
 19 up. I don't understand how the -- you know, the military
 20 can continue to, you know, dump stuff.

PT19
 Cleanup as it relates to training activities on HI is discussed in Section 2.4.3 of the EIS.

21 I'm not against the military. My dad was with the
 22 Department of Defense. I grew up in Japan on a military
 23 installation. So it's not against the U.S.A. But it's
 24 just -- it's got to stop, you know. It's not good. And
 25 looking at that data of -- okay, Lyndon Baines Johnson

Comments

Responses

29

1 commissioned that place for training in the '60s, right.
 2 That was during the Vietnam conflict. Now, I don't know
 3 the data on that, but how much conflicts have the United
 4 States really won since it was commissioned to training?
 5 Has it been good? I don't know what the data is, but it
 6 probably has not been a good outcome.

PT20

7 So hopefully, you know, you'll find another
 8 alternative site to conduct your wonderful training. And
 9 most of all, I believe, you know, got to have faith in God
 10 that, you know, he can do all things, you know. Thank
 11 you.
 12 FACILITATOR GOMES: Mahalo.
 13 Wyatt Lee is next after Pat.

PT20

The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

PT21

14 MS. PATTERSON: I think one of the most telling
 15 things is that that land was promised back to the
 16 community six months after World War II. They haven't
 17 cleaned it, now you want to put more junk in there, TOW
 18 missile, rockets, illuminated munitions.

PT21

The Army presents a history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. Cleanup of MMR is not within the scope of this EIS.

PT22

19 And you promised the Strykers would not be
 20 involved in Makua; that the EIS would not include anything
 21 about the Strykers; that that was completely separate.
 22 Now you're saying Strykers are coming down our one road,
 23 past all of our businesses, past most of our churches,
 24 past most of our schools. Please, Makua is not
 25 appropriate for the kind of places that the soldiers who

PT22

The scope of which Stryker units would require the use of Mākua is discussed in Section 2.2a of the Supplemental Draft EIS for Military Training Activities at Mākua Military Reservation, Hawai'i.

The FEIS for the Permanent Stationing of the 2/25th SBCT (ROD signed April 2008) is very clear that use of MMR for Stryker vehicles was not within the scope of that EIS, however, Stryker use would be addressed within the scope of a separate EIS.

Section 2.4.1 of this EIS makes clear that use of the Strykers would be limited. There will be no off-road use of Strykers.

Comments

Responses

30

1 need training. And like everybody else, I had a Marine
 2 nephew, two Navy nephews. I'm not against the military
 3 either, but I am for Makua to be returned to the native
 4 Hawaiian community, and that is the Waianae Coast. Thank
 5 you for coming and listening. I hope you hear very well.
 6 Aloha.

7 FACILITATOR GOMES: Wyatt followed by Pono.

8 MR. LEE: Aloha.

9 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

10 MR. LEE: I'd just like to keep it short and
 11 simple. And we have a very big distinction of people we
 12 have in here. We have regular citizens. We have
 13 veterans. And I'd just like to give a hands off because
 14 not for you veterans and the training that you guys
 15 received, I would not have the liberties and freedom that
 16 I have today. So, everybody, let's give them a hand.
 17 (Applause.)

18 MR. LEE: But now, the thing I like address is
 19 this: I'll keep it very short. For the military, and the
 20 veterans and the people that do support the training in
 21 Makua, think about this: You have a one-acre yard, I take
 22 half of your acre without you even knowing, I put up one
 23 gun range and I start shooting gun in the back there,
 24 having people come train in there and start shooting all
 25 kind of weapons and whatnot. How would you feel? Because

PT23

PT23

The danger of an indirect round leaving the valley is minimal with the safety measures currently in place. First, limited firing charges are used to reduce the maximum range of the weapon. Second, Fire Direction Control procedures include computer and hand trajectory calculations, multiple checks on both the gun line and the FDC of data and gun settings by several individuals, and review of historical data to ensure that the gun is aimed in the correct direction and aligned for the change in elevation to preclude rounds from leaving the valley. Third, rounds with the longest range are also the heaviest and are therefore less likely to be affected by wind during the flight time.

In addition, the EIS describes how the Army acquired the land at Makua in Section 1, and how that land was used.

Comments

Responses

31

PT23

1 the population on Oahu is dense. It's growing dense
 2 already. As the lady said earlier, our population is
 3 growing. And you guys can say you going shoot all the
 4 statistics on those boards but what you don't -- what we
 5 don't know, don't hurt; right? They said it wasn't
 6 housing nuclear weapons in Hawaii, but that's not what
 7 happening on Ford Island and all that kind stuff.
 8 I mean, the facts, like Bruddah was saying, you
 9 know, you got to stop lying -- people got to stop lying.
 10 Start telling the truth. Just think about what kind of
 11 EIS you going to give to one range next to your house.
 12 What would you do? That's the question you got to ask
 13 yourself for the people in the military and the people
 14 that support this. That's all I can say.
 15 FACILITATOR GOMES: Pono followed by Ted Pond.
 16 MR. KEALOHA: Aloha, everybody. My name is Pono
 17 Kealoha. I'm here to testify against the military and
 18 against the weapons of mass destruction, the stake on our
 19 sovereign nation, to make us a nation of mass destruction.

PT24

20 However of you, all your bombs that you dump out on our
 21 ocean are going into our fish that we eating. All your
 22 pollution is going into our water, into our air. Depleted

PT25

23 uranium, the half life of that is 4.5 billion years.
 24 Can't clean that up.

25 If you're a Hawaiian, you respect your aina. You

PT23

The danger of an indirect round leaving the valley is minimal with the safety measures currently in place. First, limited firing charges are used to reduce the maximum range of the weapon. Second, Fire Direction Control procedures include computer and hand trajectory calculations, multiple checks on both the gun line and the FDC of data and gun settings by several individuals, and review of historical data to ensure that the gun is aimed in the correct direction and aligned for the change in elevation to preclude rounds from leaving the valley. Third, rounds with the longest range are also the heaviest and are therefore less likely to be affected by wind during the flight time.

In addition, the EIS describes how the Army acquired the land at Makua in Section 1, and how that land was used.

PT24

The Army has conducted numerous studies that have formed the basis of the Army's evaluation of potential impacts. This EIS includes the Marine Resources Study summarized in Section 3.7.2. This study explains results of tests of fish, limu, and shellfish in muliwai and nearshore areas.

PT25

Response: The half life of many elements and chemical compounds are well beyond the expected life expectancy of a human being. For instance, the half life of Carbon-14 is 5,730 years; the half life of Aluminum-26 is 730,000 years.

Response options include, but may not be limited to continuous or periodic monitoring of the ranges, limited removal of visible fragments, or remediation.

Comments

Responses

32

PT26

1 don't allow this crap to go on. How dare you guys.
 2 You're polluting my -- my home that is illegally occupied
 3 by you. Get the hell out. You understand? Hawaii has
 4 never been United States. Read up. Check it out. We're
 5 still a sovereign nation illegally occupied by the United
 6 States of America, who is the main terrorist. You
 7 assholes. Get the fuck out. You A-holes.
 8 FACILITATOR GOMES: Hey. Kala mai.
 9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Watch your mouth.
 10 FACILITATOR GOMES: Ted Pond followed by Kukui
 11 Maunakea. Kukui.
 12 AUDIENCE: (Inaudible.)
 13 MS. MAUNAKEA-FORTH: Aloha, I'm Kukui. Aloha
 14 kakou.
 15 AUDIENCE: Aloha.
 16 MS. KUKUI MAUNAKEA-FORTH: Kau ho inoa mai
 17 Nanakuli mai au. I am fourth generation on Nanakuli
 18 homestead and proud to represent my Ohana and the moopuna
 19 to come. A very proud grandmother. Tutu moopuna that I
 20 hope will return and be able to come to this moku and
 21 respect us all of us.
 22 I think tonight, you know, there's this -- you
 23 know, we're one people. We're one community. And it's
 24 important to understand that there's a diversity of
 25 opinion here and to respect that. And so as I gaze upon

PT26

Hawai'i is a state within the United States of America. The State of Hawai'i was admitted to the union on August 21, 1959, making it the 50th state. Also, the EIS now includes text at the beginning of Section 3.10.3 regarding Public Law 103-150, that addresses the 1893 overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai'i.

Comments

Responses

33

1 all my mentors and all the kupuna and then I also look at
2 the future generation, I don't see a divide. I see a
3 continuity. So it is up to us, kakou, to move that
4 continuity.

5 I wanted to speak especially to Makua tonight
6 because Makua was very instrumental in allowing me to heal
7 my family and seeing the advantages of having a cultural
8 rootedness. Growing up, it's very complex on the Waianae
9 Coast because you have an upbringing and a nationalism to
10 our country. But we forget that will there is also
11 another good, yeah, which is our nation. It was
12 sovereign, and it still is.

13 And so when I talk about Makua, it's about that
14 movement forward, that progression forward, yeah. Aina.
15 And I learned that from somebody very new, you know, in my
16 life. I wish she was here. Kupela Collins, also a
17 Waianae resident. She said, "ai" is food and "na" is
18 to (inaudible); and that the "aina" is that which feeds.

19 Will the kupuna here or the veterans here or the
20 Army consider that that is our sustenance and that there
21 are a lot of people here that would love to see our
22 country return to feeding itself, yeah; and that the
23 war -- you know, the wars that we fight abroad and in our
24 communities, you know, we fight with our intelligence,
25 yeah. As Olana A'i says, aloha is the language of

Comments

Responses

34

1 intelligence. We fight that war with intelligence or with
 2 that aloha. I love what kupuna said about aloha.
 3 So after 80 years, yeah, I propose to this group
 4 and to the Army especially, that we take -- the community
 5 take charge of the next 80 years. And we have a different
 6 vision of what we see and want to see in our communities,
 7 and that the EIS shows it. I mean it's 750 pages. Well,

PT27

8 that's the volume on the top. But, you know, if you go
 9 the 5,000 under or the 4000 underneath, you know, what you
 10 really have is this very complex creative languaging that
 11 we all know is shibai. We know it's the -- we know what
 12 the truth is. We know already what that document says.

PT28

13 And they take all that energy, all that mass of text, and
 14 they tell us that that is the truth? And not to depend on
 15 our own cultural way of understanding things; that the
 16 land speaks through us; that our history speaks through
 17 us; that those texts that we relied on, oral history,
 18 anakala (phonetic), oral history, also has knowledge, very
 19 meaningful knowledge. More knowledge than any of those
 20 books, yeah.

21 So to conclude, because I only have a minute left,
 22 I got to turn this, to the recorder. Thank you.
 23 All of the impacts and risks that are stated in
 24 the EIS, they're very real. I think what -- you know,
 25 what was said already is that we've damaged the aina. We

PT27

The Army has conducted numerous studies that have formed the basis of the Army's evaluation of potential impacts. This evaluation is presented in Section 4 of the EIS.

PT28

The Army derived its basis for the archaeological and cultural resource analysis from site specific baseline reports from cultural resource firms with extensive local experience, archival research, as well as from oral histories, public meetings and interested individuals. In addition, the Army encouraged the public and Native Hawaiians to share their knowledge of resources present at MMR and incorporated this information into the Draft EIS. The Army has always included the community, including in its Section 106 consultations. The Army will continue to consult with any Native Hawaiians having lineal and/or cultural ties to Mākua who wish to work with us in the identification, determination of significance and evaluation of sites at Mākua.

Comments

Responses

35

1 know that. Our -- yes, we have taken Kahoolawe. And,
 2 yes, we have not figured out how to clean it up. But were
 3 we properly resourced considering the damage that was done
 4 on that aina, yeah?

PT29

5 And do you guys -- does the public expect us to
 6 clean up that aina, you know, in -- how long have we had
 7 it? Fifteen, 20 years? I don't know. You know, that
 8 quickly, how can we fix it up? How can we be expected as
 9 a people to fix that when years and years and, you know,
 10 millions of pounds of ammunition and machinery and waste
 11 have been dumped there. I think that that's unrealistic.

PT29

At this time, because cleanup is not proposed, it is outside the scope of this EIS.

12 So I propose you give the community -- give our
 13 young people a chance. We can create brotherhood, not
 14 only in a military way, but also just in a very basic
 15 people way. And I want to reach out and ask you guys to
 16 assist us, yeah. Many, many, many, many people here that
 17 I think will be able to take this cause to the next level.
 18 Thank you.

19 FACILITATOR GOMES: Mahalo.

20 Kealohi followed by Kauhi.

PT30

21 MS. KEALOHI MAUNAKEA-FORTH: Aloha kakou. No
 22 Waianae, Nanakuli mai au. Me and my family we were pretty
 23 much born and raised in Nanakuli but we moved to Waianae.
 24 And -- but every time, like, we're trying to, you know, go
 25 to sleep, we can hear, like, all the bombs and everything

PT30

In accordance with Settlement Agreements, the Army has not used MMR for live-fire training since 2004.

Since 2004 the use of MMR has been limited primarily to non live-fire training events, to include aviation lasing, and unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) training.

Comments

Responses

PT30

36

1 going on and we're wondering what it is. And then we just
 2 find out that it's coming from Makua when they're, you
 3 know, practicing. And it's kind of like, oh, my God, why
 4 are they doing that; we're trying to, you know, be
 5 peaceful, trying to, you know, do our own things. And
 6 it's kind of, like, sad that they're over there doing that
 7 to our land.

8 And, like, there's hills, cultural sites that they
 9 have over there, and it has, like, really great mana. And
 10 it's sort of like a link that connects us and the people
 11 of Hawaii to, like, our ancestors who came before us. So
 12 it kind of like links us to our past, our present, and to
 13 the future. Because, I mean, if they keep doing it to
 14 Makua what they're doing now, I mean how are our -- the
 15 future generations going to go and enjoy it, enjoy the
 16 beauty.

17 'Cause every time my friends come from town, they
 18 look and they're, like, amazed 'cause it's, like, so
 19 beautiful when they pass Makua. So, I mean, what they did
 20 to Kahoolawe, it's sad 'cause that might happen if they
 21 keep continuing to Makua. So, I'm just very, very sad if
 22 they keep doing it, 'cause Makua is like a very beautiful
 23 place to just, you know, take pictures, watch, to enjoy.

PT31

24 I mean, they should just, like, release it to us 'cause we
 25 can, you know, just enjoy it, walk around, 'cause it's a

PT30

In accordance with Settlement Agreements, the Army has not used MMR for live-fire training since 2004.

Since 2004 the use of MMR has been limited primarily to non live-fire training events, to include aviation lasing, and unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) training.

PT31

Reasonable Alternatives to live-fire training at MMR include the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4. The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS. Closure of MMR and its transfer to the local community are outside the scope of the EIS.

Comments

Responses

PT31

37

1 place of our ancestors, our people. So, that's all, I
2 guess.

3 FACILITATOR GOMES: Kauhi followed by Gary
4 Maunakea.

5 MR. KAUHI MAUNAKEA-FORTH: Aloha.

6 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

7 MR. KAUHI MAUNAKEA-FORTH: O kui kou inoa no

8 Waianae a me Nanakuli mai au.

PT32

9 In my opinion, live fire exercise and ammunition
10 is not very thrilling to me. If there is ancient Hawaiian
11 sites still there, what would happened if it got
12 demolished in a single blow? What if there was an
13 uncontrollable fire that rapidly spreads? What if Makua
14 gets tainted for life?

15 My family and I have been living on the Waianae
16 Coast for generations. I've heard stories, myths, legends
17 and the wealthiness of Makua. I would like to see it --
18 this ancient valley returned to its previous glory. Its
19 cultural, agricultural, and beautiful glory.

20 If it is returned but uninhabitable by native
21 plants, animals, and people altogether? How can Oahu even
22 be cultural? It would do many Hawaiians justice to see
23 our beautiful ahupuaa returned, but it would sadden all of
24 our hearts just to see it dumped.

25 Why did the military move, anyway? Pretty soon it

PT31

Reasonable Alternatives to live-fire training at MMR include the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4. The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS. Closure of MMR and its transfer to the local community are outside the scope of the EIS.

PT32

The Army strives to protect cultural sites at MMR through site protection measures, avoidance, and changes to training scenarios. In Section 4.10 of the SDEIS, the Army assessed impacts to cultural resources consistent with NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

Comments

Responses

38

1 will be unusable. Doesn't take many among us to realize
2 that they take one place, leave, take another, and move,
3 just like Bikini Atoll, just like Kahoolawe, and just like
4 many other places that will take a long time to make --
5 even this place would be junk and unrepairable.

6 It has been a personal dream of mine just to take
7 up responsibility in having full sustainable, cultural,
8 traditional ahupuaa. And how can it happen if there's
9 many kind of debris all in the ground. And whenever you
10 just dig, look at soil, there's military bullets. There's
11 all kinds of junk up in the ground.

12 This is dream is so we don't lose contact with our
13 cultural, our people, our ancestors, and ourselves. Thank
14 you.

15 FACILITATOR GOMES: Gary followed by Melva.

16 MR. GARY MAUNAKEA-FORTH: Hi. Aloha kakou. My
17 name is Gary. Those are my two kids. I'm obviously very
18 proud of them, and my wife. I want to finish to address
19 what the gentleman from the military said earlier on about
20 this is just Makua. And to me, this is just not about
21 Makua but this is about our community. And let me tell
22 you first that I'm an organic farmer. I've been an
23 organic farmer in this community for almost ten years now.
24 I was born and raised in Aotearoa, New Zealand. I've had
25 the good fortune of having been -- having grown up in a

Comments

Responses

39

1 beautiful country and then moving to another beautiful
2 place of Hawaii and in this community.
3 When I bring my family and friends from Aotearoa
4 to the Waianae Coast, the first thing they bond with is
5 the people and they are blown away. Even though we're
6 definitely not a wealthy community, we're a very poor
7 community, even though you can see that physically in our
8 beach parks, they are blown away with the people in our
9 community. Invariably, one of the first things we do is
10 swim at Makua. And I was swimming there with my kids and
11 a friend a few years ago -- and this is almost a decade
12 ago -- and poom, poom, poom, poom. They turned to me and
13 said, "What's going on in the valley? Can we go hiking in
14 that valley?"
15 And then, so the story goes, it's a gated
16 community; it's inaccessible; it's been used by the
17 military as the EIS says now since the 1920s.
18 Okay. So we are organics farmers. We work with
19 kids. We get them to college. We work with
20 high-schoolers and intermediate school kids. We try to
21 get land all around the State to improve from our
22 five-acre farm to something bigger. We looked at
23 400,000 acres owned by developers, the rich elite,
24 Kamehameha schools. 400,000 acres. Guess how many acres
25 we got for farming? Zero. Not one.

Comments

Responses

40

1 You folks are all in the business of security;
 2 military security, security against terrorism. We are
 3 involved in food security. And Hawaii and Waianae is not
 4 a food-secure place. 85 percent of the things we grow are
 5 imported; yet, we have the valleys and the resources to
 6 grow everything for the state of Hawaii. However, two of
 7 those valleys, 10,000 acres, are completely off limits.
 8 Makua's off limits. A small sliver of Lualualei has
 9 farmers still farming, scratching to farm.

10 The gentleman said what if, what if you could use
 11 that valley, you would waste it. We would not waste it.
 12 We are farming and providing food for many, many people.
 13 We are doing that at the rate of \$100,000 per acre. You
 14 know what that translates into? That translates into
 15 16 young kids from our community going to college.
 16 Sixteen.

17 When we went to Waianae Intermediate School and
 18 Waianae High School to work there, we asked them, "How
 19 many kids start in the freshman year?"

20 They said 650. By senior year, guess how many
 21 kids are left. 350. Where do those 300 kids go? Every
 22 year, every single year, 300 kids disappear from our
 23 education system. This is a community issue. Makua is
 24 not just about training there. This is a community issue.
 25 Don't be seduced that it's not. That is why it is

PT33

The Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan identifies long-range use policy, which includes preserving MMR as agriculture/open space and preservation. Nevertheless, the plan recognizes the importance of MMR to the overall military mission and economy of the region; therefore, it recognizes the continued military use of these lands for the foreseeable future.

PT33

Comments

Responses

41

1 rational, it is logical, and it is fine for community
 2 people to ask for the valley back. Purely logical.
 3 Purely rational.
 4 So please consider that as an option because
 5 80 years has been far too long. Mahalo.
 6 MS. AILA: Aloha.
 7 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

PT34
 8 MS. AILA: My name is Melva Aila. I lived in
 9 Waianae all my life. I agree with Fred Dodge about
 10 needing more time. We need more time to read these
 11 volumes, and the Army is just being unreasonable about
 12 that. Absolutely no training or live-fire training in

PT35
 13 Makua. Army has not been doing any live-fire training for
 14 over five years. And for over four years, they only had a
 15 limited amount of training. Army has been deemed ready
 16 for deployment for these past five years where no training
 17 or live-fire training has occurred. Army may want Makua,
 18 but they demonstrated that they truly don't need Makua
 19 valley.

PT36
 20 2029, the lease ends. The DLNR general lease
 21 issued to the Army ends in 2029. The Army should be
 22 looking for a new place to train. The preferred

PT37
 23 alternative should be to train on the mainland. The Army
 24 should have a detailed exit plan and a clean-up plan. The
 25 Army should be implementing the exit and clean-up plan

PT34
 We have to balance the need for comment, and the need to perform our mission, and regret that we could not provide more time for the public to read the document.

PT35
 Training requirements are constantly changing based on lessons learned in combat, training events, new equipment, and new commanders. The Soldiers of the 25th ID must train at their home station for possible deployment anywhere in the world.

PT36
 The Army presents a brief history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. The long-term status of MMR and legal title to it are beyond the scope of this EIS.

 The Army at this time has no plans to cease the use of Mākua Military Reservation. The commenter may be referring to the text presented in Section 3.1.2.2 Recognition of Military Use, which states “The importance of US military uses of lands at Lualualei and Mākua Valley is recognized both in terms of the overall mission of the military and the importance of the military to the economy to the State of Hawai’i and the City and County of Honolulu. The current Wai’anae Sustainable Communities Plan, which looks ahead to the Year 2020, therefore, recognizes the continued use of these lands for military purposes for the foreseeable future.”

PT37
 Alternatives that do not advance the purpose and need are not considered reasonable alternatives. The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried forward for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5. This section discusses the reasons the Army considered but eliminated other identified alternatives. There were no locations outside of Hawai’i that could meet all four screening criteria. Other locations considered included Fort Irwin, California, Yakima Training Center, Washington, and Fort Polk, Louisiana. Therefore these locations were dismissed and not considered for further evaluation.

Comments

Responses

| | | |
|------|---|--|
| PT38 | <p>42 1 right away.</p> | <p>PT38 Cleanup of MMR is beyond the scope of this EIS. The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.</p> |
| PT39 | <p>2 In the legislature this year, the bill was 3 introduced for the Army to clean up and do an exit plan 4 for Makua. The bill passed in the Senate and the bill 5 came pretty close of passing in the House, except the bill 6 didn't make it in time to be heard during the House period 7 time. We'll be at the legislature this year and doing 8 that again.</p> | <p>PT39 The Army, of course, takes no position on pending legislation.</p> |
| PT40 | <p>9 The quality of life issues for soldiers, but where 10 is the analysis of the quality of life for the Waianae 11 Coast community? Citizens cannot compete or afford to pay 12 the high cost of rent or housing costs that the military 13 can afford.</p> | <p>PT40 A full analysis of current socioeconomic conditions within the region of influence is found in Sections 3.12 and 4.12 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice.</p> |
| PT41 | <p>14 Recruiting tools. Did you ask the people who live 15 here in our islands if they could be used as a recruiting 16 tool for the Army.</p> | <p>PT41 The reviewer's comment is not clear as it pertains to the EIS. Recruiting is beyond the scope of this EIS.</p> |
| PT42 | <p>17 Cultural practices in Makua. Why are we being 18 denied access to cultural sites that we practiced at many 19 times before? The accesses are just being decreased.</p> | <p>PT42 The Army is attempting to expand cultural access under the standards recently placed on the garrison by the Department of Defense Explosive Safety Board (DDESB).</p> |
| PT43 | <p>20 I know that I could go on and on if I had more 21 time to finish the other four volumes. And in conclusion, 22 Army fails to return Makua Valley and it's a broken 23 promise they made 60 years ago. Mahalo.</p> | <p>PT43 The Army presents a brief history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. Much of the land that comprises MMR is ceded land, owned by the Federal Government; the remainder is leased to the Army by the State of Hawai'i. The Army also owns 170 acres in fee simple and holds 1.64 acres by license. The lease contract for MMR is not within the scope of this Environmental Impact Statement, therefore no changes to the document have occurred as a result of your comment. The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been included in the administrative record for this process.</p> |
| | <p>24 FACILITATOR GOMES: The next speaker is a very 25 respected kupuna in our community, not only here in</p> | |

Comments

Responses

43

1 Waianae but throughout our kapai aina.
 2 And, Aunty Frenchy, I apologize for not having a
 3 microphone.
 4 MS. DESOTO: Oh, no more mic?
 5 FACILITATOR GOMES: No.
 6 MS. DESOTO: You know when you get old, you start
 7 to slur.
 8 Mahalo. Aloha no.
 9 AUDIENCE: Aloha.
 10 MS. DESOTO: Ko inoa keanuenue okalani nui
 11 amaumau. Hanau mua na wahine kahikilani kakai Kaipuaa.
 12 Na ma ku wahine no ho with the kane Harvey, Scott, Frank.
 13 So my colonized name is Frenchy DeSoto.
 14 You know I got so much to say. But what insulted
 15 me was somebody that said to us Hawaiians, "I doubt if you
 16 can do better. Can the Hawaiians do better by taking
 17 care?" That hurt me. I would never do that to you. Why
 18 you hurt me? Why you look down on me?
 19 Makua Valley is important. If you don't want to
 20 practice the old religion, fine. Get away. My husband
 21 and my children all were in the service. All were.
 22 Remember, had the draft? They didn't sign up voluntarily.
 23 They were drafted. My husband Cobra was the first Puerto
 24 Rican from this island to go to Louisiana that he called
 25 Lousy-ana for his training.

Comments

Responses

44

PT44

1 I don't understand, so help me, God. Why, what
 2 they're doing in Makua going fit in Iran and Afghanistan?
 3 That place no more grass. And then, I don't understand
 4 where this government going. What his name? Bushwhacker.
 5 Oh, yeah. \$780 billion. For what? No more money. Who
 6 going to pay when no more money? Na poe Hawaii. Na poe
 7 Hawaii. Na poe apau.
 8 So I just want to share that. Eha ka puuwai. You
 9 know. Our people should not be looked down on and said,
 10 "Can you do better?" I know you can. That's why we down.
 11 That's why when they came, when I was a kid, give me
 12 lickin' for talking Hawaiian. And look up, not -- never
 13 down. Look up.
 14 So the colonization of this person has really
 15 affected me, to the point that I talk from my naau.
 16 And, Hanalei, I know where you coming from. I
 17 don't disrespect you, Brother. But manao i'o e ha
 18 kapuwai.
 19 How come every time we like something, we got to
 20 beg on our knees and look at a bunch of fecal matter
 21 that's contained in the books? As far as I'm concerned,
 22 that's fecal matter. And I going tell you that you know
 23 when Kahoolawe -- e kala mai -- that when I was involved
 24 in Kahoolawe, when I sat down and talked to Emmitt and
 25 Walter, I said, "Why don't you guys come and help us,

PT44

Training requirements are constantly changing based on lessons learned in combat, training events, new equipment, and new commanders. Convoy live-fire training, for example, has become an essential component in training units based on the experiences in Iraq and Afghanistan. Times of war, such as now, drastically change training requirements. Combat readiness, moreover, is an assessment based on a commander's experience and training, and therefore is a matter of discretion. Further as set forth in the SDEIS, MMR is intended to be used by other military branches. The reviewer did not provide specific comments regarding alternatives or impact analysis; therefore, no changes will be made to the EIS as a result of this comment.

Comments

Responses

45

1 Makua?”
 2 They said to me, “Aunty, Kahoolawe first. Makua
 3 second.” So we went to fight for Kahoolawe. And Senator
 4 Inouye sat there and he went hio wai. For you who don’t
 5 understand what hio wai, TS. So e kala mai. E kala mai.
 6 I better not drink it. Taking my time. The girl
 7 strongarm, you know.

8 But, you know, Mr. Army, the American Army has a
 9 beautiful way that is nauseating by writing words. And
 10 then to give it to the common people in the community and
 11 say, digest this, you dumb. We need the land to practice.
 12 Practice what? That fits Iran, Afghanistan. To go fight
 13 who? The guys who like fight Israel? I don’t know.

14 I do know this and I predict, if the guy who was
 15 tortured for six years gets elected, we’re going to have
 16 World War. I promise you this, especially for a vice
 17 president that can see Russia from his backyard. Mahalo.
 18 FACILITATOR GOMES: Break for a few minutes.
 19 Let’s take about a ten-minute break and when we come back
 20 we’ll start with Butch and then Ikaika.
 21 (A recess was taken from 8:20 p.m. to 8:33 p.m.)
 22 FACILITATOR GOMES: We’d like to continue again.
 23 We’d like to start with Butch Detraye followed by Ikaika
 24 Hussey.
 25 MR. DETRAYE: They get the mic fixed right when

PT45

Training requirements are constantly changing based on lessons learned in combat, training events, new equipment, and new commanders. Convoy live-fire training, for example, has become an essential component in training units based on the experiences in Iraq and Afghanistan. Times of war, such as now, drastically change training requirements. Combat readiness, moreover, is an assessment based on a commander’s experience and training, and therefore is a matter of discretion. Further as set forth in the SDEIS, MMR is intended to be used by other military branches. The reviewer did not provide specific comments regarding alternatives or impact analysis; therefore, no changes will be made to the EIS as a result of this comment.

PT45

Comments

Responses

46

1 it's my turn. Aloha.

2 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

3 MR. DETRAYE: >>>I was in the military and I was

4 in the Marine Corps in Vietnam, so I understand

5 desecration and the killing thinking.

6 Anyway, in Hawaii, yeah, the root cause of

7 whatever we're going through right now is that Hawaii is

8 still an independent nation. As we all know, in the

9 history books the queen got thrown under protest, yeah,

10 and still waiting for that to be set right, yeah. So

11 after we free Iraq, yeah, I say, come and free Hawaii.

12 Don't be hypocrites now. Come and free Hawaii, yeah.

13 Colonization. These islands have been colonized.

14 The people have been colonized. You take away a person's

15 self-esteem, and that's what you're going to have, yeah.

16 So the military is the biggest polluter in these islands.

17 It's no wonder that those with no more self-esteem have

18 become the polluters on the beaches, yeah.

19 Pearl Harbor. Pearl Harbor wouldn't have happened

20 if the American military wasn't there. They didn't come

21 to bomb Hawaiians. They came to bomb America and Pearl

22 Harbor. Now you're making us a bigger target by expanding

23 all of your military on all of the islands with the

24 Stryker Brigade and everything that's going on. The

25 missiles on Kauai and everything at Makua, you're making

PT46

PT46

Hawai'i is a state within the United States of America. The State of Hawai'i was admitted to the union on August 21, 1959, making it the 50th state. Also, the EIS now includes text at the beginning of Section 3.10.3 regarding Public Law 103-150, that addresses the 1893 overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai'i.

Comments

Responses

47

1 us a bigger target.
 2 I just -- I did this before but I will do it one
 3 more time -- maybe a few more times, actually. This is a
 4 little song that came to me when -- the last time Makua
 5 was burning. And it used to burn just about every year.
 6 Now that you haven't been in there, it hasn't been
 7 burning.
 8 It's called Makua Desecration Blues.
 9 Don't listen to my voice. It's very bad. Listen
 10 to the words.
 11 Makua is crying. Desecration blues. Once again,
 12 it's the same old news. We've seen it done so many times
 13 before. Can we feel her crying. How much more?
 14 Makua's burning, burning once again. Military's
 15 practicing. Desecration sin. Wake up, people, got to
 16 open our eyes. How long we going to put up with their
 17 lies? What is this madness? What have they done? Just
 18 feel their sadness, animals on the run. Makua's burning.
 19 We got to get out. We're fooling ourselves with our
 20 doubt. Come on, people, just look around. See what
 21 they've done to this sacred ground. What is this madness?
 22 What have they done? Just feel our sadness, mana on the
 23 run. Pueo flying way up high, dives into the flame right
 24 out of the sky. Ohana crying. All Makua dying. Arrogant
 25 ones just keep on lying. What is this madness? What have

Comments

Responses

48

1 they done? Just feel our sadness, Hawaii on the run.
2 Makua's crying. Desecration blues. Once again, it's the
3 same old news. We've seen it done so many times before,
4 can we feel her crying, how much more. Yeah, just feel
5 her crying, how much more.

6 Next time you're all in Makua, feel her crying.

7 FACILITATOR GOMES: Ikaika Hussey.

8 MR. HUSSEY: Aloha mai kakou.

9 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

10 MR. HUSSEY: My name is Ikaika Hussey. I'm from
11 Kaneohe. My family is originally from the island of
12 Hawaii, which is one of the places that is being
13 considered for one of the alternatives to Makua. And my
14 message here tonight as a person who's not from this area
15 is to be in solidarity with the community that is here
16 that opposes the return of military live-fire training to
17 Makua Valley.

18 And what I really want to say tonight is to
19 recognize that the only reason why there has been a
20 temporary stop in the training here is because of all of
21 the people from people from Makua proper, people from the
22 Waianae area, and the people from Oahu and throughout all
23 of pae aina of Hawaii that came out for decades to oppose
24 the military's presence. And so I really have a strong
25 heartfelt mahalo to all of the kupuna, all of the people

Comments

Responses

49

1 who participated in the nonviolent occupations of Makua
 2 Valley, the people who lived on the beach in Makua before
 3 they were evicted. And all the people who continue to
 4 come to Makua Valley, as students, people who come for
 5 religious and spiritual healing, you know, all of the
 6 people who come as a cultural practice. So my mahalo to
 7 all of you. We wouldn't be here today if not for you.

8 And the fact that there aren't -- the fact that
 9 this room is not packed should be an indication to all of
 10 us that the community knows that this process has been a

11 shibai. It has been a sham. The community called for an
 12 authentic environmental impact statement, and what we got
 13 was the conclusion that, yes, there will be harmful
 14 effects to this environment, there will be harmful effects
 15 to the cultural resources, yet we should still do it
 16 regardless of all of those destructive impacts.

17 Anyone who can rationalize, who can think
 18 logically will understand that if there is a negative
 19 impact, that means we should not do it. And yet, we are
 20 barreled -- we're barreling on in this trajectory of
 21 militarism that trumps life in this valley, this road of
 22 empire, in spite of the costs. And it's leading us to

23 just more and more destruction, both in the place where is
 24 the United States has officially declared war and the
 25 places where it unofficially declared war more than a

PT47

The EIS was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and with applicable federal and Army regulations. The Army derived its basis for the archaeological and cultural resource analysis from site specific baseline reports from cultural resource firms with extensive local experience, as well as from oral histories, public meetings and interested individuals. In addition, the Army encouraged the public and Native Hawaiians to share their knowledge of resources present at MMR and incorporated this information into the EIS.

Finally, the Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

In the end, all of the action alternatives have negative impacts. The purpose of NEPA is served when the decision-maker takes into account these impacts in making a decision.

PT47

Comments

Responses

50

1 hundred years ago, like in Hawaii.

2 We need to recall that even though what we are

3 hearing about in Makua is live-fire training, that it

4 really is just the cocking of the gun. It's the first

5 step in an actively (indiscernible) -- an act of violence.

6 The process begins at places like Makua or Pohakuloa or at

7 Schofield, and it ends with the death of innocent people

8 or combatants in Afghanistan or in Iraq or in other place

9 where the United States is deployed.

10 And so this is not mere training. This is just

11 the beginning. This is the preparation for war. It is

12 part of the process of war. And it is violence, absolute

13 violence. And what we stand for when we stand for Makua,

14 we stand for life. That is our commitment. Hawaiians

15 have a war of tradition which has been appropriated by

16 U.S. military here, but what we stand here for here is

17 life and not the cause of empire, which has driven

18 U.S. foreign policy for the last hundred years, or more,

19 depending on how you think about it.

20 I urge those who come here from the Armed Service,

21 those who are veterans, to oppose your empire and stand

22 for your country. The United States need not be this

23 destructive force, which is how most of the world sees it.

24 It should stand for the same values that animate the lives

25 of everyone else around us, which is human rights the

Comments

Responses

51

1 desire for life, and not destruction.
 2 Thank you very much.
 3 FACILITATOR GOMES: James Manuku, Sr.
 4 MR. MANUKU: Good evening. Aloha. My name is
 5 James K. Manuku, Sr., concerned parent and grandparent.
 6 And what I have to say is not anti-American or
 7 anti-military. As a hunter, I understand the need for
 8 training. Yeah, I really do. Because if you don't know
 9 how shoot the gun, you'll never bring anything home.
 10 But, anyway, I'm deeply concerned about some of

11 the comments made. And just to -- just to give
 12 information out, our land -- our religion still lives in
 13 many of us. Our religion still lives, so please don't
 14 take that away from us.
 15 You know, I'm concerned about the transportation
 16 of these bombs that you folks going to take through our
 17 community. As the gentleman said earlier, our community
 18 has grown from a few thousand to over 60,000 today. You
 19 know, what if an accident -- you know, and I've been told
 20 that accidents -- you know, you folks take precautions
 21 about accidents. But, you know, my Brother, it takes one
 22 accident, yeah, in the right place. We have three schools
 23 down below the road here. We have the -- and, you know,
 24 the radius is tremendous for one bomb. And you're
 25 transporting a lot of these ammunitions through our

PT48

PT48

The Army conducts the treatment of cultural resources in accordance with Executive Order 13007, which concerns access to sacred sites and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act. The Army thanks you for your comment, but no changes will result to the document as a result of this comment. Your comment will be included in the administrative record for this EIS.

Comments

Responses

52

PT49

1 community and I'm totally against that.
 2 Also, we need more time. Shee, the last time you
 3 gave us for the -- for Mokuleia to Schofield. We only had
 4 three volumes. Now we get five for one valley. It's
 5 mind-boggling.

PT50

6 I also disagree with the findings of these, you
 7 know, that you folks have, that the minor impact -- all of
 8 that fuel and ammunition that you folks going be
 9 transporting within our ecosystem is not going -- it's
 10 going to have a minor impact. It'll have a tremendous
 11 impact. I have 18 grandchildren. What's going to happen
 12 to them? Will they still be here or will one of the
 13 accidents completely wipe us out as it did that family
 14 that was on the Arizona.
 15 And by the way, December 7th, I'm really
 16 concerned about that. Because, you know what, after we
 17 find out after so many years they open up the war records
 18 and now we find out that, you know, it could have been
 19 prevented. Ah, but that's not for me to say.
 20 But for me to say is I'm against the use of you
 21 folks using our aina again. You folks say you're good
 22 stewards. Well, let me tell you about your stewardship.
 23 When you folks gave up the makai side of Farrington
 24 Highway, you didn't give it back to the people that loaned
 25 you the use of their property. They gave it back to the

PT49

The Army's policies for transporting ammunition are found in Chapter 3.6. The Army's first priority is to transport ammunition to MMR by helicopter to avoid schools and the risk of accident. The transportation of ammunition by helicopter includes safety measures, such as avoiding flying over heavily populated areas, using over-water routes, and ensuring secure storage of ammunition. No records have been found regarding accidents involving aircraft transporting ammunition in Hawai'i. Should ammunition be transported on the ground the Army follows strict safety procedures, including Hawai'i Department of Transportation (DOT) rules and regulations for transporting explosive materials.

In addition, a complete discussion and analysis regarding the protection of children is presented in Section 4.12.

PT50

The Army's analysis of potential impacts to the community associated with the transportation of ammunition is found in Section 4.12, Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice.

The only impacts Socioeconomic and Environmental Justice have are assessed as No Impact and relate to Economic Development.

The Army assessed potential impacts to Protection of Children as Less than Significant under the No Action Alternative (No Live-fire Training at MMR); and Significant Impact Mitigable to Less than Significant under Alternatives 1-3.

The Army assessed the potential impacts to Environmental Justice as Less than Significant (No Action Alternative), and Significant Impact (Alternatives 1-3).

Comments

Responses

53

1 State of Hawaii. And just like Kahoolawe. But by giving
2 it back to the State of Hawaii, that's not good

PT51

3 stewardship. The people that gave you the right to use
4 their valley, use their property, those are the people
5 that the military should have given it back to. Now these
6 people still have to wait longer because you folks gave
7 the state to 2029, the lease of the makai side of the
8 property. I think you maybe need to evaluate that.

PT51

The Army presents a brief history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. The lease contract for MMR is not within the scope of this EIS, therefore no changes to the document have occurred as a result of your comment.

PT52

9 And, by the way, by having people live down there,
10 it would be a bad place to practice your bomb. I also
11 concerned about previous bombing. All these people don't
12 know how many times you folks destroyed munitions in the
13 valley. I've seen them. From the Navy, Marines, the
14 Army, maybe even the Air Force. And, yet, there was no
15 protection, no warning, nobody coming down to say, hey,
16 watch out, we going to let these bombs go; and all that
17 smoke that going be coming down to you not going bother
18 you or it would bother you. Nothing was said. Never was
19 said. All we know was we down the beach, boom, we look up
20 into the valley, there's big clouds. And that's not fair,
21 you know.

PT52

The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

Potential mitigation measures for this impact include the Army notifying beach users at least one week in advance of planned training activities. Notices would be posted on the Mākua Beach access gates, in local newspapers, and on the DLNR Division of State Parks Web site or other such Web sites. This notification would provide beach users the opportunity to plan recreational activities around the hours that the Army would conduct training. Because these events are normally scheduled for weekday mornings, beach users who are notified would have the opportunity to change their visits to other weekday mornings, weekday afternoons, or weekends. Also, there are similar beaches just to the north and south of Mākua Beach that are not highly used on weekday mornings.

PT53

22 One minute. And that's another thing, too. Now
23 you guys giving us so many -- just a couple minutes to
24 give you why we shouldn't -- why you shouldn't be doing
25 this. I cannot even -- I never even give you half of what

PT53

The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

Comments

Responses

54

PT53

1 I had -- I had to say. I just glad I went learn how to
 2 write because I put it down, it's up here.
 3 But, still, that doesn't give a -- it doesn't give
 4 me any satisfaction because you guys EIS not going include
 5 my statements. What I got to read is something else that
 6 not -- not my objections. I don't have any objections
 7 inside that five volume piece of -- the kine -- paper that
 8 you folks get. And that's not fair. You guys affecting
 9 my children's life, their quality of life. You guys

PT53

The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

PT54

10 going -- like I said, you going transport these bombs
 11 through my -- our community. My children live here.
 12 Bring your folks' children over here, have one
 13 accident, and see what you going feel. That's not
 14 something we want. So, please, you guys get plenty land.
 15 Plenty, plenty land. You know our queen when she went
 16 across life, she was so amazed. Yeah? She was so amazed
 17 the amount of land you folks have and, yet, you guys come
 18 to this tiny island and ask us to let you desecrate 'em.
 19 So, please, reconsider that. Thank you.
 20 FACILITATOR GOMES: John Carroll followed by David
 21 Henkin.
 22 MR. CARROLL: Aloha. Aloha ahi ahi. Owau
 23 kalelehua o kalani pehea oi maikai.
 24 My name is John Carroll, and I am not born and
 25 raised here in Waianae. But I believe I lived here on

PT54

Chapter 2 presents the safety measures that would be employed to reduce safety risks associated with such action. The analysis of safety measures is found in Section 4.6 Traffic and Transportation, and 4.11 Hazardous Materials and Waste of the EIS.

The Army takes seriously its responsibility to the community and protection of children. If Alternative 1, 2, or 3 is chosen, the Army has proposed mitigation that would reduce the potential impacts to children and the community (see mitigations under Sections 4.1, 4.6, and in the Executive Summary.

Comments

Responses

55

1 Moua Street before most anybody in this room was born.
 2 Used to surf with Francis Keoho and Henry Priest and those
 3 boys. And I'm here tonight and I want to thank the hui --
 4 Hui Malama o Makua and particularly William Aila for
 5 putting this invitation in the newspaper. I live in a
 6 small farm in Honokaa right now. But when I saw this, I
 7 said I got to go there. William -- well, he didn't even
 8 know me but he was in diapers and his dad and I used to
 9 hunt together over on the Big Island.
 10 Anyway, the reason I came here is that I'm totally

11 against the live firing in the Makua Valley area. I'm
 12 also -- other than small-arms fire at Schofield and I
 13 think there's one safe range on Barbers Point side. But
 14 other than that, I don't think they should have any live
 15 firing of any ammo over .30-06 rounds, which I guess they
 16 don't even use anymore.

17 But in any event, they have -- they have a lot of
 18 room for this kind of operation on the Big Island in
 19 Pohakuloa. Now, some of the, you know,
 20 sovereignty-oriented people don't want any firing, period,
 21 any place; however, given the facts of where we are, where
 22 we live, Pohakuloa can handle the Stryker Brigades. They
 23 can handle any kind of fire, including, I guess,
 24 155-millimeter howitzers and whatever they got out of
 25 there to shoot out of the current cannons. But,

PT55

PT55

The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

Comments

Responses

PT55

56

1 definitely, it should not be on this island.
 2 Just from your -- my background is I was in the
 3 military. I have 34 years. And I was in tanks
 4 originally, then I graduated from air commander staff
 5 college from the air war college, so I know quite a bit
 6 about the military. And I know enough about the planning
 7 to guess that probably some of these gentlemen agree with
 8 most everything that's being said here tonight, even
 9 though they may not subscribe to it 'cause they wear a
 10 uniform.

PT55

The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

PT56

11 I also would like, if there's record being kept,
 12 to incorporate by reference the comments of Ms. Kukui
 13 Forth. I was really impressed with her comments and
 14 particularly the one where she said you can write all the
 15 magic English that you want and put all the kind of
 16 information in there that you want, but it does not change
 17 the facts. And the facts are that they should not be
 18 having live firing in that valley. That valley should be
 19 cleaned it out. It ought to be given back to the state,
 20 probably to go back to the Hawaiian homesteaders, or at
 21 the very least to be divided up for ag. land -- you know,
 22 for ag. land use by the state.

PT56

The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be mad no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

Cleanup of MMR or other sites is not within the scope of this EIS, nor is the return of Mākua to the local community.

23 The last thing -- and I know I'm kind of an
 24 interloper here because I haven't lived here since 1950,
 25 but I fly gliders every Saturday out at Dillingham and I

Comments

Responses

57

1 fly right over the edge of Makua. So I see it every
 2 weekend and it just makes me sick to see that beautiful
 3 valley, when we should have agriculture production going
 4 on there, being used for this kind of a use. I think
 5 anybody who's got any kind of common sense knows that this

PT57

6 is the truth. I'm going to ask the military if they will
 7 incorporate my comments. If they want them in the form of
 8 an affidavit, I'll be glad to submit them.

9 And finally, as a representative back in 1972, I
 10 introduced the first bill in the State to have an
 11 environmental assessment requirement. And believe me,
 12 there's nothing in that bill that would indicate that the
 13 kind of destruction that goes on from large ammunition
 14 being fired in that valley should be allowed. Thank you.
 15 Mahalo nui.

16 FACILITATOR GOMES: Dave Henkin followed by Bill
 17 Aila.

18 MR. HENKIN: Aloha kakou.

19 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

20 MR. HENKIN: O Kawika Henkin kou inoa. My name is
 21 David Henkin. I'm attorney with Earthjustice. And since
 22 1995, I have had the honor as serving as lead counsel for
 23 Malama Makua. It's been a long road. I never thought at
 24 the beginning of it we'd find ourselves 13 years later
 25 focusing on some of the same basic issues. But there have

PT57

The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been included in the administrative record for this process.

Comments

Responses

58

1 been -- there is some progress. And for that, I
 2 appreciate that we're getting a little bit more truth, a
 3 little bit more honesty.
 4 Back in 1998, the Army took the position that
 5 live-fire training at Makua with the demonstrated fires
 6 that would destroy endangered species, with the years of
 7 damaged cultural sites, that all of that didn't even have
 8 the possibility of having a significant effect on the
 9 environment; and therefore, there was no obligation to do
 10 an environmental impact statement. That -- that obviously
 11 was not the case. That didn't pass the smile (sic) test.
 12 So the Army has come a long way in admitting that there
 13 have significant impacts.

14 Back in 1995 -- and for those of you who have been
 15 involved in this issue for decades before that -- the Army
 16 always took the position that Makua was the only place in
 17 Hawaii where the Army could accomplish its mission where
 18 it do its training. That also, to anyone who had eyes to
 19 see, just didn't pass the smile test.

20 And although there are strong feelings about
 21 Pohakuloa, there are strong feelings about Makua, there
 22 are feelings about training anywhere in this state because
 23 training by its very nature is destructive. Nonetheless,
 24 it is refreshing for the Army in this document for the
 25 first time in literally decades to admit that there are

PT58

PT58

The EIS now looks at a PTA alternative (Alternative 4). The EIS points out, however, that there are practical difficulties associated with use of a PTA alternative compared to the alternatives on O'ahu.

Comments

Responses

| | | |
|-------------|----|--|
| PT58 | 59 | <p>1 some other places where they could do the training.</p> <p>2 We have to bear in mind that the purpose of an</p> <p>3 environmental impact statement is to tell the truth; is to</p> <p>4 give good information so that not only the Army but our</p> <p>5 elected officials and our citizenry can decide what is</p> <p>6 best for us.</p> |
| PT59 | | <p>7 I'm concerned that even now, this document falls</p> <p>8 very far short of that. And the reason I say this is that</p> <p>9 what we are given in terms of choices are training at</p> <p>10 Makua at a very high level, at levels that are greater</p> <p>11 than any historic level of training at Makua. And that's</p> <p>12 alternative one. That's the least training at Makua.</p> <p>13 Then you throw on top of that more weaponry and more</p> <p>14 training in Alternative 2. And then only at the end you</p> <p>15 get to Alternative 3, which the Army says it's its</p> <p>16 preferred alternative; that, as Dr. Dodge already</p> |
| PT60 | | <p>17 mentioned, would involve training well over 400 days out</p> <p>18 of the year. Which, in my universe, is not possible. It</p> |
| PT61 | | <p>19 would involve training with weapons that have proven time</p> <p>20 and time again to cause destructive fires and therefore</p> <p>21 would imperil the continued existence of the 45 federally</p> <p>22 listed endangered and threatened plants and animals that</p> <p>23 are in the Makua and the areas right around it.</p> |
| PT62 | | <p>24 And the Army tells us, for many of these weapons,</p> <p>25 we haven't even consulted the fish and wildlife service to</p> |

| |
|--|
| <p>PT58 The EIS now looks at a PTA alternative (Alternative 4). The EIS points out, however, that there are practical difficulties associated with use of a PTA alternative compared to the alternatives on O'ahu.</p> |
| <p>PT59 The EIS looks at both the minimum and optimum levels of training at MMR. The experience of the past decade should not be used to predict the required level of training. First because MMR was closed for much of the time, and second because units deploying to Iraq and Afghanistan did not have the opportunity to execute required training at MMR.</p> |
| <p>PT60 The EIS analyzes four live-fire alternatives, all of which include range usage over a 242-day training period. They differ in the intensity under which the Army would train, the types of weapon systems used, and acreage used for training. The EIS now includes additional information about the total days of collective training requirements.</p> |
| <p>PT61 The Army has identified an extensive number of mitigation measures that will help reduce the overall environmental impacts of the action. The Army is reviewing all these proposed mitigation measures and will select a number of the measures to implement. The selected mitigation measures will be identified in the Record of Decision. The 2007 and the supplemented 2008 Biological Opinion has very specific restrictions on weapons use to avoid wildfires. The Army will observe these restrictions.</p> |
| <p>PT62 The Army will continue to consult with USFWS on weapons and training activities not addressed during previous Section 7 consultations. These facts were identified in Section 2 to establish a baseline for the reader that these munitions and locations will not be used until proper consultation is completed, but their impacts are still being assessed so the public would be fully informed and aware of all the potential environmental impacts associated with the complete implementation of the proposed alternative.</p> |

Comments

Responses

PT62

60

1 see if under the Endangered Species Act we can do this
 2 training, but we're going to come out to the public and
 3 say that's what we really want to do.

PT62

The Army will continue to consult with USFWS on weapons and training activities not addressed during previous Section 7 consultations. These facts were identified in Section 2 to establish a baseline for the reader that these munitions and locations will not be used until proper consultation is completed, but their impacts are still being assessed so the public would be fully informed and aware of all the potential environmental impacts associated with the complete implementation of the proposed alternative.

PT63

4 I'm left with the impression that the Army is not
 5 being entirely forthcoming about what it really needs to
 6 do or what it really wants to do. It wants to put
 7 together a document that is so full of training, that
 8 anything less than that we would be thankful for. Because
 9 the reality is they can't do the training that they're
 10 saying is their preferred option. They can't do it
 11 because there aren't enough hours in a day or days in a
 12 year. And they can't do it because -- you know, I've been
 13 out at Makua while all the soldiers are training as
 14 quickly as they can so that they can get their training in
 15 before it gets to ten o'clock in the morning and the
 16 burning decks goes into the yellow or goes into the red.
 17 People who live out here, you know that virtually
 18 year around, including in the dead of winter, it gets very
 19 dry and it can get very hot. And, you know, you just
 20 can't do even the 242 days of training that you say that
 21 you want to do. You can't train virtually any day out of
 22 the year with tracers. You can't do the illumination
 23 rounds. You just can't do the stuff that's in here.

PT63

Based on data from previous years, there are many periods of time when the burn index facilitates use of incendiary munitions. In addition, there are very strict requirements within the 2007 Biological Opinion regarding the use of tracer ammunition. Illumination rounds are not currently authorized. If the Army decides to pursue illumination round use, Section 7 consultation will be completed.

PT64

24 And, you know, part of the honesty is admitting
 25 that you don't need to. Because out of the last ten

PT64

The experience of the past decade should not be used to predict the required level of training. First because MMR was closed for much of the time, and second because units deploying to Iraq and Afghanistan did not have the opportunity to execute required training at MMR.

Comments

Responses

PT64

61

1 years, since September of 1998, you've only done live-fire
 2 training in Makua for less than three of those years
 3 because of the activity in court. And during those three
 4 years, when under our settlement agreement, you could
 5 train up to 37 times, you only needed 26. This, during a
 6 period of time from 2001 to 2004, when you were going to
 7 war, when you were training your soldiers for battle.
 8 Where, in 2001 you haven't fired a round at Makua for
 9 three years. And you said you had to get back there and
 10 you had to do at least 16 exercises that first year.
 11 Well, you only did 13. You know, it's just -- the
 12 rhetoric and the reality, there's a serious disconnect.

13 So, in closing, I would say we need a healthy dose
 14 of truth here so that we can sit down and -- with mutual
 15 respect, try and figure out what's best for this valley,
 16 what's best for this state, what's best for this nation.
 17 Mahalo.

18 FACILITATOR GOMES: Bill Aila followed by James
 19 Cowles.

PT65

20 MR. AILA: Aloha mai kakou, everyone.

21 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

22 MR. AILA: It is indeed an honor to stand before
 23 you and offer testimony to this draft -- draft
 24 environmental impact statement. And the word I use to
 25 describe this is it fails. The very first word is it

PT64

The experience of the past decade should not be used to predict the required level of training. First because MMR was closed for much of the time, and second because units deploying to Iraq and Afghanistan did not have the opportunity to execute required training at MMR.

PT65

Alternatives that do not advance the purpose and need are not considered reasonable alternatives. The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried foPTard for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5. This section discusses the reasons the Army considered but eliminated other identified alternatives. There were no locations outside of Hawai'i that could meet all four screening criteria. Other locations considered included Fort IPTin, California, Yakima Training Center, Washington, and Fort Polk, Louisiana. Therefore these locations were dismissed and not considered for further evaluation.

Comments

Responses

PT65

62

1 fails. In the purpose of need section, it's so narrowly
 2 drawn that I cannot sit in the audience and listen to
 3 Colonel Margotta say that the decision has not been made
 4 yet. It is so narrowly drawn that in Sections 2.5.4,
 5 which is analyzing situations training outside of Hawaii,
 6 and in 2.5.5, which is analyzing -- building a new
 7 facility on Oahu, both of those alternatives are
 8 immediately rejected. And here's a quote, "Because it
 9 would not provide company-level training areas close to
 10 Schofield Barracks military base." So right off the bat,
 11 the game is fixed.

PT65

Alternatives that do not advance the purpose and need are not considered reasonable alternatives. The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried foPTard for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5. This section discusses the reasons the Army considered but eliminated other identified alternatives. There were no locations outside of Hawai'i that could meet all four screening criteria. Other locations considered included Fort IPTin, California, Yakima Training Center, Washington, and Fort Polk, Louisiana. Therefore these locations were dismissed and not considered for further evaluation.

PT66

12 This is how narrowly defined all the alternatives
 13 are going to be measured with. So the game -- the game is
 14 fixed, folks. This is not a real exercise. They may say
 15 that we want what you have to say, but they've so narrowly
 16 defined the question here as to make it impossible to come
 17 to any other conclusion other than return it to training
 18 at Makua is the best alternative.

PT66

The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

PT67

19 In Section E6-4, the Army has not yet finalized
 20 the minimum design standard for convoy live-fire training.
 21 So if they haven't finished designing it, how can they
 22 say -- how can they say that the other alternatives don't
 23 meet that requirement if they haven't finished it? Once
 24 again, the Army fails. They fail to explain to you, that
 25 they've already fixed the game.

PT67

Convoy live-fire is described in the SDEIS from page 2-36 to 2-39. Although the Army hasn't established a standard size for a convoy live-fire range, the EIS lays out the mission requirements. For instance, the route must be of sufficient length that an attack comes as a surprise.

Comments

Responses

63

PT68

1 In Section ES3, in the needs section, they refer
 2 to each infantry rifle company needing to do CALFEX
 3 training annually. And from what I understand, being
 4 involved in this issue for a long time, there's three -- a
 5 maximum of three infantry rifle companies for each
 6 battalion. And there is -- that would make three
 7 battalions to make a brigade. And you guys are free to
 8 correct me. I'm being very conservative over here. So
 9 that means nine companies would need to train for a
 10 brigade, an infantry brigade.
 11 So how did they come up with the need for 19 to 28
 12 per year as the least amount, much less 50 per year and up
 13 to hundred -- excuse me, up to 200 convoy live-fire
 14 exercises in a maximum amount.

PT68

Section 2.4.6 of the EIS has been updated to identify for the reader how the Army determined the minimum number of CALFEX training events. The number of combinations of CALFEXs that a Company Commander has the discretion to perform is somewhat flexible. For instance, the company commander could choose to have platoons train, rather than the entire company. He could also have the entire company train more than once per year. The Army has chosen the conservative number of 50 CALFEXs as the maximum under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4. 50 CALFEXs per year is the maximum that could be conducted at MMR given the restrictions on the use of the range. The Army wanted to analyze the impacts associated with the maximum possible use, even though it would be unusual to have that level of training occur. In addition, the combination can be mainly CALFEXs and fewer Convoy training events, or vice-versa, in any event the total live-fire training will not exceed 242 days.

PT69

15 In section 1.0, Purpose and Need for Scope, the
 16 Army details where CALFEXes were conducted both in state
 17 and many of the out state for the period 2001 through
 18 2004. And I realize I'm going fast because I'm trying to
 19 make the four minutes.
 20 But in 2004 to present, there's no discussion in
 21 the EIS where, for the last four years, the Army has
 22 trained and been qualified to go to both Iraq and
 23 Afghanistan but there's no discussion about where they
 24 trained there to complete the requirements for CALFEXes.
 25 So how did all those companies get trained? Where

PT69

Without training at MMR, the Army has been able to mitigate its training needs; however, these solutions are not sustainable over the long term. Over the past several years, deployments have meant that there is usually only one brigade of the 25th ID either prepared to conduct the type of training in the proposed action or in Hawai'i. We cannot expect this situation to last forever, and the time will come when the Army must train both brigades simultaneously for deployment world-wide.

Under the current force structure, the minimum number of CALFEXs that could occur at MMR are 19. This is comprised of the nine Infantry companies and one Engineer company of the 3/25th IBCT, and the nine US Marine Corps Infantry companies that require CALFEX training.

Comments

Responses

| | |
|------|---|
| PT69 | 64 |
| PT70 | <p>1 did they get trained? How come it's not in the EIS?</p> <p>2 In Section 2-6.5, the Army admits that CALFEXes</p> <p>3 have been conducted at Schofield, but there's no evidence</p> <p>4 of any analysis being conducted at the Schofield. There's</p> <p>5 no evidence. There's no analysis of CALFEXing while</p> <p>6 CALFEXes could not be done at Schofield, given the short</p> <p>7 redeployment time between the two brigades going -- coming</p> <p>8 home and going back out again. In other words, if they</p> <p>9 manage their time correctly, there should be lot of</p> <p>10 training available at Schofield.</p> <p>11 I'll go fast. My wife gave me her time.</p> <p>12 Section 3.8.3, 'cause they wanted specifics, so I</p> <p>13 did my best to read those five volumes real quickly. If I</p> <p>14 had more time, I could have more.</p> <p>15 Soil contamination. There's no mention of medical</p> <p>16 waste being burned at the OBOD site. There's no mention</p> <p>17 of any ICMs, Improved Conventional Munitions, the little</p> <p>18 bomblets that drops out of big bombs, which are really</p> <p>19 dangerous for kids. There's no mention of any training</p> <p>20 for that at Makua. There's no mention of any disposal of</p> <p>21 that at Makua, but it exists at Makua, yeah.</p> <p>22 So how good is that study that was done by this</p> <p>23 company called Geotechnical & Structural Laboratory study</p> <p>24 in 2001, which they quote and then they say, oh, don't</p> <p>25 worry about it because these guys did the study and they</p> |

| |
|--|
| <p>PT69</p> <p>Section 1.1 states that "Each Infantry Battalion contains three infantry rifle companies and one headquarters company." and "Under the current force structure, the 3/25th IBCT (currently 2/25th SBCT) has nine infantry companies that require CALFEX training." The EIS also states that other services will use MMR for training. Many other Army units require convoy live-fire training.</p> |
| <p>PT70</p> <p>Analysis of other alternatives on O'ahu is included in Section 2.5. This includes all Army lands on O'ahu including Schofield Barracks. It also considers acquisition of additional training lands on O'ahu to construct a new and/or replacement training facility.</p> <p>Alternatives that do not advance the purpose and need are not considered reasonable alternatives. The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried foPTard for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. Section 2.5 discusses the reasons the Army considered but eliminated other identified alternatives.</p> <p>The EIS makes clear that only modified CALFEXes could be conducted at the SBMR BAX, and that previous CALFEXes conducted at the SBMR were limited in scope.</p> |
| <p>PT71</p> <p>A number of studies have been conducted to identify the types of materials that were used and disposed of at MMR, including materials that were burned in the OB/OD area. These findings are documented in the Hydrogeologic Investigation Report in Appendix G-1. No biomedical materials or infectious waste were discovered during these investigations (USACE 2006), and no such disposal or usage has been reported at MMR. Additionally, infectious waste has never been reported as being disposed of at MMR (Char 2003; Kim 2003). For these reasons, biomedical waste, lead-based paint, asbestos, and radon are not included in the impact analysis.</p> <p>Regarding Improved Conventional Munitions (ICM), Figure 3-24 has been revised to reflect current improved conventional munitions (ICM) areas and impact areas. The Army has completed surface and subsurface archaeological surveys within the south firebreak road consistent with its legal obligations and NEPA. To the extent permitted by law, the Army has included such survey results in Appendix G-9.</p> |

Comments

Responses

65

PT71

1 didn't find anything. They didn't find anything because
2 they didn't look.

PT72

3 In Section 3.10.8, Army Management of Cultural
4 resources. The Army refers to the formation of a cultural
5 advisory committee. Now, if they're referring to
6 Ukanipo -- and please correct me in the back there, if
7 that's Ukanipo -- we haven't met for over five years. If
8 it's related to a future cultural advisory committee
9 that's going to be created, then we haven't been
10 consulted. So what's going on in this draft EIS? Says
11 one thing but does something else.

12 Some general comments, and my wife did give me --
13 yield me a few minutes. Okay?

14 FACILITATOR GOMES: You already had five minutes.

PT73

15 MR. AILA: All right. Mitigation plans are flawed
16 for cultural resources. Because immediately adjacent to
17 the firing area, the target area, are areas that the Army
18 never -- repeat: Never -- repeat: Never surveyed for
19 cultural resources or for biological resources.

PT74

20 And here is how they plan to not take testimony.
21 So I will stop right now. I'm only two pages into this.
22 See how they want testimony but they don't want testimony?
23 So let that be a lesson to you young folks, yeah.

24 FACILITATOR GOMES: Bill, you can always give that
25 to the reporter.

PT71

A number of studies have been conducted to identify the types of materials that were used and disposed of at MMR, including materials that were burned in the OB/OD area. These findings are documented in the Hydrogeologic Investigation Report in Appendix G-1. No biomedical materials or infectious waste were discovered during these investigations (USACE 2006), and no such disposal or usage has been reported at MMR. Additionally, infectious waste has never been reported as being disposed of at MMR (Char 2003; Kim 2003). For these reasons, biomedical waste, lead-based paint, asbestos, and radon are not included in the impact analysis.

Regarding Improved Conventional Munitions (ICM), Figure 3-24 has been revised to reflect current improved conventional munitions (ICM) areas and impact areas. The Army has completed surface and subsurface archaeological surveys within the south firebreak road consistent with its legal obligations and NEPA. To the extent permitted by law, the Army has included such survey results in Appendix G-9.

PT72

The discussion on Cultural advisory committees in Section 3.10.8 in the SDEIS does not apply to the Ukanipō Heiau Advisory Committee. This section also does not refer to a future cultural advisory committee. By contrast, it does refer to Cultural Advisory Committees which were formed in 2002 on the island of Hawai'i and O'ahu during preparation of the EIS for Transformation of the 2nd Brigade to a Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT). The cultural advisory committee on the island of Hawai'i has continued to meet on a continual basis for the last seven years. The cultural advisory committee on the island of O'ahu became the cultural monitors on the SBCT projects. There was never any intent to form a cultural advisory committee for MMR.

PT73

The areas immediately adjacent to the objectives and target areas have been surveyed. Areas outside the firebreak road have been surveyed for cultural resources whenever health and safety requirements could be met. Surveys for biological resources were conducted adjacent to the target and objective areas as well as outside the firebreak roads.

PT74

Thank you for your comment. The Army is fully committed to the NEPA process and is dedicated to its responsibility to engage the public, in accordance with 40 CFR 1500.2(d). We listened carefully to all the speakers at these public meetings.

Public meetings are designed so that the Army may receive oral input from the public. The facilities used by the Army for these public meetings operated under imposed time limitations on facility use in accordance with their standard management policies. The Army facilitated time limits on speakers to ensure all participants were allowed equal time to speak while guaranteeing the facility was cleaned and empty by the facility deadline. During public meetings, the Army additionally encouraged attendees to provide comment to the court recorder prior to the open mic phase of the public meeting; and, a second court recorder was available to register public input privately during the open mic phase of the public meeting. Members of the public were also provided blank public comment forms in order to register their input. Finally, written comments were accepted via mail, e-mail, and facsimile; and oral comments were accepted via voicemail throughout the SDEIS 45-day public comment period.

Comments

Responses

66

1 James Cowles followed by Henry Pelekai.

2 MR. COWLES: Before I say anything, I'd like to

3 get something off my chest. Too bad the gentleman that

4 had his outburst earlier tonight is not here. But I would

5 like to request that gentleman with the VFW to issue an

6 apology to the group over here. When they were doing

7 their ceremony outside, his outburst to them was

8 disrespectful. That is my opinion. They're very

9 disrespectful. I am haole, pure-blooded haole.

10 Aloha.

11 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

12 MR. COWLES: My name is James. I live in Waianae.

13 I am married to a Hawaiian-Chinese. On April 1st, we've

14 been married for 31 years. My wife has her opinions and I

15 have mine and we both respect those opinions. I know

16 Mr. Aila. I know his family. I have a lot of respect for

17 his family.

18 Frenchy DeSoto, I have a lot of respect for her.

19 She doesn't know me personally but I do know her. I've

20 seen her around. I have a lot of respect for her. I have

21 a lot of respect for the family.

22 But my opinion is not the same as theirs, it's not

23 the same as Mr. Aila's, it's not the same as all of yours.

24 And that's what makes this state so great. Everybody can

25 state their opinions civilly -- civically -- or however

Comments

Responses

67

1 you say it.

2 But my opinion is: The military needs the

3 training. I used to be in the Marine Corps. I was in the

4 Marine Corps. I got stationed over here. I did some

5 training at Makua. I did some training at Pohakuloa. And

6 my opinion is: The military does need training. But they

7 do not need the training of the heavy equipment at Makua.

8 My opinion is: They can do the training, the small arms,

9 they can do the training with the vehicles, but they have

10 to have a respect for the property, for the land. And

11 they have to show respect to Hawaiians. They're trying to

12 have the type of agricultural site. They're trying --

13 don't mind me, I don't know any Hawaiian. Not that I'm

14 trying to say that I do.

15 But what I'm trying to say is people should

16 have -- they should -- the military should give them some

17 time to go in and do what they got to do as well as do

18 training in Makua, but small -- I'm saying -- what I'm

19 saying is small arms fire training only. They can do the

20 big fires, the howitzers and all that at Pohakuloa or set

21 up a range in Kahuku. They got plenty wasted land in

22 Kahuku that they're using right now as training. And

23 they're actually building a road out there to do training.

24 Why can't they do some of the heavy-equipment training out

25 there.

PT75

PT75

A full evaluation of the potential impacts from training as they relate to the Proposed Action and Alternatives is presented in Section 4 of this EIS.

PT76

PT76

Alternatives that do not advance the purpose and need are not considered reasonable alternatives. The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried forward for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. Section 2.5 discusses the reasons the Army considered but eliminated other identified alternatives on O'ahu.

Comments

Responses

PT76

68

1 Saves us some time for shipping. They don't have
 2 to have the cost to ship all the equipment to the Big
 3 Island. They can do it right there in Kahuku.

4 Like I said, I didn't come up here -- I didn't
 5 plan on coming here to this meeting tonight to speak to
 6 anybody. I just came to listen, and I end up speaking
 7 also. But I have a lot of respect for the Hawaiian people
 8 who live out this side, and I feel they should have at
 9 least some access to the valley so they can do what they
 10 got to do; so they can teach their kids. The kids are
 11 coming up, teach them about their culture. That's the
 12 only way they're going to be able to teach the culture --
 13 their kids about their cultural, through Makua Valley.

14 Thank you.

15 FACILITATOR GOMES: Henry Pelekai followed by
 16 Luwella.

17 MR. PELEKAI: Hi. Henry Pelekai, Jr. Let's see.
 18 How do I start. Anyway, I grew up commercial fishing.
 19 Our family -- my family is fishermen, so I always was
 20 dependent on, I guess, the element of nature, yeah,
 21 something beyond myself. And just like you guys who are
 22 farmers, same thing. You know, no matter how hard I work,
 23 all the equipment I got, I still get that element that I'm
 24 not in charge of it, huh. And maybe about -- I think
 25 three weeks ago, we had this intermediate school class

PT76

Alternatives that do not advance the purpose and need are not considered reasonable alternatives. The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried foPTard for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. Section 2.5 discusses the reasons the Army considered but eliminated other identified alternatives on O'ahu.

Comments

Responses

69

1 from Aotearoa. New Zealand for you guys that might not
 2 understand. Anyway, we were taking those guys down to
 3 Makua. So before we got there, I think we was by maybe
 4 Waikomo or stuff. I was telling -- I told the guys, hey,
 5 we get one valley up here. It's a really beautiful
 6 valley, but the military is bombing it. So the guy from
 7 Aotearoa turned back to me, "Doesn't Makua mean parent?"
 8 You know, and I think it's very ironic that, you
 9 know -- that we let our parent get desecrated that way.
 10 'Cause I believe in, you know, all nature is alive, yeah.
 11 You know, like I surf a lot so, you know, a lot of times I
 12 have mercy of the ocean or fishing. You know, I've done
 13 some crazy stuff in the ocean. So, you know, I always
 14 have to -- when I swimming around and there's sharks
 15 swimming around me, I got to depend on something besides
 16 me, yeah, to know that I going be okay. Like I'll look at
 17 the shark and think, hey, that's my grandma, you know, or
 18 whatever, you know. Like gives me peace, you know.

PT77

19 I'm not for the military bombing Makua. I wish
 20 they will leave. You know, but I'm pretty powerless over
 21 that, too. You know, so the best I can do is honor my
 22 parent by saying something, yeah. You know, and I not
 23 going to get through -- 'cause I can tell you a million
 24 and one things why -- 'cause most of my life, I get a lot
 25 of anger, like lot of Hawaiian men, you know. So I

PT77

The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

Comments

Responses

70

1 always, like, on defense, you know, following the rules,
2 going to prison, following the rules, you know. And I
3 spend most of my life -- like I going back to prison in
4 February again, you know, for taking money from the
5 government, you know, that kind of stuff.

6 But, you know, so I've dishonored my parents in a
7 lot of ways, yeah, you know. So today, I think how can I
8 honor them, you know, what can I do today to make a
9 difference, yeah. And I guess this is one of it, yeah.
10 And just saying something, you know. Because I don't know
11 if we ever going get Makua back. You know, they felt the
12 same way about Kahoolawe, but they got it back, you know.
13 And still kind of, you know, iffy on the rules how to get
14 there and what they can do there, you know. But that's a
15 step forward, yeah. You know, and that's all we can do as
16 a people.

17 FACILITATOR GOMES: Luwella followed by Marti
18 Townsend -- kala mai. Not Marti. Albert. Albert Silva
19 first.

20 MS. TOWNSEND: I want to be quick about this
21 because how many meetings we've been through. And there's
22 too many. Tiring. But we're going to keep -- for the
23 young people in this community -- in this room, we're
24 going to keep being here, I think, until it's time to go
25 home. I'm really elated to see you in this audience,

Comments

Responses

71

1 really.
 2 I have three professors. One wants me to write a
 3 50-page paper, the other one wants 20, and the other wants
 4 ten. So about writing testimony for this, I don't know.
 5 I'm going to be real quick about it.
 6 In our Department of Education, let see me, what I
 7 want to say here is Waianae has two high schools, and we
 8 are the highest in the American system with drop-out
 9 students. Okay? One of the things I do in my private
 10 life is I teach drop-out students. I know in about eight
 11 years -- I give this about eight years, and we will have
 12 zero drop-out in Waianae. The thing about the Department
 13 of Education, they ask one question on the sustainability
 14 plan. And there's five of them, actually, and one that I
 15 focus on when I'm teaching. And that it says -- let me
 16 get my thoughts together.
 17 Will the children that we are teaching in our
 18 department of education -- in our schools, will they be
 19 living in Hawaii in 2050. And I look at that question and
 20 I look at the eight years in the future, and my answer to
 21 that is yes. So the reason why I am here is because I
 22 would like to see our environment be free of depleted
 23 uranium.

PT78
 24 As to why people are sitting in this cafeteria
 25 here that are at cause for depleted uranium to be flying

PT78
 The types of munitions that are planned for usage at Mākuā Military Reservation do not contain Depleted Uranium. AR 385-63, Range Safety, prohibits the use of DU ammunition for training worldwide. This policy has been in effect for over 20 years. At this point the Army has been unable to confirm the presence of Depleted Uranium at Mākuā. Discussion regarding the historical use of munitions containing Depleted Uranium in Hawai'i is found in Chapter 3.11 of this document.

Comments

Responses

PT78

72

1 in our environment, I have no understanding of that. I
 2 have no meaning of that. What meaning that I do
 3 understand, thanks to my mom, when George Helm said stop
 4 the bombing, my mother asked me to become a Hawaiian
 5 activist. And I thought that was really odd of her to ask
 6 me that. So since then, since the stop the bombing of
 7 Kahoolawe, I have been on that premise. And I will be on
 8 that premise for the rest of my life.

9 So Kanaloa, Kohe, Malamalama. That's where we are
 10 today and that's where we'll be tomorrow. And in about
 11 eight years, the world will hear the voices that we are
 12 educating now in our -- in our classrooms, specifically
 13 here at Nanakuli. Thank you.

14 FACILITATOR GOMES: Uncle Albert Silva followed by
 15 Marti Townsend.

16 MR. SILVA: Aloha everyone.

17 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

18 MR. SILVA: As I started my evening after my
 19 little dinner, I noticed in the newspaper about this event
 20 here. I felt compelled to come here and give to you
 21 another opinion. The opinion is important to all of us as
 22 citizens. Your opinion, my opinion, and we all live
 23 together harmoniously. We are Hawaiian. We have a deep
 24 sense of spirituality. What one Hawaiian told me not long
 25 ago at a service, a wake services was, "Makua will be

PT78

The types of munitions that are planned for usage at Mākua Military Reservation do not contain Depleted Uranium. AR 385-63, Range Safety, prohibits the use of DU ammunition for training worldwide. This policy has been in effect for over 20 years. At this point the Army has been unable to confirm the presence of Depleted Uranium at Mākua. Discussion regarding the historical use of munitions containing Depleted Uranium in Hawai'i is found in Chapter 3.11 of this document.

Comments

Responses

73

1 Makua forever, so why the big fuss?" And that's all he
2 said. He walked away. I can recall that day. Because
3 Ennis Kupoo, that was his service. And as a Hawaiian, I
4 feel it's important that we all keep together, keep each
5 other honest, and we respect each other, no matter what.
6 But Makua, it will be Makua for another hundred
7 years, at least. But from my eyes, from my beginning was
8 that Makua was hiahia. Maybe some of you don't know what
9 hiahia is. Hiahia is the ticket. Like as a kid, I went
10 to Makua and started off as a knee-high toddler. And when
11 I reached at about 14 years old, I used to go help the
12 paniolo, huli pipi. They didn't huli the pipi. They
13 actually roped the cattle. And this was during World War
14 II. But Makua was rough country.
15 Today, let's me tell you, if you never saw Makua
16 from my time, Makua is like a golf course right now. Why?
17 Why the golf course? Because the government is keeping
18 the Army posted, keep the place nice, spend a lot of
19 money, train the soldiers so that when they go to war,
20 they don't just get shot dead. Plenty lives already went.
21 Plenty of our ohana are gone.
22 You play baseball, you play football, you play
23 tennis, any kind of sport where there's competition, there
24 has to be training. Same like to me from my beginnings,
25 Makua has served that purpose. Makua has served that

Comments

Responses

74

1 purpose not just for my sake, but, no, for all of us. It
2 helps the troops learn prepare for battle, and they give
3 their life.

4 So I leave you with that thought, that Makua is
5 not the golf course right now. From the days that when I
6 was a youngster going into Makua. So who can do better
7 than that? Just keep their feet to the fire. That's how,
8 all of you. Keep their feet to the fire, make 'em
9 perform, keep the place nice, take care the plants. How
10 they maintain the plants, just like the goats. They say
11 get rid of the goats then they destroy the plants. The
12 goats were there; the plants are still there. Ha. You
13 answer that question. Thank you.

14 FACILITATOR GOMES: Dr. Kit Glover. And
15 Dr. Glover will be our last person for this evening.

16 Marti? Marti?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Marti left.

18 FACILITATOR GOMES: Oh, Marti left. Okay.

19 Dr. Glover is next.

20 We have -- Dr. Glover will be our last speaker
21 from this evening.

22 MR. AILA: (Indiscernible conversation.)

23 FACILITATOR GOMES: No, there isn't. We have to
24 be -- we have to be finished by 9:30.

25 MR. AILA: You on, Kit.

Comments

Responses

75

PT79
 1 DR. GLOVER: I am going to be very brief. In
 2 1942, the Army promised to return six months at the end --
 3 after the end of the war with Japan. They lied. In three

PT79
 The Army presents a history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. Much of the land that comprises MMR is ceded land, owned by the Federal Government; the remainder is leased to the Army by the State of Hawai'i. The Army also owns 170 acres in fee simple and holds 1.64 acres by license. A description of the process by which the Army now utilizes MMR is also offered in Chapter 10 Glossary "Ceded Lands."

PT80
 4 years, there's been no live fire training. Yet,
 5 apparently, there has been adequate proficiency produced.

PT80
 The experience of the past decade should not be used to predict the required level of training. First because MMR was closed for much of the time, and second because units deploying to Iraq and Afghanistan did not have the opportunity to execute required training at MMR.

6 Hawaii could show the world how to live. As Ikaika
 7 pointed out, the aloha spirit and the congeniality of all
 8 the different racial and ethnic groups we have here could
 9 show the world how to live. But Makua does all the wrong
 10 things. It shows people how to kill.

11 FACILITATOR GOMES: This is Marti Townsend, who is
 12 our final speaker for this evening.

13 MS. THOMPSON: Aloha. My apology. I put my kid
 14 to go to the car. My name is Marti Townsend. I work for
 15 Kahea Hawaii Environmental Alliance. I wanted to express

PT81
 16 our support for the community's efforts. We've been
 17 following this issue for a long time, and we really take a
 18 lot of inspiration from the community's efforts to stand
 19 up for itself. There's been a lot of harm done to the
 20 community by activities at Makua, and really forces one to
 21 question how much can one community take; how much must
 22 one community suffer for some other entity's good,
 23 whatever they wanted to do. There's really been far too
 24 much burden put on this community.

PT81
 Response: The Army remains dedicated to the protection of natural and cultural resources at MMR. Pursuant to this cause the Army has adopted a number of resource management policies and procedures that it implements based on input from Federal and State agencies, and the public. Examples of these include the Mākua Implementation Plan, Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, Integrated Wildland Fire Management Plan, and Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.

 In Sections 4.9 and 4.10 of the SDEIS, the Army assessed impacts to all natural and cultural resources consistent with NEPA, the Endangered Species Act, the Sikes Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

25 And we support all the efforts that you have done

Comments

Responses

76

1 to defend yourselves and we take inspiration from that.
 2 And we hope that you will continue on the efforts to
 3 protect your water, to protect your land, to protect all
 4 your resources. Thank you very, very much with your
 5 leadership. Mahalo.

6 FACILITATOR GOMES: We're finished for the
 7 evening. Unless -- you have two minutes. Okay. Two
 8 minutes, and that's it, Bill.

9 MR. AILA: That's not my fault you guys decided
 10 to -- Cultural access. Quick. Cultural access. The
 11 Army's spin about increasing cultural access, don't let
 12 that fool you. Okay? The access that we have right now
 13 is significantly less than we had in 2001. Okay?

14 Yesterday, I went to Makua, the cultural access, I
 15 was told that -- 545, 46 in a place that I normally give
 16 hookupu, and all of a sudden, for about the third time,
 17 this inconsistency, I was told, no, you couldn't put
 18 hokupu; you got to put it in the back of your church.
 19 Okay? This is what I was told, Aunty.

20 So this EIS has no analysis of the schizophrenia
 21 phobia of the United States Army with regards to cultural
 22 resources. I just wanted to make sure that was said. I
 23 have four other more pages. There's not enough time. But
 24 I want you young folks in the audience to understand how
 25 fixed this process is. Okay? You see how narrowly they

PT82

The Army has provided for cultural access consistent with Settlement Agreements, and has sought to accommodate the practice of religion involving Army lands in Hawai'i to the extent practicable due to human health and safety concerns and the conduct of training to support the readiness and well-being of our Soldiers in fulfilling the Army mission.

PT82

Comments

Responses

77

1 define the question and they limit the number of minutes
2 that you have to speak; although they want you to comment
3 on five telephone books worth of information. But they
4 want you to do that in writing. Why? Because they don't
5 want other people to hear what you have to say because it
6 might trigger something in their brain. And they don't
7 want you to think. They don't want you to think because
8 if you think, then you become a danger to what they want
9 to do. That's the last thing I have to say tonight.

10 Mahalo.

11 FACILITATOR GOMES: This is the end of this EIS
12 testimony public forum tonight. And tomorrow night, at
13 the same time, it will be in Wahiawa. Wahiawa.

14 Julie, where is it in Wahiawa tomorrow night?

15 MS. HONG: Wahiawa District Park, Kilani Avenue.
16 1139 Kilani Avenue, for those who are interested.

17 Aunty Frenchy? Aunty Frenchy? Can you do our
18 closing pule? Can you do our closing pule?

19

20 (Closing Pule by Hui o Malama Makua.)

21

22 (Proceedings concluded at 9:30 p.m.)

23

24

25

Comments

Responses

78

1 CERTIFICATE

2

3

4 I, ADRIANNE IGE KURASAKI, C.S.R., in and for the
State of Hawaii, do hereby certify:

5

6 That I was acting as shorthand reporter in the
7 foregoing matter on the 6th day of October, 2008;

8

9 That the proceedings were taken down in
10 computerized machine shorthand by me at the time and place
11 stated herein, and thereafter reduced to print under my
supervision; that the foregoing represents, to the best of
my ability, a correct transcript of the proceedings had in
the foregoing matter;

12

13 I further certify that I am not counsel for any of
14 the parties hereto, nor in any way interested in the
outcome of the cause named in the caption.

15

16 Dated this 11th day of November, 2008, in Honolulu,
17 Hawaii.

18

19

20

21 _____
Adrienne Ige Kurasaki, CSR 388
Registered Professional Reporter

22

23 PACIFIC REPORTING SERVICES UNLIMITED
(808)524-7778

Comments

Responses

7 October 2008 Public Meeting

1

1

2

3

4

5 In Re

Supplemental Draft

6 Environmental Impact

Statement for Military

7 Training at Makua

Military Reservation

8

9

10 TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING

11

12 Held on October 7, 2008, at Wahiawa District Park,

13 1129 Kilani Avenue, Wahiawa, Hawaii 96786.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Comments

Responses

2

| | | |
|----|--|------|
| 1 | INDEX OF EXAMINATIONS | |
| 2 | SPEAKERS: | PAGE |
| 3 | Ben Acohido | 6 |
| | Al Takesa | 8 |
| 4 | Amelia Gora | 10 |
| | Kealoha Kuhio | 13 |
| 5 | Norbert Enos | 15 |
| | General Irwin Cockett (Ret.) | 17 |
| 6 | Summer Nemeth | 19 |
| | Summer Nemeth (writing by George Helm) | 23 |
| 7 | Noa Helela | 25 |
| | Joshua Monteleigh | 26 |
| 8 | Isaac Suehiro | 27 |
| | Terri Kekoolani | 28 |
| 9 | Robert Kent | 34 |
| | Pete Shimazaki Doktor | 35 |
| 10 | Jean Starkue | 40 |
| | Mr. Peahi | 45 |
| 11 | Vince Kanai Dodge | 48 |
| | Laulani Teale | 53 |
| 12 | Daniel Anthony | 55 |
| | Terri Kekoolani | 58 |
| 13 | Vince Kanai Dodge | 61 |
| | Isaac Suehiro | 65 |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |

Comments

Responses

3

1 -oOo-

2 FACILITATOR GOMES: Before we begin with our
3 hearing, I call on Retired General Irwin Cockett to do our
4 pule for this evening.

5 GENERAL COCKETT (Ret.): As you can tell, I was
6 just handed the opportunity to do the pule this evening.
7 Aloha. Aloha kakou. Pule kakou.

8 Mahalo Ke Akua for this opportunity to gather in
9 the spirit of pono and proceed throughout our testimony
10 with a feeling of wanting to do good. We thank Thee for
11 those who have gathered here. We thank Thee for their
12 manao. And we thank Thee that Thou will look favorably
13 upon this gathering. And we pray also, God, that when we
14 depart this place, that Thou will guide us home safely to
15 our destination. All of this, we ask in Thy name. Amene.

16 Mahalo.

17 FACILITATOR GOMES: Mahalo.

18 Aloha and welcome to the public hearing for the
19 Draft Supplemental EIS Military Training Activities for
20 Makua Reservation. Tonight is an opportunity for public
21 comment to be given. It is not a question and answer
22 forum. Although, we have our Colonel Margotta and Paul
23 here, they will accept your comments. But it is not
24 question and answer.

25 You have an opportunity to give testimonies by

Comments

Responses

4

1 written response that could be submitted, including an
2 e-mail response. We do have a court reporter that can
3 also take your testimony seated right here in the front of
4 the room.

5 And we do have a video setup for right there for
6 anyone who wants to have their testimony videotaped, and
7 also you may give your testimony here at the podium.

8 The testimonies here at the podium will be allowed
9 for four minutes each, and we encourage everyone to keep
10 to their four minutes so that others may have the
11 opportunity to also give testimony.

12 I will give you cues. As the facilitator, I will
13 give you cues, one minute and then pau or stop. And
14 hopefully you will stop or I will approach the podium to
15 ask you to stop.

16 There is a sign-up list and as you come in the
17 door. If you haven't -- if you'd like to testify and you
18 haven't signed up, please do so. We will go through that
19 list. And after that list has been exhausted, if there
20 are standbys, we'll go through that list. And once that
21 is exhausted, then if there's any more testimony, folks
22 need to sign up for that.

23 We need to stop at 9:30 this evening. And we will
24 stop at 9:30 because we are under restrictions by those
25 from whom this place is rented to stop at that time.

Comments

Responses

5

1 My name is Ku'umeaaloha and I am the facilitator
2 for this evening. And I will be helping to create the
3 environment for you to be able to be heard.

4 At this time, I would like to call upon Colonel
5 Margotta, who is Garrison Commander, the U.S. Army,
6 Hawaii.

7 Colonel Margotta.

8 COLONEL MARGOTTA: Good evening, everyone. I want
9 to thank you all for attending tonight's supplemental
10 draft EIS for Makua. We're here tonight to receive
11 feedback on the draft EIS as part of the NEPA process.
12 And the NEPA process has two purposes. The first part is
13 to ensure that the government gains enough information to
14 make informed decisions. And the second part is to ensure
15 that the public is involved in that decision-making
16 process. And that's why we're here tonight, to receive
17 your comments and your feedback on our potential use of
18 Makua in the future.

19 Now, that part is important. The Army has not
20 made a decision yet with regards to the future use of
21 Makua. Has not made a decision. Therefore, it's very
22 important for us to get your feedback, get your comments.
23 And trust me when I say that the Army will consider those
24 comments. If you just take a look at the draft EIS right
25 now, there's 750 pages devoted to responses by the Army

Comments

Responses

6

1 from previous comments and previous information provided
2 us by the community.

3 So, bottom line is: The Army does consider your
4 comments and take it very, very importantly and very, very
5 seriously, so we encourage you to provide those comments
6 here tonight.

7 As our facilitator said, I encourage you to keep
8 it to four minutes or so. Tonight's crowd is not quite as
9 large as we had last night so we shouldn't have any issues
10 with regards to getting everybody through tonight's
11 presentation.

12 The other piece I would ask you to do is please
13 keep your comments related to Makua. That's why we're
14 here tonight. It's not to talk about other issues.
15 Normally you're free to do that, but I encourage you to
16 talk about Makua. So once again, thank you very much for
17 coming here tonight, and we look forward to hearing your
18 comments.

19 FACILITATOR GOMES: So without further adieu,
20 because we know that people are very anxious to give their
21 testimony about the Makua EIS, I'd like to start off by
22 calling on Ben Acohido followed by Al Takesa.

23 MR. ACOHIDO: Aloha kakou.

24 Aloha.

25 MR. ACOHIDO: I'm Ben Acohido, U.S. Army Retired

Comments

Responses

7

1 and Vietnam Veteran. This night, I'll speak on Chapter 2
2 and make very concise comments on Chapters 3 and 4. I
3 served as a commander of Waipahu VFW Post 1572, the first
4 Filipino Infantry Regiment U.S. Army. I'm here
5 representing my Post 149 members, to testify in support of
6 the recommendation contained in Chapter 2, Description of
7 the Proposed Actions and Alternatives.

8 My members, veterans of World War II, Korean war,
9 Korean Conflict and Desert Storm, supports the Army's
10 recommendation of Alternative 3, which is the full
11 capacity use of Makua Valley training area. This
12 alternative represents a maximum use capacity of that
13 training area for smaller unit training, small-unit
14 live-fire combined arms training.

15 In our experience in defending our nation in
16 various hostile assignments, we know that our soldiers
17 need to be properly trained and equipped to carry out the
18 mission that they are assigned. This alternative ensures
19 that soldiers are not separated from their families for
20 any unreasonable periods of time during training
21 especially when worldwide events are so dynamic requiring
22 deployment on short notice for over a year sometimes. We
23 must support our soldiers, ensure that they are properly
24 prepared to meet the Army's campaign, to be sure that we
25 reduce the stress of deployment on them and their

Comments

Responses

8

1 families. Providing the training our soldiers need must
 2 take precedence over other reasons, their lives and the
 3 accomplishment of the mission depends on it.

4 In conclusion, it is pragmatic and practical to
 5 have the Army train at Makua Valley MTTA, Makua training
 6 area. It is America's trained Armed Forces and veterans
 7 who serve and they protect us and allow us freedom of
 8 speech without fear of retaliation. Common courtesy is to
 9 allow all sides to be heard on community issues.

10 And in this regard, I concur with VFW Commander
 11 William Prescott's testimony on Chapters 3 and 4. And
 12 with Prescott's permission, I attached his testimony to my
 13 commentary. His historical and accurate anthropology of
 14 the Hawaiian kapu system since 1820 is helpful information
 15 to understand the con being disseminated via opposition to

16 these training areas. The VFW Post 1572 supports
 17 Prescott's recommendation to delete portions of Chapters 3
 18 and 4.

19 Mahalo nui loa. I appreciate the opportunity to
 20 speak at this public meeting.

21 FACILITATOR GOMES: Mahalo.

22 The next person is Al Takesa followed by Aunty
 23 Amelia Gora.

24 MR. TAKESA: Aloha everybody. I know you look at
 25 me as an activist. No, I'm not an activist. I wore the

PT83

PT83

Most of the archaeological sites at MMR have been identified through reconnaissance surveys (on the ground) by qualified archaeologists, and not through oral histories. Oral histories/ethnographic surveys done for MMR have yielded very little information about cultural sites. The presentation of oral histories in the cultural resources section of the EIS were requested by the community and come from documented academic sources. In addition, the NEPA process invites public input into the EIS.

Comments

Responses

9

1 Army uniform two years, yeah. Six year Vietnam, then two
 2 years in the officer program. Born and raised here,
 3 Lanai, yeah, but I really love the aina. Malama pono the
 4 aina. So it's very important from my experience as an
 5 ex-military man. I love Hawaii. Remember now, today we
 6 have 1,300,000 people in Hawaii. One million here on this
 7 island. Over a million cars. That's why we have traffic.
 8 So every inch of the aina is very important to the

PT84

9 Hawaiians. You know, so all the access land, you know,
 10 the military should give it back. You know, they're not
 11 using it. And my suggestion to have a really peace of
 12 mind for the Army and for the locals.

PT84

The return of Mākuā to the public is outside the scope of this EIS.

13 I used to be a flight attendant. Twenty years, I
 14 look out the window and fly over billions of desert land.
 15 There's no houses, no people. Maybe the Army should train
 16 there because we're fighting in the desert war, yeah.
 17 'Cause among Vietnam Veteran point of view, we lost that

PT85

18 war. Ten years, 58,000 died. Okay, that's just to give
 19 you an idea. So we need to train our soldiers in the
 20 reality environment, desert, so when they go to Iraq like
 21 that, in a hot environment, desert environment.

PT85

Training requirements are constantly changing based on lessons learned in combat, training events, new equipment, and new commanders. Convoy live-fire training, for example, has become an essential component in training units based on the experiences in Iraq and Afghanistan. Times of war, such as now, drastically change training requirements. Combat readiness, moreover, is an assessment based on a commander's experience and training, and therefore is a matter of discretion. The Soldiers of the 25th ID must train at their home station for possible deployment anywhere in the world. Further as set forth in the SDEIS, MMR is intended to be used by other military branches.

22 And our ex-generals from the Vietnam war and
 23 politicians swear they will never lose another war again
 24 or fight jungle warfare, no matter how powerful we are.
 25 Okay. So we got to stop being a bully or policeman, okay.

Comments

Responses

10

1 We need to take care of our land. We got to think about
 2 our children, the children.
 3 So this land here, as I look at Schofield, I see
 4 all the burned out land there. Since I was five years
 5 old, it's getting bigger. Mount Kaala is precious to us,
 6 or Diamond Head, ice mountain. And it's dying. I can
 7 feel that mana says kokua. Kaala, aina, it's dying. What
 8 happens? I see the fire going out because of live fire
 9 and all that. Fire started, and it's burning the
 10 mountain. Beautiful mountain. And if you know Makua is
 11 dry on the other side, we got to stop that.

PT86

12 Okay? So, please, all I can say, make everybody
 13 happy. Shoot maybe -- I have nothing against the military
 14 but we need to go where there's no restriction. And
 15 there's millions of acres on the mainland where they can
 16 do their training. Thank you.

17 FACILITATOR GOMES: Mahalo. Mahalo. Aunty Amelia
 18 followed by Kuhio Kealoha.

19 MS. GORA: Hello, my name is Amelia Kuulei Gora.
 20 I'm the -- I write a lot of books; history books,
 21 genealogy books. And I put out the news on the web. It's
 22 called The Iolani. The people that also write are

PT87

23 scientists, and especially on depleted uranium. I noticed
 24 you folks failed to post anything about depleted uranium
 25 and the outcome of what happens for depleted uranium. And

PT86

Alternatives that do not advance the purpose and need are not considered reasonable alternatives. The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried foPTard for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5.

The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

PT87

The types of munitions that are planned for usage at Mākua Military Reservation do not contain Depleted Uranium. AR 385-63, Range Safety, prohibits the use of DU ammunition for training worldwide. This policy has been in effect for over 20 years. At this point the Army has been unable to confirm the presence of Depleted Uranium at Mākua. Discussion regarding the historical use of munitions containing Depleted Uranium in Hawai'i is found in Chapter 3.11 of this document.

Although DU is slightly radioactive and is considered a toxic metal, such as nickel and lead, a wide range of governmental and independent non-governmental bodies have studied the environmental effects of DU for decades and indicate that the health risks associated with DU exposures are low. Uranium is a naturally occurring heavy metal that is mildly radioactive. Humans and animals have always ingested particles of this naturally occurring substance from the air, water and soil.

Comments

Responses

PT87

11

1 that's what's being blown up, you know, live fire and all
 2 of that.
 3 Have you ever gone to the Youtube and see the
 4 eight-legged babies and two-faced child -- children?
 5 Well, anyway, that's the outcome of what happens with
 6 depleted uranium with what the military is doing around
 7 the world and mucking up everybody's environment.

8 Anyway, I am a direct descendent of Kamehameha and
 9 many of the others, Isaac Davis, John Young. And only the
 10 people in Hawaii know who they are. But the point is is
 11 that, I'm a researcher, and the fact remains that Hawaii
 12 still has owners and the owners are here. And people
 13 around the world know about this. And the fact remains,
 14 the owners are here and I have documented in the past,
 15 it's not okay; filed oppositions with the president. And
 16 I maintain oppositions to the president. And it's in
 17 regards to Makua, Schofield Barracks, as well as
 18 Pohakuloa, because there's a lot of issues, problematic
 19 issues, and it's truly not okay.

20 This document was found by a researcher only --
 21 only two months now. And this is called Pearl Harbor
 22 Coaling Station; Imperative Necessity that United States
 23 Take Possession. It says throughout here that it's all
 24 occupation, and the favor of the new treaty should avoid
 25 all mention of troops. This is a premeditation of the

PT87

The types of munitions that are planned for usage at Mākuā Military Reservation do not contain Depleted Uranium. AR 385-63, Range Safety, prohibits the use of DU ammunition for training worldwide. This policy has been in effect for over 20 years. At this point the Army has been unable to confirm the presence of Depleted Uranium at Mākuā. Discussion regarding the historical use of munitions containing Depleted Uranium in Hawai'i is found in Chapter 3.11 of this document.

Although DU is slightly radioactive and is considered a toxic metal, such as nickel and lead, a wide range of governmental and independent non-governmental bodies have studied the environmental effects of DU for decades and indicate that the health risks associated with DU exposures are low. Uranium is a naturally occurring heavy metal that is mildly radioactive. Humans and animals have always ingested particles of this naturally occurring substance from the air, water and soil.

Comments

Responses

12

1 Hawaiian Kingdom. And ramifications are many, and it's
 2 truly not okay for any of you to use our lands, our aina,
 3 for -- for criminal wrongdoing and which is going to
 4 affect the people, because we didn't do anything to you
 5 folks. And yet, depleted uranium is going to be killing
 6 off a lot of people. And it's truly -- you know, the word
 7 "pono" was brought up, and I'm thinking how dare anybody
 8 use pono in this room because it's not pono at all.
 9 So anyway, I want to go on record that I'm in
 10 opposition and we have documentation. The owners are
 11 here, descendents of Kamehameha the descendents of Queen
 12 Liliuokalani and many others are here.

PT88

13 Makua, I have to remind you that in Makua, 1892, I
 14 have evidence that the planning of the wrongful
 15 dethronement of the Queen occurred in Makua. So I'm
 16 sorry, people, you -- it's simply not okay that you can
 17 use any of our properties, because I am one of the owners.
 18 So as a representative, I'm also an acting liaison of the
 19 Kingdom of Hawaii and have been posting information all
 20 over the world.

PT89

21 And our environment cannot be used for purposes
 22 such as that, because Hawaii -- the Hawaiian Kingdom
 23 remain as a neutral, nonviolent nation, which means no
 24 military exercise of any kind.

PT90

25 And, besides, rents and payments are due.

PT88

Although DU is slightly radioactive and is considered a toxic metal, such as nickel and lead, a wide range of governmental and independent non-governmental bodies have studied the environmental effects of DU for decades and indicate that the health risks associated with DU exposures are low. Uranium is a naturally occurring heavy metal that is mildly radioactive. Humans and animals have always ingested particles of this naturally occurring substance from the air, water and soil.

PT89

A description of the process by which the Army now utilizes MMR is described in Chapter 10 Glossary "Ceded Lands." The comment does not address the need or purpose of the proposed action; nor does the comment appear to address the evaluation of potential impacts from any of the proposed alternatives, therefore no changes to the document have occurred as a result of this comment. Also, the EIS now includes text at the beginning of Section 3.10.3 regarding Public Law 103-150, that addresses the 1893 overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai'i.

PT90

The Army presents a brief history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. A historical overview is also found in Section 3.10.3. The events that occurred in 1893 and the subsequent recognition of Hawai'i as a US territory are beyond the scope of this EIS, and have nothing to do with the proposed action.

Comments

Responses

PT90

13

1 \$500 trillion a year, all the way going back to 1893, is
 2 due. And I have been sending messages out. So the point
 3 is: This is not your land, and it's not okay for you
 4 folks to use it and abuse it. And this is just going to
 5 be a follow-up of -- I'm going to be posting -- okay. I'm
 6 going to be posting information, oppositions and
 7 everything. Okay. Thank you.
 8 FACILITATOR GOMES: Mahalo.
 9 Kuhio Kealoha followed by Norbert Enos.
 10 MR. KUHIO: Good evening. My name is Kealoha
 11 Kuhio. I'm here in opposition against the white man from
 12 America to use my ancestors' land, Pohakuloa training

PT91

13 facility and Makua Valley. I see propaganda over here on
 14 the boards, on the table, but what I no see and I told the
 15 lady, where's the deed to the property; where's the metes
 16 and bound description?
 17 Three documents, the 1840s Mahele will give you
 18 significant cultural sites the metes and bound
 19 description. You have none here. In 1999, the Department
 20 of Interior called for reconciliation with the Hawaiian
 21 people. Reconciliation means return what you stole, the
 22 white man from America, the foreign country.
 23 Till today, the Americans had brought out the
 24 Stryker Brigade, are using live military on our land that
 25 they ignored the Department of Interior's request for

PT90

The Army presents a brief history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. A historical overview is also found in Section 3.10.3. The events that occurred in 1893 and the subsequent recognition of Hawai'i as a US territory are beyond the scope of this EIS, and have nothing to do with the proposed action.

PT91

The fee simple parcels which correlated to the LCA parcels from the Great Mahele were purchased by the Army in 1942. I refer you to Marion Kelly's 1977 study of the History of Mākua Valley.

Comments

Responses

14

1 reconciliation with the Hawaiian nation. Instead, the
2 American has showed aggression by using force. When I say
3 “force,” you want to use live ammo on our land. Pohakuloa
4 was on kahuna property. So is Makua, was a kahuna land
5 where our priest used to practice their culture. And you
6 desecrate our land by shooting live ammo, bombing our
7 property. This is what the white man from America did to
8 Hawaii. It’s evidence. I no got to tell you people.
9 We go to Kahoolawe. They never clean up
10 Kahoolawe, but they want to do more destruction. It’s
11 time that the American government realize that it’s time
12 to leave our country. Vanity will be found. When vanity
13 found, America must leave, so will the military. The
14 Kingdom of Hawaii had many treaties with foreign
15 countries. We would invite their countries in to our land
16 as our friends. We ask the United States keep out of our
17 land because they was our enemies, as evidenced in 1893
18 overthrow of our queen.
19 Today, you’re still using force on us. Still
20 telling us that we cannot go on our ancestor land. And to
21 me, that’s not right. With the white man with the guns
22 and pointing it at the Hawaiians, that’s where the white
23 man has the power.
24 But as far as documentation, I see none. There is
25 no documents on this board here to show me that Edna Pake

Comments

Responses

15

1 (phonetic), the state of hawaii, the trustees of Hawaii
 2 estate had given this land to United States government.
 3 The United States government in turn took this land and
 4 run with it.
 5 So in closing, I oppose to the American military
 6 here in Hawaii and all actions, live ammo, dummy ammo,
 7 even maneuvers in Bellows field, I oppose. Thank you very
 8 much.
 9 FACILITATOR GOMES: Norbert Enos followed by
 10 Irwin -- General Irwin Cockett.
 11 MR. ENOS: Hello, and thank you. My name is
 12 Norbert Kaiama Enos. I'm a native Hawaiian, obviously
 13 sitting here with my cap, VFW, Veterans of Foreign Wars.
 14 I'm with the state department as the adjutant
 15 quartermaster. And on behalf of 5,000-plus members, I
 16 speak in favor of Makua. And we've been restricted to
 17 speak only of Makua. However, it's kind of hard to
 18 mention other things growing up in Hawaii.
 19 Born here on this island, grew up few years in
 20 Pawaa. And believe it or not, that's some distance away
 21 from Pearl Harbor. And I grew up with a bomb shelter in
 22 my yard. I grew up with my sister and brother out selling
 23 papers on December 7, 1941. When I got up under the bed,
 24 my mother took me out the next day, bullets, houses burnt
 25 all over. I moved to Kalihi. Why? Because Lunalilo

Comments

Responses

16

1 school, my school, burnt down. And from Kalihi, moved to
 2 Maili, Waianae, with my family out there, the Piilaaus,
 3 the Kaihuis, the Dungs, and the list goes on.
 4 I know Makua Valley. After we through harvesting
 5 every summer up the valley, we go down to Makua where the
 6 tent was there. And as kids, we wander across the street,
 7 we wander across the fields up the valley. I respect the
 8 Hawaiians' belief, the culture. I also respect the
 9 Hawaiians to respect the military, because there's so many
 10 of us military that have served, and this is why we have
 11 freedom today and we can speak what we want to talk about.
 12 It's so obvious.
 13 I understand culture being a native Hawaiian,
 14 raised the Hawaiian way, fishing, crabbing, picking taro,
 15 picking tomatoes, picking the yams, you name it, back
 16 there up in Puea. Some of you never heard of Puea.
 17 That's what they call the valley now up there, Lunalilo.
 18 Okay. So naturally, I'm in favor. I spent
 19 30 years in the military. And I trained in Pohakuloa. I
 20 trained in Schofield. I trained in the Koolaus and the
 21 Waianae range. I trained in the water at Bellows,
 22 everywhere. So I really understand. The military needs
 23 realistic training. They really do.
 24 Some of you have families. They say, well, they
 25 don't need the training. They never trained there, and

Comments

Responses

17

1 yet they served. Yes, maybe they had a different kind of
2 job. My job was combat arms. I was on the front line
3 always. Thirty years. Thank you very much.

4 FACILITATOR GOMES: Retired General Irwin Cockett
5 followed by Summer Nemeth.

6 GENERAL COCKETT (Ret.): Aloha. Aloha kakou.

7 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

8 GENERAL COCKETT (Ret.): My name is Irwin Cockett,
9 and I am a native Hawaiian and a veteran, having served a
10 total of 36 years in the regular Army and the Hawaii Army
11 National Guard. Since my retirement from the military, I
12 have and continue to serve in several veteran
13 organizations.

14 While Chapter 1 sets out the scope of the
15 supplemental EIS, it does note on page 1-7 that to support
16 the training needs of the current force, structure,
17 collective live-firing training is a basic requirement.

18 I took my basic training at Schofield barracks in
19 1949 and served as an infantryman with the fifth
20 regimental combat team during the Korean War and the
21 campaigns of 1950 and '51. And I also served three tours
22 in Vietnam.

23 Today, if my Kamehameha school classmates and
24 Korean War comrades, Homer Coons, William Opulaohu, and
25 Hiram Kay, and my foxhole buddy, Herbert Kaluna, could

Comments

Responses

18

1 speak to you from their graves, they would tell you about
 2 the agony of war and, most important, being sent into
 3 harm's way poorly trained and ill-equipped.

4 The Korean War began at 0400 hours on June 25th,
 5 1950. And the fifth RCT, composed of many local boys,
 6 were among the first units to arrive and reinforce the
 7 battle-weary elements of the 24th Infantry Division, the
 8 Taro Division. It was a very hard, personal earned lesson
 9 for me during that conflict on the importance of training.

10 Train, train, train.

11 Waianae, Kahuku, Kamehameha, University of Hawaii,
 12 and all of our football teams train almost every week.
 13 And as I speak, Hui Nalo and Healani are storing their
 14 canoes after a hard-training day paddling at sea. Our
 15 halaus intensify their training before the Merry Monarch.
 16 They may review videos and films, but there is no
 17 substitute for on-hand training.

18 How can we send our troops into harm's way without
 19 the opportunity to train and experience the difficulty to
 20 coordinate troop movement, weapons fire, and supporting
 21 elements under the most realistic training and stress
 22 conditions they will face on the battle field.

23 Makua is the only range in Hawaii capable of
 24 company-sized live-fire training with supporting weapons
 25 such as aviation and artillery. Makua provides them with

Comments

Responses

19

1 a place to learn. It means they can train here in Hawaii
 2 and not be separated from their families for longer
 3 periods of time prior to repeating deployments. It is
 4 economical for us as taxpayers but, most important,
 5 training saves lives.
 6 Mahalo for allowing me to testify this evening. I
 7 believe the time for the delaying tactics of more studies
 8 is over. We need to fully utilize Makua Military
 9 Reservation and prepare our troops for the challenges they
 10 face. I remind you, training may save the life of your
 11 son, your grandson, your daughter, your granddaughter, or
 12 somebody from your ohana. Mahalo. Aloha.
 13 FACILITATOR GOMES: Mahalo.
 14 Summer followed by someone who's going to read the
 15 testimony of George Helm.

PT92

16 MS. NEMETH: Military activities shall not take
 17 place in the lands or territories of indigenous peoples
 18 unless justified by a relevant public interest or
 19 otherwise freely agreed with or requested by the
 20 indigenous people concerned. Where does that come from,
 21 you may ask? It's from United Nations Declaration on the
 22 Rights of Indigenous People, Article 30.1.

PT93

23 We have not freely agreed to your use of our aina
 24 as battle ground. You have stolen our land without our
 25 permission and you continue to destroy our mookuauhau

PT92

Article 30 of the United Nations Declaration for the Rights on Indigenous Peoples, approved in 2007, states:

1. Military activities shall not take place in the lands or territories of indigenous peoples, unless justified by a significant threat to relevant public interest or otherwise freely agreed with or requested by the indigenous peoples concerned.
2. States shall undertake effective consultations with the indigenous peoples concerned, through appropriate procedures and in particular through their representative institutions, prior to using their lands or territories for military activities.

While the United States of America has a large indigenous population which we seek to protect, the Declaration for the Rights of Indigenous People is not the appropriate mechanism by which to do so. The United States did not sign the Declaration, and it is not a legally binding document and has no legal effect in the U.S.

The Army's record of consultation with Native Hawaiian groups on this action is exemplary.

PT93

The State of Hawai'i has agreed to allow the Army to use MMR as a training range.

Comments

Responses

PT93

20

1 without our permission. It is clear that this process is
 2 flawed. It has failed our people. You have failed our
 3 people. Your EIS fails our people.

PT93

The State of Hawai'i has agreed to allow the Army to use MMR as a training range.

PT94

4 In that Makua EIS in the section on Environmental
 5 Consequences, Culture Resources, there are three instances
 6 where the Army recognizes that war games at Makua, quote,
 7 unquote, would result in physical damage and loss of mana
 8 for the native Hawaiian culture. How dare you. Knowingly
 9 and openly taking another's mana? What does that
 10 translate to culturally for us? When you intentionally
 11 take one's mana for your own, you are declaring that
 12 person an enemy.

PT94

The Army recognizes there may be significant impacts from implementation of the proposed action.

13 Have you considered how your desecration and
 14 destructive behavior truly impact our community by
 15 destroying our mana, our mookuahau, our aina? You have
 16 started a war against the Kanaka Maoli. Every EIS hearing
 17 becomes a battlefield. Every reprint of this bogus EIS is
 18 an atomic bomb on our identity.

PT95

19 And what does that mean for na koa? What are the
 20 impacts of one going to war? Well, we're hearing a lot
 21 about that from your soldiers coming home and killing
 22 their wives and children and unborn children. We hear
 23 about soldiers committing suicide and abusing drugs and
 24 alcohol. We read about escalating cases of domestic
 25 violence and divorce on the military home front after a

PT95

The impact of War on Soldiers, specifically Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) has been the focus of many studies, including an ongoing study conducted by researchers at Walter Reed Army Institute of Research.

Comments

Responses

PT95

21

1 tour in Iraq. And you are bringing these soldiers home to
 2 our community? Have you studied those impacts?
 3 Have you thought about studying how the reading of
 4 your many environmental impact statements affect those
 5 whose homelands are in jeopardy? I sink into depression
 6 every time I try to read through one. I don't want to
 7 wake up in the morning when I read through one. And I
 8 know I'm not alone.

PT95

The impact of War on Soldiers, specifically Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) has been the focus of many studies, including an ongoing study conducted by researchers at Walter Reed Army Institute of Research.

PT96

9 And what about these hearings? Why is it that at
 10 the earlier hearings, they were packed to the brim with
 11 our people, standing room only? Why is it that no -- no
 12 one wants to come out anymore? Why are so many of us
 13 broken down and unable to stand for what is pono? Here is
 14 a lesson you need to learn.

PT96

The Army has provided the public opportunity to review the Army's analysis and submit input. Most changes made to the SDEIS since public distribution of the DEIS were in response to public and agency comments on the DEIS and subsequent studies. There are greater discussions on the current status of historic properties and cultural resources and the results of endangered species consultations. There is also the incorporation of the marine resources study and other studies, surveys, and reports done since the issuance of the DEIS in 2005. The lengthy EIS process is not designed to wear the public down. Rather we are trying to take a hard look at the affected environment and the impacts of the proposed action.

PT97

15 The impact is called cultural trauma. And when
 16 you consider the battlefield you have created in our home
 17 land, this emotional and psychological war zone that we
 18 must face to protect the very essence of our being, we,
 19 the Kanaka Maoli, are severely traumatized. But what does
 20 the Army know about trauma. You can't even treat your own
 21 vets suffering from PTSD.
 22 So what happens with a community plagued with
 23 cultural trauma? The same thing that happens to those
 24 untreated soldiers, uncontrolled anger, violence, suicide,
 25 abuse, hopelessness, depression, lack of motivation,

PT97

The assessment of psychological impacts on the civilian population is outside the scope of NEPA.

Comments

Responses

PT97

22

1 alcoholism and drug use, and the list goes on. Where is
2 this information in your EIS?

PT97

The assessment of psychological impacts on the civilian population is outside the scope of NEPA.

PT98

3 Your EIS demonstrates your inability to truly
4 understand the repercussions of your actions. The failure
5 to recognize the true impacts of your war games and your
6 lack of cultural sensitivity equates to the U.S. military
7 overall failure.

PT98

The Army recognizes there may be significant impacts from implementation of the proposed action. The Army derived its basis for the archaeological and cultural resource analysis from site specific baseline reports from cultural resource firms with extensive local experience, as well as from oral histories, public meetings and interested individuals. In addition, the Army encouraged the public and Native Hawaiians to share their knowledge of resources and incorporated this information into the EIS.

8 In the time of Ku, I am a woman of valley and
9 stream who summons the moo Kihanuilulumoku, guardian of
10 Laieikawai, to protect our wahi pana, to devour like flies
11 those who train soldiers to penetrate the depths of Papa,
12 raping her with foreign projectiles until she bleeds
13 rusted metal; who calls upon Kihanuilulumoku, guardian of
14 Laieikawai to protect our wahi pana, to lash out against
15 those who turn fishponds into toxic stews, who turn
16 fertile islands into barren deserts in the name of
17 national defense.

18 A woman who summons Pikoikaalala, to draw his bow
19 against those who hooiole, who erect barbed wire fences
20 around the aina of our ancestors, claiming with ordnance,
21 littering with toxics, our Makua; Lihue, Lualualei,
22 Pohakuloa, Nohili, Waikane, Waimomi, Waianae, our waiwai,
23 our aina, our kai, as personal playgrounds in the name of
24 homeland security.

25 In the time of Lono, when the flag of white kapa

Comments

Responses

23

1 flies, I am a woman, a weaver of words, who reinforces red
2 feathers to capes that connect and entwine the blood of
3 fallen generations to the shoulders of young warriors, to
4 ensure their mana is restored, that their bones shall
5 live. So that their bones shall live. In the time of
6 Lono, I am a woman, a teller of stories, who recites the
7 chants of Hiiakaikapoliopole, of Laamaomao, of Laieikawai,
8 who praises the actions of Kuapakaa, of Kahalaomapuana,
9 who remembers the struggles of Liliulani, of George Helm,
10 who celebrates Sovereign Sunday, the Hawaiian Renaissance,
11 Punana Leo and aloha aina, so that these bones shall live.
12 In the time of Lono, I give thanks for the restoration of
13 pono. I ask for the blessings of my ancestors.
14 E ho mai ka ike. E ho mai ka ikaika. E ho mai ke
15 akamai. E ho mai ka maopopo pono. E ho mai ka ike
16 papalua. E ho mai ka mana.
17 In the time of Lono, I will wait for the time of
18 Ku to deal with you.
19 FACILITATOR GOMES: You're going to do it? Okay.
20 MS. NEMETH: This testimony is from anakala George
21 Helm. Anakana George Helm. It's dated January 30th,
22 1977.
23 "I have my thoughts. You have your thoughts.
24 Simple for me. Difficult for you. Simply, the reason is:
25 I am a Hawaiian, and I have inherited the soul of my

Comments

Responses

24

1 kupuna. It is my moral responsibility to attempt an
2 ending to this desecration of our sacred aina, kohe
3 malamalama o kanaloa and makua.

4 "For each bomb dropped as further injury to an
5 already wounded soul. The truth is, there is man and
6 there is environment. One does not supersede the other.
7 The breath in man is the breath of papa. Man is merely
8 the caretaker of the land that maintains his life and
9 nourishes his soul. Therefore, aina is sacred. The
10 church of life is not in a building. It is the open sky,
11 the surrounding ocean, the beautiful soil. My duty is to
12 protect Mother Earth who gives me life. And to give
13 thanks with humility as well as ask forgiveness for the
14 arrogance and insensitivity of man.

15 "What is national defense when what is being
16 destroyed is the very thing the military is entrusted to
17 defend: The sacred land of Hawaii. The spirit of pride
18 is left uncultivated. What truth -- without truth and
19 without meaning for the keiki o ka aina, cut off from the
20 land as a fetus is cut off from its mother. National
21 defense, it's in defensible in terms of the loss of pride
22 for many of the citizens of Hawaii nei.

23 "Call me radical for I refuse to remain idle. I
24 will not have the foreigner prostitute the soul of my
25 being and I will not make a whore out of my soul, my

Comments

Responses

25

1 culture. All the archaeological discoveries incredibly
 2 are not enough cause, it seems, for the federal government
 3 to respect the sacredness of history. This continued
 4 disregard for seriousness, this refusal to give
 5 credibility to the Hawaiian culture based on aloha aina,
 6 forces me to protest.”
 7 FACILITATOR GOMES: That was a reading from George
 8 Helm.
 9 Noa Helela followed by Joshua Monteleigh.
 10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Monteleigh.
 11 FACILITATOR GOMES: Monteleigh.
 12 MR. HELELA: Aloha. Aloha kakou.
 13 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

PT99
 14 MR. HELELA: My name is Noa Helela. And I’ve
 15 lived in on Oahu my whole life. And my family has been
 16 involved in protecting Makua before. And so I just found
 17 out recently about this, about this idea of bombing Makua
 18 again and I’m -- I was shocked. I mean, how many times
 19 does it need to be bombed, you know? How much target

PT100
 20 practice does the military need for -- for -- and for
 21 what? To go and bomb innocent women and children and --
 22 and, you know, not just women and children, innocent
 23 people in -- in other countries.

PT101
 24 And this is -- you’re going to -- if you’re going
 25 to practice somewhere, why would you -- why would you

PT99
 The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

PT100
 Overseas commitments are not relevant to the Scope of this EIS. The U.S. Armed forces do not target innocent people.

PT101
 The Army is dedicated to fulfilling its responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. The Army has conducted extensive research to the cultural resources present at both MMR. The results of this research is found within Section 3.10 of the EIS. The Army has based the analysis of potential impacts of the proposed action in part on this documentation.

The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

Comments

Responses

PT101

26

1 destroy sacred land that you've already destroyed before?
 2 You know, you've got -- you've bombed Kahoolawe. You've
 3 bombed Makua before. You've bombed -- it's just so
 4 sickening. I can't believe it. I just -- I can't -- my
 5 mind can't -- I don't have -- I have to -- my mind
 6 seems -- I can't just comprehend what you may be thinking.
 7 I can't understand why would you want to bomb a place like
 8 this over and over and over again, when the people of
 9 Hawaii have been protecting it. And it's just so
 10 disrespectful to think that you can try and destroy a
 11 sacred place like this again. So it just really breaks my
 12 heart.
 13 (Singing in Hawaiian.)
 14 Mahalo.
 15 FACILITATOR GOMES: Joshua followed by Isaac
 16 Suehiro.
 17 MR. MONTELEIGH: Aloha mai kakou.
 18 AUDIENCE: Aloha.
 19 MR. MONTELEIGH: I'd like to ask how many -- how
 20 much of Kanaka Maoli? Raise your hand.
 21 And how much of us are against bombing Makua?
 22 How much are you guys with bombing Makua?
 23 You know what, if you guys want to bomb somewhere,
 24 you guys should bomb the U.S. 'cause they fucked us over.
 25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hey! Watch your mouth.

PT101

The Army is dedicated to fulfilling its responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. The Army has conducted extensive research to the cultural resources present at both MMR. The results of this research is found within Section 3.10 of the EIS. The Army has based the analysis of potential impacts of the proposed action in part on this documentation.

The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

Comments

Responses

27

1 MR. MONTELEIGH: Kala mai hupaloa wahine.
 2 They really messed up us as Kanaka Maoli. Okay.
 3 They influenced our children to think it's okay to run
 4 around with weapons and point at each other like paintball
 5 guns that's influencing -- they're fucking -- oh, kalamai,
 6 kalamai. E na, soft guns are influencing war. That's
 7 why -- that's why you guys think it's okay to bomb Makua.
 8 Makua is wahi kapu, okay. It's sacred land. You buy
 9 that? Our ancestors is going to bite you guys in your
 10 lemu big time, you know.

11 Mahalo.

12 FACILITATOR GOMES: Isaac Suehiro followed by
 13 Terri Kekoolani.

14 MR. SUEHIRO: It's probably said about 80,000
 15 times today, but why are you guys bombing Makua? Like
 16 target practice doesn't really make sense. You guys are
 17 going to bomb here to bomb somewhere else later. Yeah,
 18 you guys are pretty much just, like, killing yourself,
 19 like cutting yourself, punching yourself in your face and
 20 shooting your foot, all at the same time.

21 Like, and I looked over there, there's, like,
 22 really nice pictures of the place, and you guys want to go
 23 bomb that, just blow it up, like gone? Nothing's going to
 24 go back. You can't unblow something up. I just don't get
 25 it.

PT102

PT102

The Army remains dedicated to the protection of natural and cultural resources at MMR. Pursuant to this cause the Army has adopted a number of resource management policies and procedures that it implements based on input from Federal and State agencies, and the public. Examples of these include the Mākua Implementation Plan, Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, Integrated Wildland Fire Management Plan, and Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.

Comments

Responses

28

1 I forgot what I was going to say.
2 Yeah, I heard about this today. Like, as soon as
3 I got home, my friend called me. He told me there's a
4 seminar about this. And I came up with what I was going
5 to say in a car on the way here while eating food. So,
6 yeah. Sorry. Bye.

7 FACILITATOR GOMES: Mahalo, Isaac.

8 Terry followed by Robert Kent.

9 MS. KEKOOLANI: Aloha kakou. My name is Terri
10 Kekoolani, and I really miss seeing our people in the
11 audience. But I do want to let you know that even though
12 many of them are not here, they're out there. This is a
13 very big issue. Okay.

14 I want to make a few comments on the environmental
15 impact statement or the draft. I brought two leaflets,
16 one that talks about the Army and what its proposing to
17 do. It's two pages. And the other one, which has just
18 been done. It talks about the health, environment, and
19 our rights as kanaka and the impact of the military on our
20 people. And so these are the two leaflets that we brought
21 for you to read.

22 A lot of what we do is provide education and
23 dialogue among our people. It's really important. When
24 we do so, we come in peace and we do so nonviolently.

25 Now, I'm just going to start reading from one of

Comments

Responses

29

PT103

1 the leaflets. It says, "The Army plans to expend over
 2 2 million munitions annually, further destroying the
 3 beautiful and sacred Makua Valley during their proposed
 4 240 day out of 365 days of war games. These munitions
 5 include the most threatening illumination munitions,
 6 120-millimeter mortars, 155-millimeter howitzers, inert
 7 TOW missiles, and 2.75-caliber rockets, some of which will
 8 be launched from helicopters and all of which the Army
 9 admits will increase chance of wildfire and, quote,
 10 physical damage and loss of mana for the Native Hawaiian
 11 culture, unquote." This is taken from your study, 4-99
 12 (sic).

PT103

The Army remains dedicated to the protection of natural and cultural resources at MMR. Pursuant to this cause the Army has adopted a number of resource management policies and procedures that it implements based on input from Federal and State agencies, and the public. Examples of these include the Mākua Implementation Plan, Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, Integrated Wildland Fire Management Plan, and Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.

Additionally, Table 2-6 of the EIS provides more accurate estimates of munitions items expended annually for daytime and nighttime CALFEXs, as they pertain to the number of CALFEXs associated with each Alternative.

PT104

13 Now, what does the supplemental draft say? This
 14 draft is an enormous document. It's more than 5,000
 15 pages. And I just want to make a brief comment. To ask
 16 the community to comment in two weeks on this kind of
 17 document, which has actually taken you a couple of years
 18 to produce, is just a unconscionable. It's very bad. The
 19 procedures are really horrible.

PT104

The Army has provided the public opportunity to review the Army's analysis and submit input. Most changes made to the SDEIS since public distribution of the DEIS were in response to public and agency comments on the DEIS and subsequent studies. There are greater discussions on the current status of historic properties and cultural resources and the results of endangered species consultations. There is also the incorporation of the marine resources study and other studies, surveys, and reports done since the issuance of the DEIS in 2005. Finally, the Army offered the public 75 days to review the DEIS; 60 days to review the Marine Life Study, Archaeological Survey, and DEIS in 2007; and 45 days to review the SDEIS in 2008.

PT105

20 Now, the draft confirms what the community has
 21 been concerned about for years, that Army training at
 22 Makua has had and will continue to worsen serious and
 23 unmitigatable (sic) environmental, cultural, and social
 24 impacts. And yet, the Army proposes to expand its
 25 training footprint and activities significantly.

PT105

It should be noted that the 2003 fire began not because of military training but to clear an area to clear UXO in accordance with the 2001 settlement agreement. Also, the weather conditions under which this prescribed burn was conducted were ideal for a "hot burn" to remove as much vegetation as possible. The Army recognizes that dry conditions are not the optimum time to train with incendiary conditions, and in fact the 2007 BO restricts their use during such conditions.

Comments

Responses

PT105

30

1 Let's talk about just one problem. That is fires.
 2 More than 300 fires over the last 12 years. The last
 3 catastrophic fire in 2003 destroyed more than 2000 acres
 4 and killed several populations of endangered plants. Yet,
 5 the draft admits that devastation from wildfires will be
 6 even more likely due to the Army's plan to increase
 7 training to 242 days of war games every year with
 8 munitions known to cause wildfires. The document even
 9 mentions that training will occur all year long, day and
 10 night, despite the fact that fires are most likely to have
 11 devastating results during dry months.

12 Another point: Contaminants. The draft mentions
 13 the resumption of live-fire training and the use of
 14 munitions. It also refers to a study on fish tissue found
 15 on the north and south muliwai and near the shore of
 16 Makua. There is a reference. It's Table 5-1. This is
 17 coming from your study. There's a reference to materials,
 18 explosive that will be used; RDX, perchlorate, and
 19 nitroglycerin. These have all been found near the shore.
 20 Perchlorate in particular has been found not only on the
 21 shore but in the north and south muliwai.

22 What is it? Perchlorate, a primary ingredient in
 23 rocket fuel, munitions, and explosives, leading to thyroid
 24 problems in pregnant women, newborns, and young children
 25 nationwide. That's what it is. And it's found in fish

PT105

It should be noted that the 2003 fire began not because of military training but to clear an area to clear UXO in accordance with the 2001 settlement agreement. Also, the weather conditions under which this prescribed burn was conducted were ideal for a "hot burn" to remove as much vegetation as possible. The Army recognizes that dry conditions are not the optimum time to train with incendiary conditions, and in fact the 2007 BO restricts their use during such conditions.

Comments

Responses

31

1 tissue offshore of Makua.

PT106

2 Now, you folks aren't planning to have no
3 alternative use. You are planning for full-capacity use
4 with limited, possibly, use of weapons. But, full
5 capacity. You are not going to decrease the presence of
6 perchlorate. You're going to increase it.

PT106

The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). Under these alternatives the Army has no plans for full capacity use of MMR. The activities planned for MMR under these alternatives the current level of training at MMR would remain.

PT107

7 Next point: In your study, you also say that
8 you're going to be considering moving training activities
9 from Makua to Pohakuloa on the Big Island. This is
10 unacceptable, to shift the devastation and the
11 destruction, contamination and suffering to another
12 island, to another of our community.
13 So what is at stake? Makua is one of the richest
14 concentrations of Kanaka Maoli cultural sites with more
15 than 70 percent of the valley covered with terraces,
16 shrines and temples, dwellings, burials and other
17 features. More than 40 endangered species, some of them
18 found only in Makua. Makua is one of the most -- last
19 intact ahupuaas on Oahu where Kanaka Maoli could learn and
20 practice traditional land-management methods and systems.
21 Makua is a victim and unwilling accessory of the illegal
22 and moral U.S. wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Makua is a
23 manifestation of American empire in Hawaii and in the
24 Pacific.
25 Now, what do our people want? We demand that the

PT107

Alternatives that do not advance the purpose and need are not considered reasonable alternatives. The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried foPTard for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5. This section discusses the reasons the Army considered but eliminated other identified alternatives. There were no locations outside of Hawai'i that could meet all four screening criteria. Other locations considered included Fort IPTin, California, Yakima Training Center, Washington, and Fort Polk, Louisiana. Therefore these locations were dismissed and not considered for further evaluation. The installation has completed ESA consultation with the USFWS, and they determined that implementation of the proposed action would not jeopardize or adversely modify critical habitat based on the Army's multiple actions to minimize and reduce threats associated with training at MMR.

Comments

Responses

32

1 Army select a community's preferred alternative, which is
 2 not included in your list of alternatives. And that is to
 3 end Army training in Makua, to completely clean it up, and
 4 to restore the environment. We will not accept the
 5 devastating impacts of wildfire caused by Army war games
 6 nor any further desecration of our sacred sites nor
 7 limiting access to the valley. This is not acceptable.

PT108

8 Further, we will not expect -- accept further
 9 exposure to contaminants that harm our people, our forest,
 10 and our ocean life. It's time to demand that the Army
 11 clean up Makua and return the valley to the people.

PT109

12 Now, I would like to also highlight the absurdity
 13 of the Army's saying publicly that they prefer
 14 full-capacity training to be -- and also to be exempt from
 15 environmental law after their recent announcement in 2006
 16 of weapons dumped off of Waianae shore. I don't have the
 17 time -- we have been given a limit -- to tell you how many
 18 tons of chemical weapons were dumped in Waianae, but I
 19 think you know how much.

20 Now, continued use of Makua, the dumping of these
 21 chemical weapons and toxic chemicals off of our shoreline.
 22 There has been a horrific environmental racism dished out
 23 to the Waianae Coast, an area which has a very high
 24 population of Kanaka Maoli. To tell us that you want to
 25 resume live-fire training is unjust and immoral, which

PT108

The Army, at this time, has no plans to cease the use of Mākuā Military Reservation. The importance of US military use of lands at Mākuā Valley is recognized both in terms of the overall mission of the military and the importance of the military to the economy to the State of Hawai'i and the City and County of Honolulu. The current Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan, which looks ahead to the Year 2020, therefore, recognizes the continued use of these lands for military purposes for the foreseeable future.

PT109

Weapons disposal activities are addressed in a separate study paid for by the Army, and is not within the scope of this EIS.

Comments

Responses

33

PT109

1 leads me to my second leaflet, which I don't have the time
 2 to talk to you about. But I'm going to say to you, please
 3 come back and read it because in it it talks about our
 4 rights of Kanaka Maoli for a -- we have a fundamental
 5 right to political, cultural, economical, spiritual,
 6 environmental self-determination. This means that we
 7 decide how our lands and resources are to be used. We
 8 decide how we restore, protect our aina from military and
 9 industrial abuses. And we decide what we allow in our
 10 bodies, in our communities. Again, the title of it is Our
 11 Health, Our Environment, and Our Rights.

12 Okay. I'm sorry, Ku'umeaaloha, I really prepared
 13 really hard for our testimony tonight. I've had to go
 14 through in a very short period of time an executive
 15 summary and trying to even list off one of those volumes
 16 and go through it. It has been very difficult.

17 FACILITATOR GOMES: If we have time after this,
 18 you can testify. Let others to testify.

19 MS. KEKOOLANI: In conclusion, I want to say that
 20 developing the intelligence of a political will to find
 21 peace is the real mana of Makua. Our people have gone
 22 through civil resistance and civil disobedience for
 23 decades to reclaim our aina, our lands, our peace and
 24 sustainability -- and I mean economy sustainability -- and
 25 rock for endless destruction and war. Our people will

PT109

Weapons disposal activities are addressed in a separate study paid for by the Army, and is not within the scope of this EIS.

Comments

Responses

34

1 continue to do so. And I would like to say that I feel
2 the Army is unwisely promoting the use of Makua for live
3 training -- for live-fire training and destruction, which
4 many in our community will continue to righteously and
5 openly oppose. And the legacy of Kahoolawe will continue.
6 Mahalo.

7 FACILITATOR GOMES: Mahalo.

8 Robert Kent followed by Pete Shimazaki Doktor.

9 MR. KENT: My name is Rob Kent. I've lived in
10 Wahiawa for 43 years. I came here in 1965 when I was in
11 the Army during the 25th division, with Vietnam at the
12 25th division; came back in 1975 and retired from the
13 25th division. I've been through training in the military
14 and I know how important this training is for the young
15 people. And for these young men that's up front here, if
16 we ever have a war that comes to the United States, you
17 will be drafted into the military. And when this happens,
18 if you do not have the training that is needed, then you
19 won't be living very long because you will get killed.

20 And what I support the training that's going to be
21 happening, at this time they need to have all the training
22 that they can get so that it will save the lives of the
23 military that's going in. Some of the military are local
24 boys from Hawaii. Some of them are your children, your
25 grandchildren. They will need the training that they need

Comments

Responses

35

1 so that they can stay alive. Thank you very much.

2 FACILITATOR GOMES: Pete Shimazaki Doktor followed

3 by Jean -- I'm sorry if I pronounce your names wrong --

4 Starkue.

5 MR. SHIMAZAKI DOKTOR: Aloha mai kakou.

6 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

7 MR. SHIMAZAKI DOKTOR: My name is Pete Shimazaki

8 Doktor. And I'm a prior service member in the United

9 States Army. I'm also a prior testifier, so I'm not going

10 to repeat some of the points I've made in the past.

11 But one of those times I came to testify, I wasn't

12 allowed to. In fact, I was arrested along with a couple

13 other people simply for having signs. Now, you could look

14 around the room and see plenty of signs and propaganda

15 from military. But for a private citizen to exercise a

16 first amendment right, they were denied that.

17 So this whole excuse of the military protecting

18 our freedom right there doesn't make sense, because we

19 were denied to be able to speak but the military was able

20 to. And private security was used to arrest us and then

21 pass us on to HPD, which booked us not far from here and

22 we had to go to court right down the street. Of course,

23 the charges were dropped because the city was embarrassed

24 about how bogus the charges were.

25 But that's more than a metaphor. That's an

PT110

PT110
The Army is fully committed to the NEPA process and is dedicated to its responsibility to engage the public. Also, there were no restrictions placed on the people's ability to express themselves.

Comments

Responses

36

1 example of the hypocrisy that's being expressed here that
2 we cannot express basic democratic rights. We don't have
3 a democracy. We have an option and it goes out to the
4 highest bidder, the most power people, okay. When it's
5 who has the most money and power, well, the military is
6 one of them.

7 It is not just the -- it isn't the individuals in
8 the military, which I'm former and have plenty friends and
9 family. This isn't the individuals. We're talking about
10 the institution, the military welfare system.

11 Recently we're seeing how the bank bailout -- how
12 the bank is drawing and sucking us in with the whole
13 economy through their corruption. Yet, every year -- you
14 know, 700 billion. Think about the budget the military
15 gets every year, 600 billion. Boom, one year. Okay, next
16 year we're going to get another package.

17 And I'm now a public high school teacher and I'm
18 just outraged to see our resources going away from our
19 youth and to bombing people overseas. Now, this whole
20 argument about training for safety is ridiculous because a
21 lot of the countries have militaries, okay. Yet, they
22 don't seem to have to go to other countries to train.
23 And, in fact, you know, I understand lot of people would
24 like to believe that the U.S. was attacked on 9/11 by
25 terrorists. But no one was asking, well, how come they

Comments

Responses

37

1 didn't attack Canada or Mexico or Belgium, other
 2 democracies. And it probably has something to do with the
 3 United States having military in 130 other countries,
 4 50 countries have permanent U.S. bases. Now, can you
 5 imagine if Iran or China or one of those countries had
 6 that. But, no, it's okay for the United States. Okay.
 7 So it just blows my mind.

PT111

8 The safety excuse, it's -- it's -- it's -- well,
 9 this is it. We had to burn the village to save it. We
 10 had to destroy the village to save it. How's that for
 11 logic? Well, that's the logic that's taking place now.
 12 We're going to burn down Makua so we can save it and
 13 liberate it.

14 And, you know, as a former service member, I
 15 really feel for the people in there, too. A lot of them
 16 are students who I've seen manipulated through poverty or
 17 manipulated by recruiters. I had one who told me today,
 18 oh, our Marine recruiter told me it's okay to go into the
 19 military now 'cause we won't be going to Iraq 'cause it's
 20 under control now. These are adults telling minors this.
 21 This is the kind of world we live in and a place where a
 22 lot of people here live in denial of or make excuses
 23 about, that this take place. You want safety? Stay home.
 24 I know there's military in other countries. They're not
 25 facing the same dangers the U.S. military is.

PT111

The Army remains dedicated to the protection of natural and cultural resources at MMR and PTA. Pursuant to this cause the Army has adopted a number of resource management policies and procedures that it implements based on input from Federal and State agencies, and the public. Examples of these include the Mākua or PTA Implementation Plan, Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, Integrated Wildland Fire Management Plan, and Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.

Comments

Responses

38

1 Now, because this is obviously a dog-and-pony
2 show, you could have 99 percent people against it, they're
3 still going to do it. They could -- you know, it's not
4 who casts the votes. It's who's counting the votes.
5 Okay. And Stalin said it and unfortunately that's the
6 direction this country's going.

7 So, you know, I want to tell you about that I read
8 something, okay, 'cause this is more a message of
9 resentment 'cause you're going to do what you're going to
10 do, anyway. And when we were arrested, the security
11 guards were some local Samoan, some, Hawaiian, guys just
12 trying to feed their families. When they didn't want to
13 arrest us, including our kupuna, an 81-year-old man at the
14 time, a medical doctor, was arrested, they had tears in
15 their eyes because they were being told they had to arrest
16 this elder. Okay. Not only were the security guards --
17 they lost it. I saw tears coming from their eyes 'cause I
18 was right up in the front. The owner of the security
19 company lost it, started crying.

20 And the HPD officer that put me in the car and
21 took me off, he told me, he said, "You know, I really
22 respect what you guys are doing. You know, in fact, if I
23 wasn't" -- and he stopped in mid sentence. And I knew
24 where it was going and he knew where it was going, too.
25 That he was standing on our side but because of the

Comments

Responses

39

1 mortgage and other economics concerns, they were justified
2 to going along with what they know is immoral and unjust.

3 So, don't get us wrong, we want security, but we
4 want human security, not this national security as defined
5 by politicians. Human security as in like clean air, food
6 and water, sustainable jobs. How about education and
7 health care. That would bring real security.

8 My experience in the military was the EPA would
9 shut us down every so many months. I was stationed in
10 Colorado and we couldn't train for periods of time because
11 we would destroy the aina there so badly, we had to let it
12 restore a little and then we can go back and destroy it
13 again. That's not taking care of the aina. You know,
14 that's not really -- and that's the problem here is
15 that -- wrap up soon.

16 Okay. I don't have much time. So I understand a
17 lot of people are, like, I don't get this culture argument
18 that's coming up here, okay. And I understand that
19 because you share a different cultural orientation. A lot
20 of people, by a show of hands, are not Kanaka Maoli. But
21 even those who are are very indoctrinated by the system,
22 such as the DOE I work in and I see it happening.

23 It's funny how they don't understand why Hawaiians
24 get upset about bones and burials. But god forbid we got
25 to bring back those MIA bones from Vietnam. See, those

Comments

Responses

40

1 are same kind of principals, but it's in the favor of the
 2 U.S. That's what's going on here. Okay. So if you want
 3 to bring security, go bomb someone else's churches and
 4 sacred lands.

5 Just as Wall Street's bringing us down, so is the
 6 military system. And this is a thing, too, what's sad is
 7 they're using a lot of well, good-intended, good people,
 8 who are serving the military, are being used by
 9 politicians, bankers, to go fight rich people's wars. And
 10 you're trying to make it sound like, you know, if war
 11 solved their problems, we would have world peace centuries
 12 ago. Mahalo.

13 FACILITATOR GOMES: Jean followed by Curtis Peahi.

14 MS. STARKUE: Aloha kakou.

15 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

16 MS. STARKUE: My name is Jean Starkue and I do not
 17 support live-fire training in Makua, nor do I support the
 18 Army's efforts to continue occupying Makua's Kahanahaiki
 19 and Ohikilolo valleys. Here we are, years of protest and
 20 resistance later, with little progress. Perhaps a new
 21 generation of people, generals and sergeants, we will
 22 hopefully reach a resolution to an old story waiting to
 23 reach a conclusion.

24 A little history about myself so you'll understand
 25 where I'm coming from. I was born in Ridge Crest,

PT112

PT112

The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

Comments

Responses

41

1 California. My father was working nearby at the Naval
2 warfare training center where they had air warfare and
3 missile training. We later moved to Hawaii when I was
4 about four years old. I call Hawaii my home. This is
5 where I was raised.

6 Last night's meeting was a perfect example of a
7 lesson I learned in my past. Listen to what your kupuna
8 elders have to say, keep your mouth shut and listen. I
9 was surprised that the Army was also practicing the simple
10 lesson. I remember going to Makua with my father. It was
11 and still is a sanctuary, a place of refuge, a place to
12 feel safe, which is ironic since you could hear the sound
13 of trainings in the background.

14 This essentially felt like being at home. This is
15 where I go to find comfort and peace of mind. It is a
16 spiritual place that is also alive. Happy, sad, or angry,
17 I can always find balance and harmony at Makua.

18 Unfortunately, my father passed away and was
19 unable to finally hear the silence of the valley. My
20 father was in the Marines. He was an older gentleman when
21 he passed away in his 70s. He served the U.S.A. in World
22 War II and the Korean War, so I'm aware of the training
23 necessary for the military. I understand that at a time
24 of war, the military needs places to practice their
25 tactics and missions. There's a time and place for

Comments

Responses

42

1 everything.

PT113

2 What I don't understand is how the military,
 3 particularly the Army, wants to practice in a tropical
 4 environment when the war is currently in areas like Iraq
 5 and Afghanistan. Last I heard, the terrain was sandy,
 6 dry, hot, and desert-like, more like Death Valley and the
 7 Mojave Desert in California. This is a significant
 8 difference between the Army's wants and needs.

PT113

Training requirements are constantly changing based on lessons learned in combat, training events, new equipment, and new commanders. Convoy live-fire training, for example, has become an essential component in training units based on the experiences in Iraq and Afghanistan. Times of war, such as now, drastically change training requirements. Combat readiness, moreover, is an assessment based on a commander's experience and training, and therefore is a matter of discretion. Further as set forth in the SDEIS, MMR is intended to be used by other military branches. Units from Alaska, for instance, are required to deploy to the desert. Units in the Texas desert must be prepared to fight in the jungle or snow.

PT114

9 Ultimately, we can agree that the Army needs training and
 10 that they want Makua, but they don't need Makua.
 11 Live-fire training has been ceased for three, almost four
 12 years now. The military has been at conflict and war
 13 since about 2001 with the little training -- with little
 14 training at Makua. Makua is not needed for the military's
 15 efforts at this time.

PT114

Training requirements are constantly changing based on lessons learned in combat, training events, new equipment, and new commanders. The Soldiers of the 25th ID must train at their home station for possible deployment anywhere in the world.

16 Additionally, the military has changed
 17 tremendously over the years. There was a time in history
 18 when the military was looked up to as true American
 19 heroes. The upper ranks appeared to be well-mannered and
 20 gentleman-like. The military was respected and also did
 21 respectful things such as respect the host culture. The
 22 modern culture of the military is viewed as mostly all
 23 grunts, negatively connotated, and at times looked down
 24 on. I urge you, the military, to do its part in restoring
 25 and returning Makua, allowing everyone to eventually heal.

Comments

Responses

43

1 This would be an opportune time for the military to
 2 finally do the right thing and look good. The military
 3 could start to repair its name and finally make a
 4 difference for the positive in the community, environment,
 5 and humanity. I do commend the Army for its efforts in
 6 attempting to essentially repair Makua. We are at a
 7 critical time where if we don't stop the fires, the
 8 effects will be irreversible.

PT115

9 I was perturbed to be attending a cultural access
 10 back in June or July. While walking on the road, we found
 11 some old shells. The attendant, who got out of his car
 12 'cause they drive behind us and they walk up the road,
 13 picked it up and threw it on the side. I thought this was
 14 a strange way of disposing of ordnance. I also found it
 15 odd that the person lecturing us about picking up the
 16 debris was so dangerous and might explode with -- maybe
 17 blew off our hand or something, would throw something like
 18 that into the air which could possibly explode when
 19 landing. The irony to everything is so uncanny. I do not
 20 agree with this type of action or attitude.

PT116

21 I do agree with the natural resource program,
 22 which I am an active volunteer of. I do not agree that it
 23 is helping the valley heal from military training, rather
 24 it focuses on invasive species and protecting endangered
 25 species. The program works at various sites such as Mount

PT115

The event the commenter is referring to was attended by Army's Cultural Resources Manager and an EOD escort. To the recollection of the Cultural Resources Manager the EOD escort picked up spent shell casings, which is not live ammunition but is an empty brass casing. The EOD escort next placed the spent brass shell casings to the side of the road to be collected later.

PT116

Invasive species pose the greatest threat to HI's natural environment. They out compete the native flora and fauna, pose a tremendous fire threat that will alter the native ecosystems, and they have direct impact on native vegetation through grazing, trampling and other disturbances. Control of the invasive species threat is critical for restoring (healing) HI back to it's native condition. Protection of endangered species is a requirement of the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Many of the plants and animals on HI are critically endangered and the Army's management and conservation efforts have helped prevent the extinction of these organisms.

Comments

Responses

44

PT116

1 Kaala, Kahanahaiki, Kahuku, and the Koolaus. To access
 2 the sites, we generally go up through the Waialua route.
 3 We work at the back of the valleys there at the top of the
 4 ridges, not in the fire-training areas. This does not
 5 account for the huge training areas that are pretty much
 6 destroyed. I urge people to actually volunteer because
 7 you don't actually work with Army officials but more with
 8 human beings, scientists, educators, and cultural
 9 specialists. It partners with RCUH and is a great
 10 opportunity to visit Makua in a different way.

PT116

Invasive species pose the greatest threat to HI's natural environment. They out compete the native flora and fauna, pose a tremendous fire threat that will alter the native ecosystems, and they have direct impact on native vegetation through grazing, trampling and other disturbances. Control of the invasive species threat is critical for restoring (healing) HI back to it's native condition. Protection of endangered species is a requirement of the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Many of the plants and animals on HI are critically endangered and the Army's management and conservation efforts have helped prevent the extinction of these organisms.

PT117

11 Again, I do not support live-fire training at
 12 Makua. I do not support the military presence at Makua
 13 other than cleaning up the ordnance and debris. I do
 14 support the importance of implementing more programs like
 15 the Army National Resource Program, assisting the
 16 environment community and the future generations of the
 17 Leeward coast. I do support the military's efforts in
 18 honoring the host culture, environment, and land. I also
 19 support the idea of the community having more time to
 20 review the reports as the community has been waiting over
 21 25 years for this to be completed, and it's only fair to
 22 grant more time for review. Thank you for your time.

PT117

The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been included in the administrative record for this process.

23 FACILITATOR GOMES: At this time, we're going to
 24 take a ten-minute break before we proceed with the rest of
 25 the testimony.

Comments

Responses

45

1 (A recess was taken from 8:12 p.m. to 8:21 p.m.)

2 FACILITATOR GOMES: Aloha everyone. Hopefully
3 you're enjoying your break. We're going to reconvene
4 everyone at this time and proceed with the rest of our
5 hearing.

6 At this time, I'd like to call on Curtis Peahi
7 followed by Vince Kanai Dodge. Curtis.

8 MR. PEAHI: Aloha.

9 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

10 MR. PEAHI: I didn't create a speech or do any
11 research about this. My fiancée over there helped me as a
12 Hawaiian learn all the things that I won't ever learn in
13 school at all, honestly. I was in school learning
14 Hawaiian and basic stuff, colors, numbers, things you
15 don't really need to know.

16 But as soon as I learned the history, start to
17 learn that the air that you breathe will come out as
18 something different, you know; that something that the
19 plants will even take in and then will then release
20 something that you will intake. I'll probably start to
21 cry, but maybe I say that, holding it in a little bit.

22 Me myself, like I said, I don't know. But I know
23 for sure my ancestors inside of me, people who probably
24 behind me right now, helping me speak. I look at
25 everybody, I see face but I see mainly people are behind

Comments

Responses

46

1 me, spirit, soul, air, moving. Even people over there,
2 they got to do their own culture like we do on their own.
3 They're not from over here. We're not from over there.
4 But, you know, I try to understand what they have to do.
5 And in return, I don't -- I don't know if they even
6 researched what they have to do for us. But like I said,
7 I didn't research. But I know for one thing, deep down in
8 inside, not even me as what you see, a person that you
9 listening to, close your eyes and listen, you feel my
10 voice touch you. I don't even need to open my eyes and
11 say anything. You just look at me. Honestly.
12 I mean, I went to that service trip up in Makua
13 and dug out stuff, strawberry guava that is invasive, so
14 that I can see a ohia tree grow, red, yellow, whatever
15 color. 'Cause it's everywhere and there's not even one
16 the same. Right next to each other, they're never the
17 same. I never know that. I went to Makua and I learned
18 that.
19 I didn't know Makua had three valleys of
20 civilization. I didn't know that. When I went into
21 Makua, I learned that. Why couldn't I learn that before I
22 even left school. I probably wasn't the smartest one, sat
23 in the back, but I like to listen. I like to speak. When
24 the teacher's talking, I interrupt and say I'm interested.
25 We're not in the same tactics as they are. I have a

Comments

Responses

47

1 slight different learning, so does everybody else.
 2 Everyone has their own -- different things they have to
 3 do.
 4 We are now on the occupation of America. They had
 5 to do what they had to do when they said they had to do
 6 it. That's what I learned. I don't know. I don't know.

PT118

7 All I know is Makua needs to be saved. I don't agree on
 8 any -- any bombs hitting it. I put my sweat and blood
 9 into the ground to regrow a fern, hapuu. I didn't know
 10 that until I got to Makua. I learned so much from Makua.
 11 Makua just sat there. Just sat there. And didn't do
 12 nothing. Like I said, I could just sit here and do
 13 nothing, but you'll just hear the wind. You hear
 14 anything.

PT118
 The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

PT119

15 Lessons got to be learned. I learned a lot in
 16 Makua. I learned where my naau can speak 'cause I speak
 17 from deep inside. And I want Makua to be saved 'cause I
 18 want it returned. Those service trips, I put shovels,
 19 snippers into the ground. I can't go back after you start
 20 practicing. Probably for -- what is the time period that
 21 they said that you practice and you stop, let it grow,
 22 practice again.

PT119
 The Army at this time has no plans to cease the use of MMR. The importance of US military use of lands at Mākua Valley is recognized both in terms of the overall mission of the military and the importance of the military to the economy to the State of Hawai'i and the City and County of Honolulu. The current Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan, which looks ahead to the Year 2020, therefore, recognizes the continued use of these lands for military purposes for the foreseeable future.

23 So they practice. Now they stopped. I went put
 24 practice into myself to practice being Hawaiian. You did
 25 your practice; I did my practice. Maybe there's a time

Comments

Responses

48

1 you need to stop. But I guess like for me, I don't need
2 to stop practicing my Hawaiiiana. But without it, I can't
3 practice my Hawaiiiana. Without a lot of places that are
4 out there, I cannot practice my Hawaiiiana. My elder, my
5 kupuna just passed away from me. She taught me a lot of
6 things. She even talked about it before she even left,
7 "When I go, I want you to do this." So when she left, I
8 already did it. I knew what I needed to gather, closed my
9 eyes and sat there. Some things you just got to let it
10 go. Please let Makua go.

11 FACILITATOR GOMES: Vince followed by Laulani.

12 MR. DODGE: Aloha mai kakou.

13 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

14 MR. DODGE: My name is Vincent John Kanai Dodge,
15 and I'm here on behalf of my kupuna, my children, and
16 grandchildren on behalf of the aina. I'm from the ahupuaa
17 of Waianae. I've been there nearly 30 years. And I've
18 had the experience of seeing Makua in its various states.
19 I fished for ten years in the '80s. I watched that valley
20 burn repeatedly as a result of military training and the
21 fires that scorched it. I wish I had a picture of that
22 tonight to show you. I just have this one that shows the
23 burn in the background from the last fire.

24 And I've seen the valley quiet for the last four
25 years, which is a wonderful thing, a wonderful gift. I

Comments

Responses

49

1 want to say that I'm at a place in my life where I don't
 2 see an us against them. I only see us. You know, at this
 3 point in my life, I have an American passport. I am a
 4 taxpayer. The U.S. Army is my army. I have friends that
 5 are in the Army. My dad is a veteran. We support our
 6 troops. We need to bring them home. We know this is a
 7 crazy world that we're in. We knew it was crazy from the
 8 beginning. We need to bring them home.
 9 Because it's only us, it's our kuleana to speak
 10 strongly about what we see. We're on the ground. And
 11 because it's only us, you know, we have to push on our
 12 Army to change it. And times are changing and the Army is
 13 changing, and we're very grateful for the work that's been
 14 done in the Makua as far as identification and protection
 15 of native species and the pretty much powerful way that
 16 the Army had negotiated with Malama Makua over the lawsuit
 17 and this kind of resulting settlement, which is resulting
 18 in this environmental impact statement.

19 But we believe that this EIS, this draft EIS, is
 20 flawed, and for a number of reasons. Let's see. Very
 21 briefly, the ICM, Improved Conventional Munitions, which
 22 are some of the most dangerous bomblets created, which
 23 were said to have been found in Makua Valley, that issue
 24 has not been adequately addressed in this EIS. And the
 25 whole purpose in the EIS was to tell us, the community,

PT1120

PT120

The Army has completed surface and subsurface archaeological surveys within the south firebreak road consistent with its legal obligations and NEPA. To the extent permitted by law, the Army has included such survey results in Appendix G-9.

Comments

Responses

50

PT120

1 what is the status of that aina. We need to have a
 2 complete study about this situation. The bomb just keeps
 3 changing. The story keeps changing. We have contested
 4 the whole story from the very beginning. So we need to
 5 have that answered.

PT120

The Army has completed surface and subsurface archaeological surveys within the south firebreak road consistent with its legal obligations and NEPA. To the extent permitted by law, the Army has included such survey results in Appendix G-9.

PT121

6 The issue that training -- that Makua is essential
 7 for training, you really need to take a good look at that.
 8 I think that's been addressed well tonight. But in brief,
 9 in the last ten years since 1998 to 2008, only three years
 10 that the Army had the valley for training. They did not
 11 train from '98 to 2001. They trained from 2001 to 2004 by
 12 agreement. By settlement agreement, they had 37 days
 13 where they could -- times where they could do their CALFEX
 14 training. And by their own count, they used only 21 days
 15 of that. They did not even use their full amount.
 16 Yet, consistently, Army command has said that all
 17 troops sent to Iraq are ready. They are trained. They
 18 got their training somewhere else. Since 2004 to present,
 19 there has been no live-fire training in Makua Valley. And
 20 thank God that we negotiated that. The Army was supposed
 21 to finish this in 2004, but they got involved in the
 22 Stryker Brigade and then put their energy in that and
 23 Makua went on the back burner.
 24 So if we're only training three -- and only
 25 partially three out of the last ten years but we've been

PT121

The experience of the past decade should not be used to predict the required level of training. First because MMR was closed for much of the time, and second because units deploying to Iraq and Afghanistan did not have the opportunity to execute required training at MMR.

The lack of home-based live-fire training capability has an impact on Soldier morale as more time is spent away from family, which is not quantifiable in Unit Status Reports; however, reduced time with family is clearly identified as reason for Soldiers not re-enlisting during exit interviews.

Comments

Responses

51

PT121

1 at war for the last seven, how can we come to the
 2 conclusion that this valley is essential for training?
 3 The training has happened at other places. Now, one of
 4 the things that was in the draft EIS is that having to
 5 train our troops outside of Hawaii is a hardship on
 6 military families. We understand that. And again, we
 7 would like to do our part in supporting those families,
 8 but we need to see some clear evidence, some studies done
 9 on what exactly are those effects on military families. I
 10 mean, we've had from 2004 to present to make those
 11 studies. I would hope that they had been done or that
 12 they will be done so we can see quantitatively what is
 13 going on there.

PT121

The experience of the past decade should not be used to predict the required level of training. First because MMR was closed for much of the time, and second because units deploying to Iraq and Afghanistan did not have the opportunity to execute required training at MMR.

The lack of home-based live-fire training capability has an impact on Soldier morale as more time is spent away from family, which is not quantifiable in Unit Status Reports; however, reduced time with family is clearly identified as reason for Soldiers not re-enlisting during exit interviews.

PT122

14 Down to a minute. That brings up another issue
 15 that the four-minute time limit is way too short. This is
 16 for public comment. These are really valuable moments for
 17 us. Four minutes is too short and so is 45 days to review
 18 that humongous document. We need 90 days. We need at
 19 least 10, 12 minutes to speak adequately. I guess we're
 20 going to have to jump around here just a little bit.

PT122

Public meetings are designed so that the Army may receive oral input from the public. The facilities used by the Army for these public meetings operated under imposed time limitations on facility use in accordance with their standard management policies. The Army facilitated time limits on speakers to ensure all participants were allowed equal time to speak while guaranteeing the facility was cleaned and empty by the facility deadline.

All speakers were allotted four (4) minutes to provide comment. The Army encouraged members of the public who felt they were not allotted sufficient time to speak, to provide oral input. During public meetings, the Army additionally encouraged attendees to provide comment to the court recorder prior to the open mic phase of the public meeting; and, a second court recorder was available to register public input privately during the open mic phase of the public meeting. Members of the public were also provided blank public comment forms in order to register their input. Finally, written comments were accepted via mail, e-mail, and facsimile; and oral comments were accepted via voicemail throughout the 45-day public comment period.

We have to balance the need for comment, and the need to perform our mission, and regret that we could not provide more time for the public to read the document.

PT123

21 We also need to have -- so the alternatives for
 22 training outside of Hawaii need to be looked at,
 23 seriously. We need to also have studies done on impacts
 24 on those potential communities like proper, you know,
 25 cumulative studies on them and not just try and pass this

PT123

The EIS considers conducting required training at sites in the continental United States at Section 2.5.3. To be carried forward for full evaluation, all reasonable alternative training locations must meet the Army's four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5.3. The continental United States alternative would not meet the purpose of the proposed action.

Comments

Responses

PT123

52

1 training on to some other place where the impacts will be
2 just as bad.

3 I think that I really want to wrap this up -- can
4 we see that? I just want to say that this is where we're
5 at in Makua today. We have cultural practice. We have
6 people back on the aina. It's a wonderful, living place.
7 And we have the burn in the background, the destruction
8 that's been going on since 1941.

PT124

9 I hope that you all know that, you know, one of
10 the reasons we're here in this room is that the Army
11 promised back in 1941 that they would hold the valley
12 until six months after the end of World War II and then
13 they would clean it up and return it. It's been over
14 65 years. That's a long time to be waiting. That's a
15 long time to sacrifice. The Waianae community has
16 sacrificed for a long, long time. This is where we can
17 go. We can go back here. If we return to live-fire
18 training, we can go back here, more destruction of that
19 precious aina.

20 If we move forward and bring Makua back to its
21 rightful place, we can go to this place of verdant,
22 beautiful, rich growth, a fully producing valley it once
23 was in the past. Mahalo.

24 FACILITATOR GOMES: Mahalo, Vince.

25 Laulani Teale.

PT123

The EIS considers conducting required training at sites in the continental United States at Section 2.5.3. To be carried foPTard for full evaluation, all reasonable alternative training locations must meet the Army's four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5.3. The continental United States alternative would not meet the purpose of the proposed action.

PT124

The Army presents a brief history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. The long-term status of MMR and legal title to it are beyond the scope of this EIS.

Comments

Responses

53

1 MS. TEALE: Aloha kakou.

2 AUDIENCE: Aloha kakou.

PT125

3 MS. TEALE: You know, I'm sorry, I didn't actually
 4 prepare anything to say today as I wasn't prepared to
 5 speak. I came here to bring the opio to this meeting.
 6 And I still need to say something. I don't want to talk
 7 to the Army because I think that every single one of us in
 8 this room knows that the Army is not listening. The Army
 9 has not listened since the Army moved into our aina, since
 10 the U.S. military came into the sacred waters of Kaupahao
 11 and through all the years that followed.

12 I've been to many, many, many, many, many hearings
 13 in my lifetime, and I think I can say with certainty that
 14 the Army has never listened once. So I'm not hear to talk
 15 to the Army. I'm here to talk to you. I'm here to talk
 16 to you, to everyone here, and especially to anyone here

PT126

17 who thinks that the United States needs to bomb Makua,
 18 needs to practice live-fire training at Makua. I want to
 19 talk to you as a person, as a human being on this aina who
 20 lives and breathes the same air, drinks the same water,
 21 loves with the same heart, the same love, for your
 22 children and for your life.

23 Can one of you kids bring me that book back there.
 24 Sorry about that. Like I said, I'm not prepared. I'm
 25 sorry.

PT125

Thank you for your comment. The Army is fully committed to the NEPA process and is dedicated to its responsibility to engage the public, in accordance with 40 CFR 1500.2(d). We listened carefully to all the speakers at these public meetings.

PT126

The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process.

Comments

Responses

54

1 For those who didn't see these guys, this is Noa,
2 Isaac and Josh, and they -- they're koolaupoko opio and
3 they're awesome. And it's because of them that I feel
4 that I've got to say something.

5 Okay. It's kind of small from here. I think you
6 guys know all the picture. Here's Makua, right. This is
7 Makua. Now, you tell me, honestly, is there one single
8 person in this room who can tell me that they want to bomb
9 or destroy this land in any way? Anybody? U.S. Army?
10 Anybody? Any one person who's going to stand up right now
11 and tell me that you want to see this land harmed, this
12 land right here on the cover of this volume issued by the
13 U.S. military? Anybody? Nobody?

14 Nobody wants to see this land harmed. Okay.

15 We -- you know, I'm a peacemaker. We have consensus.
16 Okay. Nobody wants to see that land harmed. Now, my next
17 thought is, okay, if nobody wants to see that land harmed,
18 why do you feel you need to harm it? I'm not going to
19 speak for anybody, but I'm going to take a guess here,
20 okay. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think it has
21 something to do with the fear. You know, I'm -- I
22 understand being afraid. Okay, I've been scared. I've
23 been really scared, when I felt under attack, when I felt
24 like, oh, my God, somebody could come to my home and do
25 bad things to me. Yeah, it's scary, you know. It's

Comments

Responses

55

1 scary. And, you know, so I understand. I understand why
2 people feel so scared that they feel they need to do
3 something bad. But I'm asking you to do something today.
4 I'm asking you to go home. I want you to think about it.
5 I want you to think about whether that fear is really
6 worth it. This is beautiful land. Doesn't belong to me.
7 This land belongs to akua. It's not my akua. This is
8 akua. I'm asking you to go home, really, really think
9 about it. Is what you're afraid of worth the destroying
10 something like this? Mahalo.

11 FACILITATOR GOMES: Lualani was our last speaker
12 and we still have time this evening. One more. Then we
13 still have time this evening, so if people want to -- if
14 there's anybody else who wants to speak or if people want
15 to return to the podium, they may do so but please go back
16 there so that your name can be registered.

17 Daniel Anthony.

18 MR. ANTHONY: Aloha kakou.

19 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

20 MR. ANTHONY: O Daniel kou inoa mai Waianae waiiau
21 auau wai ke kai o Makua, hewa kakuahiwi.

22 I'm a third generation of a family that has had
23 the access to Makua, malama of Makua. I'm fortunate I'm a
24 father. I have two daughters. They have a lot of
25 kuleana. They're the next generation that's going to

Comments

Responses

56

1 speak up for access to this place. My oldest daughter's
 2 name is Koiahi and her iewe is buried in the kuahiwis of
 3 Koiahi. That wahi pana has the most amount of explosives

PT127

4 in Makua Valley. There's zero access to that. My second
 5 daughter's name is Maaloa. And maaloa is the endemic
 6 plant, which, thank you, you guys are working on saving
 7 but it grows on the cliffs of Koiahi.

8 Makua is a very important part of our community.
 9 You know, I do believe that the military needs to train in
 10 Makua, but they need to train in how to clean up, 'cause
 11 we're making a lot of mess all over the world but we're
 12 not really training in what are we going to do after the
 13 mess is made. As all technical and as all great as these
 14 bombs are, they're some place. So why don't we take this
 15 opportunity to revolutionize how the Army takes care of
 16 the damage and destruction that they do. If the Army is
 17 only about blowing stuff up, well, somebody has to
 18 rebuild. Somebody has to make that happen. Makua is the

PT128

19 perfect place. It's totally contaminated. Get bombs all
 20 over the place. It's actually one of the last remaining
 21 ahupuaa that have no development.

PT129

22 What we need is training. We need cultural
 23 training. Make them work hand in hand with the Army to
 24 make this -- to make this a partnership so that all sides
 25 can benefit. You guys need access? You know what, you

PT127

The Army thanks you for your comment. Each of the alternatives presented within this EIS are being fully considered for implementation. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publication of the Final EIS.

PT128

Cleanup after training exercises is addressed in Section 2.4.3.

PT129

The Army has provided for cultural access and has sought to accommodate the practice of religion involving Army lands in Hawai'i to the extent practicable due to human health and safety concerns and the conduct of training to support the readiness and well-being of our Soldiers in fulfilling the Army mission. In addition, the Army provides training in Hawaiian culture and religion to their Soldiers.

Comments

Responses

57

1 guys have a lot of work. Besides making bombs, there's
 2 going to be generations of clean up in Makua Valley as it
 3 speaks. So make the first step and start that. Make that
 4 initiative and work with the cultural practitioners to
 5 revolutionize the way that you guys take a look at the
 6 cultural diversity, the biodiversities of Makua. The
 7 sciences that are available might only be found there in
 8 the world.

9 I feel like, you know, the opportunity in Makua to
 10 bring back what it is to have a parent. We need to turn
 11 Makua into a Makua, into a parent, into a teacher. And I
 12 would hope that the military would make the first step.
 13 We got all the valleys, but we ain't got no money,
 14 straight out. We just broke kanakas, just living hand to
 15 mouth, foot to mouth, off the sea.

16 You know what, I have an explosive personality. I
 17 been eating the fish on the Waianae Coast for the last
 18 30 years. All of a sudden, all the fishing grounds, come
 19 to find out, ammo reef. You know, I mean, you guys, this
 20 is -- I'm a human being. Treat me like one. You make a
 21 mess, you clean it up. I have kids. I clean up after
 22 them. There's no parent for you guys. You guys just go
 23 make a mess. Well, you guys are all adults. And you guys
 24 are all human beings. We're human beings. We're exactly
 25 the same. It actually is in our benefit. We can both

PT130

PT130

Weapons activities discussed by the commenter are addressed in a separate study, and is not within the scope of this EIS.

Comments

Responses

58

1 learn and both get funding and both do the things we need
 2 to do that's important for what we're doing for the rest
 3 of the world. But we need to really think about what that
 4 is and what message we want to send.
 5 I think the military wants to send a message of
 6 aloha to the people of Hawaii. The military wants to hold
 7 the kuleana that they said when they came over here, yeah,
 8 protecting people in the world. But how can you protect
 9 somebody all the way over there when you can't even
 10 protect the people right here. Us. You guys' first
 11 kuleana is to take care of us, the people of this place.
 12 So, I ask you to listen. Listen to your naau.
 13 It's called instinct. You guys all have it. You need to
 14 turn it away from the destruction into actually making
 15 Makua a better place. Eo to you guys. Pomaika'i.
 16 FACILITATOR GOMES: Terry.
 17 MS. KEKOOLANI: I'm going to take advantage of
 18 this time.
 19 You know, what Anthony just said is really wise.
 20 How do you take a really bad situation and turn it into a
 21 good thing, a positive thing, something that gives back
 22 life, instead of perpetuating continuous violence. It's
 23 really good manao that he gave. I'm very proud of him.

24 Now, I'm going to -- I didn't have an opportunity
 25 to mention and this was my point: The absurdity of

PT131

Weapons activities discussed by the commentator are addressed in a separate study, and is not within the scope of this EIS.

PT131

Comments

Responses

59

1 proposing further use of live-fire training by the Army in
2 Makua, when in 2006 there is was an announcement by the
3 Army of dumping tons of chemical weapons offshore of
4 Waianae. In 1945, off Waianae, the Army dumped 7 tons of
5 1000-pound hydrogen cyanide bombs, 461 tons of 1000-pound
6 cyanogen chloride bombs, 20 tons of 500-pound cyanogen
7 chloride -- I can't even say it -- 800 tons of 114-pound
8 mustard bombs, 510 tons of mustard mortar shells,
9 1817 tons of one-ton mustard containers, and 300 tons of
10 one-ton lewisite -- I think that's what to say --
11 containers.

12 And I'm just going to give you what we were told
13 in a newspaper article about what these things are. I'm
14 just going to give you two examples. Cyanogen chloride,
15 it's a colorless gas which turns into hydrogen cyanide in
16 the body. If exposed to water, it breaks down very
17 quickly, first to hydrochloric acid and cyanic acid and
18 then to carbon dioxide and (indiscernible).

19 There are things that are in the ocean, our ocean
20 environment offshore of Waianae, yeah, that need to be
21 cleaned up. And, yet, you come with a proposal to bring
22 more, more chemical pollution to Makua. This is not
23 correct. And what we say is and what we recognize it is
24 environmental racism. That's what it is. And it's
25 shameful.

PT131

Weapons activities discussed by the commentator are addressed in a separate study, and is not within the scope of this EIS.

PT131

Comments

Responses

60

PT132

1 Now, there's another thing that I didn't get to
 2 talk about and I'm going to read from it. And that is a
 3 study, a project called Our Health, Our Environment, and
 4 Our Rights. I'm going to read to you a little bit about
 5 how we approach this problem about our rights in the
 6 malama, to malama aina.

7 "In Hawaiian culture we understand the delicate
 8 balance between akua (creator), kanaka (people), and aina
 9 (land). We live in harmony with the sacred earth because
 10 we know that everything is interdependent. Whatever we do
 11 to the aina, we do to ourselves. When it is clean, we are
 12 healthy. When it is poisoned, we are sick. Aina is our
 13 life. It's also our home. We are its guardians and must
 14 care for 'aina for our cultural, ecological, and spiritual
 15 survival. Not only is our kuleana to take care of land
 16 and our health, it is the responsibility of our
 17 government, industries, and military institutions to be
 18 accountable for the environmental impacts they inflict on
 19 our aina and our kanaka, our people. Because their impact
 20 can lead to great hazardous harm, we must demand that they
 21 act with precaution."

22 Our current system -- now I just want you to hear
 23 me out -- the elements of precaution are: Number one,
 24 when we have reasonable suspicion that harm is occurring
 25 or may occur; and, two, we have scientific uncertainty;

PT132
 The Army has implemented several measures to protect cultural sites at MMR. These measures are described more fully in Section 3.10 and include both physical protective measures and restrictions on training activities.

Comments

Responses

PT132

61

1 then, three, we have a duty to act to prevent harm.
 2 “Our current system uses risk assessment for
 3 decision-making. Risk assessment determines the level of
 4 risk in a particular activity. It puts the burden on the
 5 individuals to prove there is potential for harm. The
 6 precautionary principle, however, assumes there will be
 7 harm or risk unless proven otherwise. While risk
 8 assessment is like gambling with our health, the
 9 precautionary system principle allows us to be better safe
 10 than sorry. Which do we prefer as Kanaka Maoli?
 11 Precaution.

12 So, I do encourage you to pick up our leaflet and
 13 to see how we have laid out our approach to the problem.
 14 Mahalo.

15 FACILITATOR GOMES: Vince Dodge. Vince.

16 MR. DODGE: Aloha kakou again.

17 AUDIENCE: Aloha.

18 MR. DODGE: It was pointed out to me that not
 19 everybody got to see these pictures. And, plus, this is
 20 being recorded and so, you know, you show a picture but
 21 you don't explain it, then if you're listening to a
 22 recording, you have no idea what the picture is. I wanted
 23 to explain that a little bit.

24 Will I be recorded if I don't use the microphone?

25 Great.

PT132

The Army has implemented several measures to protect cultural sites at MMR. These measures are described more fully in Section 3.10 and include both physical protective measures and restrictions on training activities.

Comments

Responses

62

1 So this is a picture from, I believe, 2006. And
2 what you're seeing in the background is the burn. This
3 where the controlled burn got out of control, burned the
4 whole valley, burned up into the endangered species areas,
5 and then across the street onto the beach as well.

6 And what you see in the foreground is the Makua
7 ahu that we built back in 2001 as part of the protocol for
8 celebrating makahiki, which is the time to celebrate peace
9 abundance in Makua Valley. And I say that this is where
10 we're at today because here's the contrast. You have the
11 valley, which has seen a lot of destruction. I remember
12 in the early '70s when I first came to Waianae, that the
13 foreground of Makua Valley was all huge kiawe trees.
14 There was a huge forest. And by the time I moved there or
15 by the time we got to the mid '80s, that forest had been
16 burnt to a crisp. Now, there's like one monkeypod tree
17 and one mango tree and maybe one large kiawe tree in the
18 foreground.

19 But because we have had cultural access to the
20 valley for the last seven years, we're doing as much as we
21 can to recognize the aliveness of the valley, to honor
22 that, to cultivate that, and to celebrate that. And that
23 is the purpose of the ahu of Makua Valley. So that is --
24 so that's where we're at now.

25 This picture, I believe this picture was taken

Comments

Responses

63

1 back in the '70s. And in the foreground in this picture
 2 is a round of, I think, .50 caliber munitions. I was part
 3 of the clean-up crew in 2003 that went through Makua
 4 Valley that swept the valley looking for unexploded
 5 ordnance. I joined that crew because I really wanted to
 6 see how challenging it was to clean up. It's totally
 7 possible to clean that valley. Absolutely.

PT133

8 We may not be able to take a bulldozer in there
 9 and dig holes, plant trees, but we can put mulch and grow
 10 up, you know. It may never be a place where, yeah, you
 11 can swing a pick and know for certain you're not going to
 12 hit something that's buried in there. But all over
 13 Europe, all over Japan, all over Britain, you know, they
 14 went back and built their houses and farmed their farms
 15 after World War II. It's totally possible to bring this
 16 valley back.

17 If we settle again for live-fire training -- you
 18 know, back in 1941, the population in Waianae was probably
 19 2000 people or less. We're 50,000 people now. It's just
 20 totally inappropriate to train there at this time. It's
 21 totally inappropriate to train on this island, period. We
 22 got over a million people, you know. There are a lot of

PT134

23 things that that environmental impact statement did not
 24 study, did not look at.

PT135

25 There's also that, you know, the EIS is pretty

PT133

Cleanup of MMR is not within the scope of this EIS.

The Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan identifies long-range use policy, which includes preserving MMR as agriculture/open space and preservation. Nevertheless, the plan recognizes the importance of MMR to the overall military mission and economy of the region; therefore, it recognizes the continued military use of these lands for the foreseeable future.

PT134

The Army feels it has prepared a thorough analysis of the potential impacts across each alternative as they pertain to the proposed action. These impacts are described fully in Section 4, summarized in the executive summary, and supported by studies found in appendix G of the SDEIS.

PT135

The combination can be mainly CALFEXs and fewer Convoy training events, or vice-versa, in any event the total live-fire training will not exceed 242 days.

Comments

Responses

PT135

1 unrealistic that the Army asked for 240 CALFEX days plus
2 another 240 convoy days. If you add those up together,
3 you come up with 440 days. There's not 440 days in a

PT135

The combination can be mainly CALFEXs and fewer Convoy training events, or vice-versa, in any event the total live-fire training will not exceed 242 days.

PT136

4 year. Then you add in that you have to train within the
5 burn index. You know, the valley gets really dry in the
6 summer and you can't train because of risk of fires. In
7 the period of 1988 to 1998, over 270 fires were caused by
8 military training in Makua Valley. That's outrageous.

PT136

The Army has identified an extensive number of mitigation measures that will help reduce the overall environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed action. The Army is reviewing all these proposed mitigation measures and will select a number of the measures to implement, based on the Alternative chosen. The selected mitigation measures will be identified in the Record of Decision.

A full discussion of the potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures as they pertain to wildfires resulting from training at MMR (Alternatives 1-3 and the No Action Alternative) is found within Section 4.14. The Army recognizes that dry conditions are not the optimum time to train with incendiary conditions, and in fact the 2007 BO restricts their use during such conditions.

PT137

9 So I don't feel the EIS is kind of dealing with
10 reality. There's sort of what the Army wants and what it
11 says the impacts might be. They say that their option,
12 the third alternative would have unmitigatable (sic)
13 damage to endangered species, cultural sites, community
14 access, and a couple other things.

PT137

The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

15 I want to finish up with this picture. We're
16 going to ask this artist to do a picture of Makua Valley
17 as maybe it once was a couple hundred years ago and how it
18 once can be a place verdant with food and people that are
19 well, yeah. There's a whole army of us out there. You
20 know, Kamehameha the Great, he understood the potential of
21 an Army. And after the conquest of the islands, he turned

PT138

22 his warriors loose and they went and they grew food. The
23 Army really needs to do this for the Hawaiian community,
24 for the people here. We've been used for a long time.
25 It's time to really give back. Not to the politicians but

PT138

The Army thanks you for your comment and appreciates your participation in this public review process. Your comment has been considered and has been included as part of the administrative record for this process. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS.

Comments

Responses

65

1 to the people.
 2 You know, security, we don't have security. The
 3 barges stop coming, Matson stops coming, we're going to
 4 starve. Then you'll see a real war here locally. We need
 5 security. It can be done. We need our army to do as
 6 Kamehameha the Great did with his Army, put them back on
 7 the aina. Let's grow food together. Let's malama. Let's
 8 malama Makua. Mahalo.
 9 FACILITATOR GOMES: Isaac Suehiro again.
 10 MR. SUEHIRO: Okay. I'm back up here because I
 11 remember what I was going to say.

PT139

12 You know how you guys make flight simulators and
 13 stuff, like spend millions and millions of dollars? Why
 14 don't you use that instead of bombing real land?
 15 Seriously.

16 And when you bomb it, you scar it, like, forever.
 17 It's not going to be the same. And if war is so terrible,
 18 like do you guys think war is good? Like did you enjoy
 19 being constantly almost killed? No? Well, then, why do
 20 you want to blow stuff up here? Practice doesn't make
 21 perfect, so why do you practice so much?

PT140

22 Plus all the wasted materials in those bombs, it's
 23 not really practical. And why train there, like, of all
 24 places. And the purpose of the Army is supposed to
 25 help -- is supposed to be to help the people. Like how

PT139

The Army widely uses simulated weapons systems during training to simulate the effects of combatant live-fire engagements as an alternative to using weapons systems that have the potential to add to contaminants in the environment. Proposed devices include demolition effect simulators, grenade and artillery simulators, and blank ammunition.

There is no replacement for live-fire training in order to prepare Soldiers for combat. Live-fire contributes to the realism of training. The advantage of live-fire training is the ability to simulate as closely as possible the characteristics and environment of an actual battlefield scenario. These simulated battle conditions best prepare the company commander, subordinate leaders, infantry Soldiers, and supporting teams for combat.

PT140

Explosives are designed to burn very quickly and efficiently, releasing the energy in an explosive reaction, which is what causes them to be effective during combat. Studies have shown that only minute quantities of RDX remain after detonation of high explosives.

Comments

Responses

66

1 are you guys helping us if you're blowing us up? Yeah. I
2 got all my thoughts out. I'm happy. Bye.
3 FACILITATOR GOMES: As there are no more
4 testimonies, that brings us to the end of the night on the
5 Makua -- on the Supplemental Draft EIS for Makua, Military
6 Training Activities at the Makua Military Reservation.
7 Thank you all for coming. Thank you for your testimony.
8 They have been recorded.
9 And thank you to Colonel Margotta, Paul, and the
10 rest of the military team for being here. Mahalo.
11 And we forgot to thank Leimana, who has been
12 writing all of your comments down.
13
14 (Proceedings concluded at 9:04 p.m.)
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Comments

Responses

67

1 CERTIFICATE

2

3

4 I, ADRIANNE IGE KURASAKI, C.S.R., in and for the
State of Hawaii, do hereby certify:

5

6 That I was acting as shorthand reporter in the
7 foregoing matter on the 7th day of October, 2008;

8

9 That the proceedings were taken down in
computerized machine shorthand by me at the time and place
10 stated herein, and thereafter reduced to print under my
supervision; that the foregoing represents, to the best of
11 my ability, a correct transcript of the proceedings had in
the foregoing matter;

12

13 I further certify that I am not counsel for any of
14 the parties hereto, nor in any way interested in the
outcome of the cause named in the caption.

15

16 Dated this 11th day of November, 2008, in Honolulu,
17 Hawaii.

18

19

20

21 _____
Adrienne Ige Kurasaki, CSR 388
22 Registered Professional Reporter

23

24

Comments

Responses

8 October 2008 Public Meeting

1

1

2

3

4

5 In Re:
6 Supplemental Draft
7 Environmental Impact
8 Statement for Military
9 Training at Makua
10 Military Reservation, Hawai'i

9

10 TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING

11

12 Held on October 8, 2008, at Autie Sally Kaleohano's

13 Luau Hale, Hilo, Hawai'i.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 REPORTED BY TERI "SERAH" HOSKINS, RMR, CSR #452

Comments

Responses

| | | |
|----|--|------|
| 1 | CONTENTS | 2 |
| 2 | ORAL TESTIMONY GIVEN BY: | PAGE |
| 3 | KEITH RIBBONTROP | 9 |
| 4 | JIM ALBERTINI | 12 |
| 5 | KALE GUMAPAC | 16 |
| 6 | LOUIS KAO'IWI | 18 |
| 7 | CORY HARDEN | 20 |
| 8 | DENISE REGHETTI | 24 |
| 9 | WOODY VASPRA | 24 |
| 10 | LARRY KELLY | 27 |
| 11 | MARGARET FURUKAWA | 29 |
| 12 | KAHALE SAITO | 30 |
| 13 | GALLEN KELLY | 32 |
| 14 | PUEO McGUIRE | 35 |
| 15 | IWANI KAIWI | 37 |
| 16 | MIRANDA McQUADE | 40 |
| 17 | HERRING KALUA | 41 |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | * Denotes reporter unsure of spelling | |
| 25 | ** Denotes reporter could not understand or hear | |

Comments

Responses

3

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Aloha. Before we start
3 the public hearing for the Draft Supplemental EIS for
4 the military training activities at the Makua Military
5 Reservation, I would like to call on Malia Morales to
6 do the pule for this evening.

7 (Whereupon Ms. Morales said the pule.)

8 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Mahalo, Malia.

9 So aloha and welcome to the public hearing
10 for public comment for the Draft Supplemental EIS for
11 military training activities at Makua Military
12 Reservation. This is the third of a series of four
13 hearings, two of which have been held on Oahu so far,
14 in Nanakuli and Wahiawa, and the remaining two are
15 being held tonight and tomorrow night in Waimea.

16 My name is Ku'umehaaloha Gomes, and I am the
17 facilitator for this evening to assure that everybody
18 has the opportunity to present their oral testimony
19 here. There are several ways in which you can give
20 testimony, and they include:

21 The written response forms that you will find
22 on the back table where Jenny is. Jenny, if you can
23 raise your hand. If you want to write your responses,
24 you can get them there.

25 Also, on those forms is the e-mail address if

Comments

Responses

4

1 you want to e-mail your comments.

2 The court reporter, Valia, is in the back of
3 the -- oh, right there. Do they go in the back to talk
4 to Valia? So in the back of the poster boards is where
5 Valia, the court reporter, is. If you want to speak to
6 her and have her record your testimony, she is back
7 there.

8 David is over here with the video camera if
9 you want to be videoed, you want to make your comments
10 that way.

11 And the other thing is you can come up here
12 to the podium to give testimony. Leimana is recording
13 your comments on newsprint this evening as you speak,
14 and Malia Morales, who just did our pule, is available;
15 and if you want to maka'olele* Hawaii with your
16 testimony, she will take it down and translate it into
17 English so that it can go into the record.

18 The public comment period ends on November
19 3rd. If you want to, after tonight, if you feel like
20 you don't have enough time and have some thoughts that
21 you would like to submit, you can do so in e-mail.
22 Pick up a form in the back. There's an e-mail address,
23 and you can go and e-mail to submit your forms by the
24 deadline of November 3rd.

25 Everyone who wants to testify tonight must

Comments

Responses

5

1 register, and the registration is at the back table.

2 Julie, can you raise your hand?

3 Julie is taking the registration back there.

4 Sign in on the form to speak tonight, and your name

5 will be submitted to me, and I will call names in the

6 order that they are received.

7 I want to remind people that the venue for

8 tonight, in terms of speaking, that everyone has four

9 minutes to speak, and I really encourage folks who are

10 speaking tonight to really monitor yourselves so that

11 others have an opportunity to speak.

12 As a facilitator, I will give you a

13 one-minute card warning that you have reached -- you

14 have one more minute. And then, also, I'll lift the

15 card to tell you that you're pau, to stop. I have to

16 tell you that if you don't stop, I will move into your

17 space to get you to stop, because we have to be very

18 considerate, and I ask you to be very considerate of

19 others. We do have a long list of people who want to

20 speak tonight, and for some, this is their only

21 opportunity to do it.

22 So we will start with the first five speakers

23 and then continue to move on. If we've exhausted the

24 list of 25 speakers, we will go on to those who are

25 stand-bys. If we exhaust that list of stand-bys and

Comments

Responses

6

1 there is time remaining, then those who want to have a
2 repeat can do so, again with a four-minute time limit.
3 We will end tonight at 9:30 because we have a
4 restriction on the place.

5 And someone I was speaking to thought it was
6 going to be a question-and-answer period. It is not a
7 question-and-answer period. This is a public comment
8 session. The EIS mandates that. And although Colonel
9 Morgatta and Paul Thies of the U.S. Army are here
10 sitting at the table, they are here to accept your
11 comments but not to engage in a question and answer.
12 So if anyone does come up with that, I'll defer your
13 questions to your testimony and not have the colonel or
14 Paul engage in a Q and A.

15 At this time, I would like to call on Colonel
16 Morgatta, the Garrison Commander of the U.S. Army
17 Hawaii, to say a few words.

18 COLONEL MORGATTA: Good evening. Aloha and
19 welcome to tonight's public comment session. I first
20 want to thank everybody for taking the time to come out
21 here tonight. And I sincerely mean that. I know it
22 takes time out of your busy schedule to come out here
23 and to dialogue with us, but on the part of the Army, I
24 just want to thank you all for doing that.

Comments

Responses

7

1 process, and that process is designed to do two
2 different things:

3 The first one is to ensure that the Army or
4 the government gains enough information to be able to
5 make an informed decision on the issue at hand; and
6 tonight that issue is about the Army's future use of
7 Makua.

8 The second purpose behind the NEPA process is
9 to ensure that as part of that decision-making process,
10 the government goes out and solicits and seeks public
11 comments about the proposed action. So that's what
12 we're here for tonight.

13 As I mentioned before, I'm sincerely glad
14 you're all here, because the Army is very concerned
15 about the comments you have about our future use of
16 Makua. Trust me when I say we do consider your
17 comments as a part of that decision. We do take action
18 upon those comments and your concerns. We take a look
19 at the present document, the draft EIS. There's over
20 750 pages in that devoted to the Army's responses to
21 comments that were provided previously in other public
22 forums. We'll do the same thing tonight. We'll take
23 your comments, we'll go back, we'll work those issues,
24 we'll look at those things, and we will consider all
25 this before we make our decision.

Comments

Responses

8

1 That leads me to our next point. We have not
2 made a decision yet. All of this is pre-decision with
3 regards to the future use of Makua. The Army will not
4 make that decision until all the information is
5 gathered, all the comments are looked at, and then that
6 decision-making body will take a look at all the
7 information provided and then determine which way we're
8 going to go forward with regards to Makua. We have not
9 made that decision yet.

10 As the facilitator said, tonight we're here
11 to talk about Makua. I know it's maybe a stretch, but
12 I would ask you all to try to keep your comments
13 Makua-related. That's what we're really here for
14 tonight.

15 And the other piece is although we only have
16 four minutes scheduled for each one of the people that
17 want to come up and make comments, given the number of
18 people that we've got signed up right now, don't worry;
19 if you can't complete your comments during the
20 four-minute time frame, you'll probably get the
21 opportunity to get back up and make some additional
22 comments towards the end. That's what occurred last
23 night.

24 Once again, I welcome you all, thank you all
25 for coming, and we'll get started. Thank you.

Comments

Responses

9

1 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Before we get started, I
2 just want to point out that this section here is a
3 neutral space. This is the facilitator's space, and
4 it's neutral, so there are no protest signs here, there
5 are no posters here. This is a space to allow you to
6 be able to come up to the podium and give your
7 testimony in as powerful a way as you want to.

8 I encourage you to be very respectful of your
9 time, again, taking into consideration that there are
10 others after you who want to speak. I will not condone
11 any profanity or yelling, and I will confront you about
12 that and ask you to stop that. We want to have a very
13 respectful process, so I will interrupt any of that
14 kind of behavior.

15 At this time, I'd like to commence with our
16 testimonies. And the first person is Keahi Ribbontrop,
17 followed by Jim Albertini.

18 KEITH RIBBONTROP: Aloha.

19 THE AUDIENCE: Aloha.

20 KEITH RIBBONTROP: My name is Keith
21 Ribbontrop. I'm retired from the United States Air
22 Force, and I'm a disabled veteran. I've lived in
23 Hawaii for about 32 years and on the Big Island for
24 about 18 now -- 20 years.

25 In my period on the Big Island, I have served

Comments

Responses

10

1 as a volunteer at the vet center. I have been the
2 Disabled Veterans Outreach Program specialist for the
3 state of Hawaii. I've run the State of Hawaii Office
4 of Veterans Services, Hawaii branch. In my period --
5 in all of my service, I have worked with 'most all the
6 disabled veterans on the island. We have 1,648 rated
7 0 through 100 percent in Hawaii County and a total of
8 about 17,000 veterans in Hawaii County.

9 I'm here tonight basically to speak in
10 support of. A combat veteran myself, I realize the
11 importance of training. You can't function without
12 knowing what you're expected to do and how to do that.
13 You can't shoot a gun if you don't know which end to
14 point someplace. You can't win without preparation.
15 And that's what I feel this is all about, is
16 preparation. You can't win a football game, you can't
17 win a soccer game, you can't win a card game without
18 practice.

19 The second thing I'd like to say is that
20 speaking about the Army, I, quite frankly, have driven
21 by Makua, but I have never entered the valley, but I
22 would like to speak about the Army and their
23 stewardship of the land and also the Army as a
24 community -- a community citizen -- corporate citizen
25 of the community.

Comments

Responses

11

1 In my job as Hawaii branch manager of the
2 Veterans Services, we're responsible for -- or we
3 are -- they still are responsible for the veterans
4 cemeteries in the county. In west Hawaii, we have
5 about 75 acres, and we have a master plan to return
6 that cemetery to an ecologically dry land forest which
7 it was in the past. The Army and the people at the
8 Army, Colonel Richardson and her predecessor, support
9 the reforestation of that cemetery through contribution
10 of materials and personnel. It's gone a long way in
11 our work there.

12 If you haven't been to Pohakuloa Training
13 Area, it's an interesting place, because I think
14 there's only about four active-duty military people
15 there; the rest are civilians. The largest contingent
16 in Pohakuloa Training Area is the cultural and --
17 agricultural component. There's about, I guess,
18 somewhere around 49 to 50 people assigned to that.
19 Their sole job in life is to make sure that the
20 archeological areas of PTA are protected and that the
21 endangered species are propagated and put back into the
22 wild; and I think it's a very admirable program.

23 I don't see -- just because we do it at PTA,
24 I'm quite certain that the Army does the same thing at
25 its other facilities. It's a good corporate -- a

Comments

Responses

12

1 corporate citizen and also one who is very sensitive to
 2 endangered species.

3 I currently serve as the state veterans
 4 long-term-care liaison officer to the veterans home in
 5 Hilo. We currently have 40 residents there, and each
 6 one of them requested that I say something tonight.
 7 And they all went to training. And they just said we
 8 need -- we need to support our troops. It's not about
 9 war; it's about making sure that our people are safe.

10 Thank you so much. Mahalo. Aloha.

11 JIM ALBERTINI: Aloha, everyone.

12 THE AUDIENCE: Aloha.

13 JIM ALBERTINI: My name is Jim Albertini.
 14 I'm a local taro farmer and peace activist, long time
 15 here, twenty years, growing taro in Kurtistown. In
 16 fact, I spent all day -- the last eight hours -- at the
 17 county council trying to get support for a bill there
 18 that would ban genetical engineering of taro and
 19 coffee, but I wanted to come here. This is a very
 20 important issue.

21 How much time do we have? Five minutes?

22 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Four.

23 JIM ALBERTINI: Four minutes. I'll be very

24 brief.

25 I think there should be an Alternative 5

PT141
 This and other community alternatives do not satisfy the purpose and need stated in Sections 1.2 and 1.3 of the EIS.

 Moreover, Hawai'i is not an independent nation, rather Hawai'i is a state within the United States of America. The State of Hawai'i was admitted to the union on August 21, 1959, making it the 50th state.

PT141

Comments

Responses

PT141

13

1 proposal, and that is ending all military activity at
 2 Makua and PTA. Clean up your opala and return the land
 3 to the proper owners, the Independent Nation of Hawaii.
 4 The very land that we stand on right here, this is
 5 former Crown land of the Independent Nation of Hawaii,
 6 and the land that Makua and PTA is former ceded lands
 7 of the Nation of Hawaii.

PT141

This and other community alternatives do not satisfy the purpose and need stated in Sections 1.2 and 1.3 of the EIS.

Moreover, Hawai'i is not an independent nation, rather Hawai'i is a state within the United States of America. The State of Hawai'i was admitted to the union on August 21, 1959, making it the 50th state.

PT142

8 I want to say that before the Stryker EIS
 9 process, even the scoping meetings, began, Dan Inouye
 10 told the Chamber of Commerce on Oahu that he was
 11 assured the Stryker Brigade for Hawaii; so so much for
 12 community input and the Democratic process.

PT142

The Senator has stated that he was told Hawaii had been selected for a Stryker Brigade conversion "subject to completion of the environmental review."

13 We're not playing football or soccer here.
 14 We're playing deadly war games, and the military has a
 15 history of lying to the people. Just give you a few
 16 examples:

PT143

17 In the 1960s, the Army got a lease from the
 18 State Department of Land and Natural Resources in the
 19 Hilo watershed right here in the Waiakea Forest. They
 20 said they were going to do weather testing. They
 21 didn't do weather testing; they tested two of the most
 22 deadly nerve gas and biological agents of the arsenal.

PT143

This statement is not relevant to the purpose of the proposed action for this EIS. The statement is not derived from any of the factual data presented within this EIS. Thank you for your comment. Your comment will be included within the administrative record for this EIS.

23 One of them is 1/50th of a drop will kill you.
 24 When Patsy Mink disclosed this, all hell
 25 broke loose. The mayor at the time, Shunichi Kimura,

Comments

Responses

14

PT143

1 said, "Cancel the lease. They lied to us. They
2 weren't doing weather testing." That's one of the
3 first lies that I'm aware of.

PT143

This statement is not relevant to the purpose of the proposed action for this EIS. The statement is not derived from any of the factual data presented within this EIS. Thank you for your comment. Your comment will be included within the administrative record for this EIS.

PT144

4 But here they told us another lie, that they
5 never used Depleted Uranium in Hawaii. Our monitors --
6 our own civilian monitors picked up several spikes of
7 radiation on the Saddle Road, right at Mauna Kea State
8 Park, a year before they confirmed that, indeed, they
9 did use Depleted Uranium here.

PT144

While the characterization survey has not been completed, preliminary studies have shown the use of DU at PTA to be similar to that of Schofield Barracks, therefore the health risks are similar at both locations. This is the basis for the statement that there is no health risk from DU.

PT145

10 Now, a few brief comments on this EIS.
11 Section 4-217 and 218 says, "There is little or no risk
12 from DU." That's another lie. That's right in the EIS
13 today. The fact is they haven't done -- haven't
14 completed a characterization in human health risk
15 assessment on the DU at Pohakuloa, yet they are making
16 these conclusions that there is little or no risk of
17 DU.

PT145

While the characterization survey has not been completed, preliminary studies have shown the use of DU at PTA to be similar to that of Schofield Barracks, therefore the health risks are similar at both locations. This is the basis for the statement that there is no health risk from DU.

PT146

18 Another point. Section ES-8 concerning
19 unexploded ordnance, it says, "Unexploded ordnance
20 removal will have to take place prior to range
21 construction at PTA."
22 Now, here's the point. They find money to
23 remove the unexploded ordnance from construction at
24 PTA, but there's over 250,000 acres on this island
25 littered with unexploded ordnance where civilians are

PT146

The scope of UXO removal at PTA is limited in acreage.

Comments

Responses

PT146

15

1 living around, but there's never enough money to clean
 2 that up. How come there's enough money to clean it up
 3 for range expansion, but not where the poor people are
 4 living? Waikoloa Village is loaded with unexploded.
 5 Makua Homestead area is a former bombing range. No
 6 money to clean up these areas, but money to have range
 7 expansion.

PT146

The scope of UXO removal at PTA is limited in acreage.

PT147

8 The county council on July 2nd of this year
 9 passed a resolution, eight to one, that had five
 10 points. Two of the main points were this: That all
 11 live fire at Pohakuloa should be stopped immediately
 12 and that the Depleted Uranium should be cleaned up.
 13 Another point they said is that there should be
 14 monitors around Pohakuloa to see what level of
 15 radioactivity is coming off PTA.
 16 I want to be able to turn my home computer on
 17 and see the measurements of those monitors to know what
 18 we're being poisoned with. That should be a basic
 19 premise of democracy. People should have a right to
 20 know what they're being poisoned with.

PT147

The resolution itself recognizes that it has no binding or legal effect on the Army. The Army and other military services have an ongoing need to conduct live-fire training at PTA. In fact, the Marine Corps just completed an environmental assessment for a Convoy live-fire range. In August 2007, a DU scoping survey was performed at PTA. The results of this survey will be used to develop the follow-on plans.

Depleted Uranium (DU) has not been detected outside the impact area. The Army remains committed to continuing to protect the health and safety of people in surrounding communities, Soldiers and their Families, and the civilian work force who live near and work at PTA. To that end, the Army is working closely with the State of Hawai'i and other federal agencies, such as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Agency for the Toxic Substance and Disease Registry, to continually define the issue and determine its effects and will continue to aggressively monitor DU in the environment at PTA.

21 We're not asking too much, but I say let's
 22 get back to the basics. We have to ask the question
 23 what is this training for? This is training for
 24 empire. It's to slaughter people in Iraq and
 25 Afghanistan. For who? For the Wall Street Bank

Comments

Responses

16

1 officers to rip us off to pay for their wealth. We got
 2 to get a grip. America is not the good guys. It's the
 3 empire that is slaughtering millions of people around
 4 the world today. Amen.

5 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.
 6 Kale Gumapac followed by Uncle Louie Kao'iwi.
 7 KALE GUMAPAC: [Hawaiian chanting].

PT148

8 My name is Kale Gumapac. I am with Aha Kana
 9 Nakanaka Council. We oppose any military action, any
 10 military occupation, at Makua. We oppose any military

PT148

Alternatives that do not advance the purpose and need are not considered reasonable alternatives. The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried forward for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. There were no locations outside of Hawai'i that could meet all four screening criteria.

PT149

11 occupation at Pohakuloa. You are the illegal occupiers
 12 to the Kingdom.
 13 When did the United States Constitution
 14 supersede our Kingdom Constitution? Does the U.S.
 15 recognize the Kingdom of Hawaii as a sovereign nation?
 16 Does the U.S. recognize the royal patents? Does the
 17 U.S. recognize the ceded lands of which the Hawaii
 18 State Supreme Court said DLNR, no can sell our land;
 19 they no can trade our land?
 20 The land that you have that you're using is
 21 ceded lands. The contract that DLNR made with you

PT149

Hawai'i is a state within the United States of America. The State of Hawai'i was admitted to the union on August 21, 1959, making it the 50th state.

The Army presents a brief history of the Mākua land transaction in Section 1.1 of the SDEIS. Much of the land that comprises MMR is ceded land, owned by the Federal Government; the remainder is leased to the Army by the State of Hawai'i. The Army also owns 170 acres in fee simple and holds 1.64 acres by license. The lease contract for MMR is not within the scope of this EIS. In addition, Section 3.10.3 of the EIS now includes text referring to the apology bill (Public Law 103-150) and the overthrow of Hawai'i in 1893.

PT150

22 guys is illegal. When will that be addressed? When
 23 will it be addressed that Kahoolawe that you left pilau

PT150

Cleanup of Kahoolawe is not within the scope of this EIS. The Army conducts regular cleanup activities associated with the proposed action. A description of these activities are found in Section 2.4.3.

PT151

24 still never get cleaned up? When is it going to be
 25 addressed that all of the chemical weapons that you

PT151

Weapons disposal activities are addressed in a separate study, and is not within the scope of this EIS.

Comments

Responses

PT151

17

1 dumped right off of Maile in the ocean going to get
 2 cleaned up? All we read about is how you guys no can
 3 clean it up because those weapons could blow up in the
 4 guys that's going to go clean them.
 5 Jim Albertini is correct; the military
 6 continues to lie to us. And for all of those of you
 7 out there who believe the military, you guys part of
 8 the problem. We have solutions over here for each and
 9 every one of us, and the military needs to leave,
 10 because what you bring to Hawaii is hewa. It's not
 11 good for our people. When has the military been good
 12 for our people? Because you take our boys, you take
 13 them to war, and they come back either dead or maimed;

PT151

Weapons disposal activities are addressed in a separate study, and is not within the scope of this EIS.

PT152

14 and at the same time, you do not recognize our own
 15 sovereignty. The United States continues to ignore
 16 that question.

PT152

Hawai'i is a state within the United States of America. The State of Hawai'i was admitted to the union on August 21, 1959, making it the 50th state. Section 3.10.3 of the EIS now includes text referring to the apology bill (Public Law 103-150) and the overthrow of Hawai'i in 1893.

PT153

17 When will you begin to recognize your impact
 18 on the kanaka mauole* and your impact on the social,
 19 cultural, and physical problems of the kanaka that you
 20 bring? This is all part of the problem and needs to be
 21 addressed in your DEIS. The problem of the wrong
 22 patents. The problem that you bring with us, because
 23 when has the military been a clean environment? Every
 24 time you guys come someplace, every time you go
 25 someplace, you leave your mess to clean up. It's known

PT153

The Army has conducted a full evaluation of the potential impacts associated with each alternative as they relate to the proposed action. This evaluation of impacts is found in Section 4 of the EIS.

Comments

Responses

18

1 that the military has got the worst environmental
 2 record anyplace around, and you continue to come to our
 3 small islands and continue to bring hewa to all of the
 4 land. So why would we want to trust you? There is no
 5 trust. There is no aloha.
 6 It is important that you understand this.
 7 And until we can start to get back our own Kingdom and
 8 the recognition of the Kingdom, you're not welcome.
 9 There is no aloha, not from the kanaka.
 10 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.
 11 Uncle Louie followed by Cory Harden.
 12 LOUIS KAO'IWI: Aloha mai kakou.
 13 THE AUDIENCE: Aloha.
 14 LOUIS KAO'IWI: My heart bleeds tonight when
 15 I hear people complain about the military. I served in
 16 the military and trained at Makua in 1968. I know
 17 there's a lot of endangered species there that the Army
 18 had fenced up or had put flags around. The heiaus were
 19 marked. I ask my kupunas to please put whatever
 20 indifference you get on the side and come to the table
 21 to ho'oponopono so that you can discuss with the
 22 military what is your pilikea. I know sometimes people
 23 are deaf; they don't want to hear what is discussed,
 24 but, truthfully, we need the area to train -- to train
 25 our people so that when they go to war, they don't come

PT154

PT154

While fencing is one method employed by Army Natural Resources professionals, the Army also employs a variety of programs to effectively manage endangered species on Army lands. These programs are fully described within the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan and the Draft Pōhakuloa Training Area Implementation Plan.

Comments

Responses

19

1 back in a body bag.
 2 I've seen so many -- I only have one nephew
 3 left, who serves his second term now in Iraq. So I ask
 4 you kupunas, please come to the table and listen to the
 5 Army presenting their true facts and sit down and be
 6 like men and women to discuss what troubles you.
 7 Yes, the Army has made a lot of mistakes, but
 8 they have admitted to some of them. They have not
 9 admitted to all of them, but they're still working on
 10 it. It's a working system; but if you shut them down,
 11 who wins? Nobody wins. You lose. I lose. The Army
 12 lose. Everybody lose.
 13 Economically, our land has been wasted
 14 because you claim that the Army hasn't cleaned it up.
 15 Sure, they haven't cleaned all of it up, because you
 16 say that -- that the money was spent to clean the range
 17 area where they needed to practice. Yes, the Army has
 18 worked at Pohakuloa putting the so-called monitors
 19 around the area. If we have to put some more, please
 20 address this to the Army. Have them put some more
 21 monitors around so that we can detect whatever we have,
 22 Uranium in Pohakuloa.
 23 I was one of the very fortunate men that
 24 could be trained at Makua. If it wasn't for the
 25 training, when we went to Vietnam, I think I would not

PT155

PT155

The Army continues to conduct air quality studies with focus on DU. A formal report that provides the data collected will be made available to the public once finalized.

Comments

Responses

20

1 be back here talking to you now.

2 But I pray and I ask you for forgiveness and

3 try to understand what the Army is trying to do for our

4 keikis and moapunas*. I don't want to see them to come

5 back in a body bag. I had three people in my unit come

6 back dead in Vietnam. It is not a pleasant thing. It

7 upset me. I couldn't sleep, I couldn't eat, for over

8 two weeks.

9 And I ask, please put whatever pilikea you

10 get on the side and come to the table and sit down and

11 try discuss whatever problems you have.

12 Economically, if we lose the Army and we lose

13 the Navy and the Marine Corps, our economy for the

14 state of Hawaii is zero. Right now, we in dilemma.

15 Wall Street is crashing. What about the retirees who

16 have retirement plans? Will they be able to retire or

17 continue to work after 70 years old? I ask you please

18 come to the table and please try to see if you can

19 ho'oponopono. Thank you.

20 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.

21 Cory Harden followed by Denise Reghetti.

22 CORY HARDEN: Aloha and thank you for

23 listening to comments.

24 I'm Cory Harden making comments for Sierra

25 Club Pohakuloa Group. We are real concerned about the

Comments

Responses

21

PT156

1 proposed action. We feel whether it's at Makua or at
2 Pohakuloa, Army actions are going to do more to destroy
3 the village than to save it.

PT156

The Army remains dedicated to the protection of natural and cultural resources at MMR and PTA. Pursuant to this cause the Army has adopted a number of resource management policies and procedures that it implements based on input from Federal and State agencies, and the public. Examples of these include the Mākua or PTA Implementation Plan, Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, Integrated Wildland Fire Management Plan, and Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.

PT157

4 On fire, use of weapons with high potential
5 to cause wildfires would cause increased potential for
6 wildfire ignition beyond the Army's ability to
7 adequately manage these sources of ignition, according
8 to the EIS. The proposed weapons ammunition and
9 tracers are notorious for starting fires. Some fires
10 may start at night, making them hard to fight and
11 dangerous to sleeping island residents.

PT157

If Alternative 1, 2, or 3 is chosen for implementation, night live-fire training at Mākua would not occur until after fire suppression issues have been finalized by the Army and approved by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Also, there is no history of large fires starting at night due to military training.

Implementation of PTA's IWFMP SOP would avoid and minimize the potential for fire ignition by limiting training to times of lower fire risk. Army personnel would continue to use BMPs during operations.

12 The fire history of the Army is not real
13 encouraging. Fires at Makua consumed 20,000 acres five
14 years ago and 300 acres three years ago. Past fire
15 management plans have been written, but they haven't
16 been fully used. Fire history files are mostly manual,
17 and they were disposed of in some way and then
18 destroyed after five years.

PT158

19 Citizens' calls for a trained fire manager at
20 Makua to ensure that fire management plans are followed
21 have not been heeded.

PT158

The Army has hired a wildfire manager for O'ahu as required in the Integrated Wildfire Management Plan and 2007 BO. In addition, the Army has also hired a 20-man wildfire strike crew, the only one of its kind in Hawai'i.

22 Fires threaten native ecosystems by killing
23 native species, helping non-native species spread, and
24 causing erosion. The action will also cause erosion
25 from training and from PTA trail construction at

Comments

Responses

22

PT159

1 Pohakuloa. The EIS says the effects of soil loss may
 2 be irreversible in some areas. And, also, there would
 3 be significant soil loss and compaction from training,
 4 that these impacts cannot be reduced to less than
 5 significant. This is on top of the Stryker which
 6 already is going to cause a lot of soil loss and
 7 erosion.

PT159

The full evaluation of impacts and proposed mitigations as they relate to soils and geology is found in Section 4.8 of the EIS. This evaluation includes the use of Stryker vehicles at MMR (Section 2.4.1 of the EIS makes clear that use of the Strykers would be limited. There will be no off-road use of Strykers.) At PTA, the use of Strykers is fully documented in the FEIS for the Permanent Stationing of the 2/25th SBCT (ROD signed April 2008).

PT160

8 Regarding Depleted Uranium at Pohakuloa, the
 9 EIS says there's little or no risk, but as other folks
 10 have mentioned, the DU studies aren't completed, so I
 11 don't see the basis for this statement. The one study
 12 that has been completed for Pohakuloa raised many
 13 questions when our Sierra Club consultant reviewed that
 14 report. Also, I am not getting answers from the Army.
 15 I'd really appreciate getting some answers on DU. I
 16 have given materials tonight. I have questions from
 17 May that are still unanswered. The questions that were
 18 answered, it took six months. When the Sierra Club
 19 consultant contacted the Army, he got answers, and I am
 20 feeling like we've got to pay to get answers. I'm not
 21 getting answers, especially on the air monitoring.

PT160

While the characterization survey has not been completed, preliminary studies have shown the use of DU at PTA to be similar to that of Schofield Barracks, therefore the health risks are similar at both locations. This is the basis for the statement that there is no health risk from DU.

PT161

22 The air monitoring did not start until
 23 through Sierra Club. I contacted the EPA. I sent them
 24 stacks of documents saying we need air monitoring.
 25 After the Stryker hearings, several other people worked

PT161

The air sampling procedure followed EPA protocol. The Army continues to conduct air quality studies with focus on DU. Both high and low volume samplers are being used for this study. A formal report that provides the data collected will be made available to the public once finalized.

Comments

Responses

| | Comments | Responses |
|-------|--|---|
| PT161 | <p style="text-align: right;">23</p> <p>1 on it. After a year or two, we finally got some air 2 monitoring, but it's the wrong type to detect the 3 airborne DU. And when I ask questions on air 4 monitoring, I don't get answers.</p> | <p>PT161 The air sampling procedure followed EPA protocol. The Army continues to conduct air quality studies with focus on DU. Both high and low volume samplers are being used for this study. A formal report that provides the data collected will be made available to the public once finalized.</p> |
| PT162 | <p>5 Okay. Native Hawaiian cultural resources 6 will be impacted even more at Pohakuloa than Makua. 7 Access to areas of traditional importance and 8 archaeological sites will be restricted. Landscape 9 shrines, burials can be damaged by trampling and live 10 fire.</p> | <p>PT162 The Army recognizes in the impact analysis that there could be substantive and unmitigable harm to cultural resources at PTA.</p> |
| PT163 | <p>11 A recent Navy EIS addressed the issue of 12 ceded lands, and the Papahānao* Mokumakea* EIS 13 addressed the Hawaiian sovereignty, and this EIS should 14 do the same.</p> | <p>PT163 Hawai'i is a state within the United States of America. The State of Hawai'i was admitted to the union on August 21, 1959, making it the 50th state. Also, the EIS now includes text at the beginning of Section 3.10.3 regarding Public Law 103-150, that addresses the 1893 overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai'i.</p> |
| PT164 | <p>15 Endangered species are going to be severely 16 impacted. Studies can't be done because you can't go 17 in the impact area.</p> | <p>PT164 Because the impact area is unsafe for human activity, surveys for listed species cannot be conducted, nor can it be accurately determined which species will be lost, or the magnitude of the loss.</p> |
| PT165 | <p>18 We're also concerned about the unexploded 19 ordnance. As other people said, there's 50-plus sites 20 on this island. For years, I've been told -- "Why 21 don't you clean it up?" I'm told, "Well, that's 22 another program, and Congress won't give us the money." 23 You know, if you can find money for all these new 24 programs in cleaning up for the new programs, there is 25 money, if there's the will, to clean up this old UXO.</p> | <p>PT165 Discussion of cleanup of unexploded ordnance as it pertains to this EIS is found in Section 2.4.3.</p> |

Comments

Responses

24

1 All those military actions in Hawaii, the
2 Stryker, the Army Growth and Force Realignment, the
3 Navy Hawaii Range Complex Actions, the general shifting
4 of forces to the Pacific region, chemical weapons in
5 the sea. How much of the village is going to be
6 destroyed in order to save it? Thank you.

7 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.

8 Denise Reghetti followed by Woody Vaspra.

9 DENISE REGHETTI: Aloha. My name is Denise
10 Reghetti. I'm here in Hawaii as an advocate for peace
11 and justice, and I have been compelled from what I have
12 read here on these plaques, brochures simply to say
13 that this is sacred ground, and the military does not
14 belong here. And I think that we need to resolve a lot
15 of things that have been unjust and not right.
16 Remember, this is sacred ground, and everything that
17 Jim Albertini has said, I magnify that many, many, many
18 times. He's a man that knows what he's talking about.
19 Listen to that. Take heed to that. And it's a sacred
20 ground. The military does not belong here.

21 That's all I want to say. Thank you.

22 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.

23 Woody Vaspra followed by Larry Kelly.

24 WOODY VASPRA: My name is Woody Vaspra. I'm
25 representing the Kanaka Council Moku Keawe. I grew up

Comments

Responses

25

1 in the north shore of Oahu, across the mountain where
2 Makua Valley was, and I used to drive through Wahiawa
3 quite often, and I used to hear the bombing going on in
4 Wahiawa, which is by the Kolekole Pass, onto the
5 mountains.

6 I wanted to mention my father is a World War
7 II vet. He served in Iwo Jima and Guadalcanal, was
8 stationed at Schofield Barracks, and was commander of
9 the American Legion, not only for the north shore; at
10 times commander of the American Legion for the whole
11 state of Hawaii.

12 I myself was a graduate of Kamehameha when it
13 was a military academy. I served in Vietnam three
14 tours. I was the entire air force through the arc
15 lights and dropped a lot of ordnance, as you know what
16 one plane can do, for those who were in Vietnam, and
17 also was involved with the clean-up of Rocky Flats. I
18 was brought in in the '90s to clean up Rocky Flats
19 which was involved with nuclear weaponry. I know what
20 weapons can do.

21 I think there was some discussion about we
22 need the military here. They're here; but rather than
23 looking at it from a war economy, let's look at it from
24 a peace economy.

25 I'm also very much aware about training.

Comments

Responses

26

1 Flying B-52s require lots of training. And they're
 2 still flying. ** retired from the Boeing Company that
 3 made them.

4 I would like to see training done in places
 5 they already train. Why do we have to use Makua
 6 Valley? I think it should be left alone, because as I
 7 came up, grew up, and I was serving in the Air Force
 8 and coming back home, I want everybody to realize that
 9 this is the most remotest archipelago on the whole
 10 planet in the largest ocean. Land is at a premium.
 11 The population is booming. Oahu is looking like L.A.
 12 Why don't we use some of this land to start looking for
 13 sustainable programs? What happens when we can't move
 14 stuff anymore, move food?
 15 I'm looking at it from a different
 16 perspective. I'm aware, but also I know war is
 17 political. Only word. For those in Vietnam, how many
 18 times have we sit there and say, "Why do we have to be
 19 here?" But I was there. I was inducted, but I decided
 20 to not walk the ground, but fly.
 21 I highly recommended Makua Valley be left
 22 alone, have a chance to come back and be used for
 23 positive programs. There are training grounds near
 24 Schofield and on the Huulau* range, because I went up
 25 there one time to walk some of the sacred trails I grew

PT166
 The Army has proposed alternatives to live-fire training at MMR, these are the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4 (Training at PTA). The final decision will be made based on many factors, including public involvement. The final decision will be made no sooner than 30 days after publishing the Final EIS. Also, Mākua is an existing training area.

Comments

Responses

27

1 up in, and I saw a lot of training going on up there.
 2 And those are the places I think they should be
 3 continued.

PT167
 4 And I just want to say that I know what
 5 weapons can do to the ground. I know this EIS is going
 6 and all of that stuff. I used to fly over, dropping
 7 all types. And that's one place that's very
 8 contaminated. Also there's no data.

PT167
 A full description of the hazards encountered at MMR is discussed in Section 3 of the EIS.

9 So I would like everybody to reconsider and
 10 start looking at the preciousness of the land that's on
 11 these islands, because these islands are not Nevada,
 12 Arizona, California; these are small little islands,
 13 and their resources have been stretched to the max, and
 14 the population is growing.

15 Mahalo nui loa. Thank you very much.

16 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.

17 Larry Kelly followed by Margaret Furukawa.

18 LARRY KELLY: Good evening.

19 THE AUDIENCE: Aloha.

PT168
 20 LARRY KELLY: The question that always comes
 21 up for me regarding environmental impact studies is
 22 what happens to the residue? Where does it go? Does
 23 it just go up into the air and disappear forever, or
 24 after we have so much rain in these beautiful islands,
 25 does it wash down and go into the aquifer?

PT168
 A full discussion of the occurrence of munitions residue as it pertains to the proposed action of this EIS is found in Sections 3.7 Water Resources, 3.8 Geology and Soils, 3.11 Hazardous Materials and Waste. An evaluation of the potential environmental impacts associated with munitions residues as they relate to the proposed action is found in Section 4.7, 4.8, and 4.11.

 Finally, the Army performs has performed numerous studies on the fate and transport of munitions residues. The studies that that assisted in formulating the foundation of environmental analysis in this EIS include a hydrogeologic investigation report, Muliwai sediment and sampling, Air sampling reports, and a Marine Resources Study.

Comments

Responses

PT168

28

1 And my question is what is being done about
 2 that; and how is it monitored; and how is it studied;
 3 and how public are the findings; and what are the
 4 findings; and how will this expansion impact those
 5 findings in more pollution?

PT168
 A full discussion of the occurrence of munitions residue as it pertains to the proposed action of this EIS is found in Sections 3.7 Water Resources, 3.8 Geology and Soils, 3.11 Hazardous Materials and Waste. An evaluation of the potential environmental impacts associated with munitions residues as they relate to the proposed action is found in Section 4.7, 4.8, and 4.11.

Finally, the Army performs has performed numerous studies on the fate and transport of munitions residues. The studies that that assisted in formulating the foundation of environmental analysis in this EIS include a hydrogeologic investigation report, Muliwai sediment and sampling, Air sampling reports, and a Marine Resources Study.

6 And the other thing that came to my mind,
 7 I've been thinking for a long time about my children,
 8 the children that I work with. I'm a social worker.
 9 And how do I explain to them not to be violent on this
 10 island?

PT169

11 One of the impacts that the military
 12 represents, whether it likes it or not, is that we
 13 don't sit down at the table and work things out. We go
 14 in and take what we want. We destroy things. We
 15 intimidate people in order to get what we need. So I'm
 16 having a very difficult time with my kids that are in
 17 trouble, that are misbehaving, if you want to put it
 18 that way, in school and in public, and that are
 19 court-involved. How do I tell them that fighting is
 20 wrong when all around them is fighting and killing?
 21 So to me, that is quite an impact in the
 22 environment and actually impacts our children to
 23 immeasurable heights. So just think about that. And
 24 thank you for listening. Aloha.

PT169
 The Soldiers of the United States Army training in Hawai'i are preparing to defend the United States. Training in Hawai'i is in accordance with accepted standards and are carefully planned. It is our intent to set a positive example.

25 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.

Comments

Responses

29

1 Margaret Furukawa followed by Kahale Saito.
2 MARGARET FURUKAWA: I'd just like to share a
3 few words with you from Major General Smedley Butler,
4 U.S. Marine Corps, twice awarded the Medal of Honor in
5 1914 and 1917. General Douglas MacArthur described him
6 as one of the really great generals in American
7 history. I'm giving you a very short excerpt from a
8 speech he made in 1933, the year I was born.
9 He said, "There are only two things we should
10 fight for. One is defense of our homes, and the other
11 is the Bill of Rights. War for any other reason is
12 simply a racket. There isn't a trick in the
13 racketeering bag that the military gang is blind to:
14 Its finger men to point out enemies, its muscle men to
15 destroy enemies, its brain men to plan war, and the big
16 boss, supernationalistic capitalism. It may seem odd
17 for me, a military man, to adopt such a comparison.
18 Truthfulness compels me to.
19 I spent 33 years and 4 months in active
20 military service as a member of this country's most
21 agile military force, the Marine Corps. I served in
22 all commissioned ranks, from Second Lieutenant to Major
23 General. During that period, I spent most of my time
24 being a high-class muscle man for big business, for
25 Wall Street, and for the bankers. In short, I was a

Comments

Responses

30

1 racketeer, a gangster, for capitalism. I suspected I
 2 was just part of a racket at the time. Now I am sure
 3 of it.

4 Like all members of the military profession,
 5 I never had a thought of my own until I left the
 6 service. My mental faculties remained in suspended
 7 animation while I obeyed the orders of higher-ups.
 8 This is typical with everyone in the military service.”

9 KU'UMEAALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.

10 Kahale Saito followed by Gallen Kelly.

11 KAHALE SAITO: Aloha mai kakou. My name is
 12 Kahale Saito.

13 THE AUDIENCE: Aloha.

14 KAHALE SAITO: On behalf of my students, the
 15 Keiki O Ka Aina, I stand before here as a member of the
 16 Protect Kahoolawe 'Ohana, a new generation that is only
 17 here because of the aunties and uncles who have fought.
 18 To me, this is what I see Makua. This is the future of
 19 Hawaii. This is the future of Makua. This is the
 20 future of Schofield. This is the future of Pohakuloa.

21 I do not -- I know this process is here to
 22 expand the live-fire training. As a member of the
 23 pikio* and my vested interest in Kahoolawe and the
 24 amount of hewa that you guys have left and you guys
 25 continue to do on these other places, this is what it's

PT170

PT170

Discussion of cleanup activities as they relate to the proposed action in this EIS is found in Section 2.4.3.

Comments

Responses

31

PT170

1 going to end up being like. Kahoolawe. This is the
 2 future of Pohakuloa. This is the future of Makua and
 3 the future of Hawaii.

PT170
 Discussion of cleanup activities as they relate to the proposed action in this EIS is found in Section 2.4.3.

PT171

4 I do not want you here. I am not an
 5 American. You guys are -- the United States is an
 6 illegal occupier of these islands. And we will
 7 continue on the basis of aloha 'aina. We will not use
 8 violence. We will not use weapons of mass destructions
 9 like you guys do. We will do it on the basis of aloha
 10 'aina. And this is what I practice, and this is what I
 11 believe in, and this is what I will continue to teach
 12 my students, and this is where my generation is at.
 13 There are not very many people in my
 14 generation here, but they're out there, and we're going
 15 to come with a different way of combating this and
 16 combating all the hewa that you guys continue to do on
 17 all our sacred sites. Every inch of our 'aina is
 18 sacred.
 19 You guys do not belong here. You guys will
 20 leave. I will see in my lifetime that the rest of
 21 these islands will be protected the same way that
 22 Kahoolawe is protected, and I will spend the rest of my
 23 life and will be teaching the keiki to come to ensure
 24 that we have this rightful place here in Hawaii.
 25 And I leave you with one prophecy that my --

PT171
 Hawai'i is a state within the United States of America. The State of Hawai'i was admitted to the union on August 21, 1959, making it the 50th state. Section 3.10.3 of the EIS now includes text referring to the apology bill (Public Law 103-150) and the overthrow of Hawai'i in 1893.

Comments

Responses

32

1 come from my kupuna, and I will always end my testimony
2 here in testifying at any of these things. I do not
3 believe in this process. I do not believe in your EIS
4 process. I do not believe in the court systems. I
5 have been a part of a lawsuit in the Stryker Brigade,
6 and we have lost, but I vow to continue my efforts in
7 aloha 'aina. And I will end with [Hawaiian chanting].
8 Mahalo.

9 KU'UMEAALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.

10 Gallen Kelly followed by Pueo McGuire.

11 GALLEN KELLY: Aloha.

12 THE AUDIENCE: Aloha.

13 GALLEN KELLY: I was very moved by the last
14 sharing. I think that kind of commitment is so pure
15 and clean and devoted and the hope of the world, so I
16 thank my Hawaiian sister for that.

17 I stand with the kanaka and share their pain
18 about the sacred mountain, the invasion there. To
19 them, it is their Mecca, their Vatican, their
20 beginning, and to see it adulterated is just horrible.
21 The saying that comes to mind is Guantanamo at
22 Pohakuloa.

23 We were asked to stay on topic tonight, and I
24 am trying to do that, but I'm the kind of person that
25 wants to go to the cause. In other words, if a doctor

Comments

Responses

33

1 is studying congenitive heart failure and he sees that
 2 there's a swollen ankle, he doesn't just look at the
 3 ankle; he tries to get to the cause of the disease.
 4 And when I look at the cause of this experience on the
 5 mountain, it boils down to the learning how to take
 6 human life, to kill other humans.
 7 I was reading the bulletin boards there, and
 8 one of the sentences was "To prepare soldiers for the
 9 full spectrum of operations faced in combat."

PT172

10 My own feeling is that no amount of training
 11 can come close to reality, because on a very deep
 12 level, the soldier knows that it's a simulation and the
 13 real thing is far more terrorizing. Maybe that's why
 14 we have so many troops that are in places of trauma,
 15 suffering PTSD, near 10,000 defections. I heard on the
 16 radio today suicides of returning troops are up to 18 a
 17 day. That's over 600 a year. A family of 14 innocent
 18 Iraqis were killed this morning. How does the soldier
 19 come back from something like that, from having
 20 participated in something like that? We call it -- you
 21 guys call it collateral damage, and we call it human
 22 life.

23 You used the term "Operation Enduring
 24 Freedom" and "Operation Iraqi Freedom." With two
 25 million Iraqi dead and two million displaced, Iraq

PT172

U.S. Soldiers have a difficult mission. Training must be made as realistic as possible, but you are correct; nothing can truly prepare people for war.

Comments

Responses

34

1 reduced from First-World status to Third-World status,
2 what kind of freedom is that?
3 Do you like the kind of freedom you're seeing
4 in the world today, especially in our own nation? Look
5 at the rights we've lost in the name of defending
6 freedom. We have the FISA bill now, where they can spy
7 on any telephone conversation, on all e-mails; the
8 Fourth Amendment, where a man's home is his castle, is
9 kaput to people. Someone can enter into your home
10 without due cause. And that is so invasive; and our
11 beloved free speech is at risk. Now they have free
12 speech cages, which is an oxymoron. To me, this points
13 to aberration in the leadership. Something is wrong at
14 the helm.
15 And we are often -- those of us that work for
16 peace have the question put to us, "Well, what about
17 the terrorists? What about them? If we don't go
18 there," you know, "they'll come here." And I have to
19 ask myself, well, what is a terrorist? And when I
20 study the issues -- and believe me, we have to study
21 them -- I see that they are those who are rising up to
22 defend their homelands, those who have been invaded,
23 who have had their resources stolen. And if we could
24 stand in their shoes for a minute and ask how would we
25 feel if there was an invading army here and they wanted

Comments

Responses

35

1 to take all our resources from the islands? And I'm
2 sure the kanaka know what that feels like.

3 Someone mentioned that they need the training
4 because we don't want to see our boys coming home in
5 body bags. Is it okay to see some other mother's son
6 coming home in a body bag?

7 I speak as the mother of a daughter who
8 returned from Iraq with multiple health problems. It's
9 too long a story, but just know our family is facing a
10 lot of trials around that.

11 And I'll just close with saying I do believe
12 we lost our way. I see the spiraling down of humanity
13 due to poor leadership and imperial pursuits. And,
14 really, coming here tonight is somewhat of an outreach
15 to the military, to intelligence, to police to look
16 deeply at the system that you're serving. Search your
17 conscience. Save your soul. There are other ways.
18 People will be here for you if you decide that this is
19 not the road you want to continue on. There are other
20 ways. I do not think that killing each other is what
21 the Creator had in mind for us.

22 Thank you.

23 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.

24 Pueo McGuire followed by Iwani Kaiwi.

25 PUEO MCGUIRE: Aloha mai kakou.

Comments

Responses

36

1 THE AUDIENCE: Aloha.
 2 PUEO MCGUIRE: My name is Pueo McGuire. I'll
 3 be real brief.

PT173

4 The DEIS insufficiently addresses the
 5 environmental impacts on the ecosystem. It
 6 insufficiently addresses the cultural impacts on the
 7 native Hawaiians. It insufficiently addresses the
 8 socioeconomic impacts. It insufficiently addresses
 9 everything.

PT173

The EIS was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and with applicable federal and Army regulations. The Army derived its basis for the archaeological and cultural resource analysis from site specific baseline reports from cultural resource firms with extensive local experience, as well as from oral histories, public meetings and interested individuals. In addition, the Army encouraged the public and Native Hawaiians to share their knowledge of resources present at MMR and incorporated this information into the EIS.

PT174

10 As well as the sister said, this whole
 11 process is flawed. I mean, you guys, you give this
 12 public comment period, and I cannot come to them more
 13 than once, and I will probably come to them again, but
 14 I can't help but realize that everything I say right
 15 here really isn't going to be -- isn't going to affect
 16 the Army and how they go forward with this. All that
 17 matters is what the state agencies say or the federal
 18 agencies say about this, and that's all you folks are
 19 concerned with. You don't care about how we feel.

PT174

Public meetings are designed so that the Army may receive oral input from the public. The facilities used by the Army for these public meetings operated under imposed time limitations on facility use in accordance with their standard management policies. The Army facilitated time limits on speakers to ensure all participants were allowed equal time to speak while guaranteeing the facility was cleaned and empty by the facility deadline.

The Army encouraged members of the public who felt they were not allotted sufficient time to speak, to provide oral input more than once. During public meetings, the Army encouraged attendees to provide comment to the court recorder prior to the open mic phase of the public meeting; and, a second court recorder was available to register public input privately during the open mic phase of the public meeting. Members of the public were also provided blank public comment forms in order to register their input. Finally, written comments were accepted via mail, e-mail, and facsimile; and oral comments were accepted via voicemail throughout the 45-day public comment period.

The Army has provided the public opportunity to review the Army's analysis and submit input. Most changes made to the SDEIS since public distribution of the DEIS were in response to public and agency comments on the DEIS and subsequent studies. There are greater discussions on the current status of historic properties and cultural resources and the results of endangered species consultations. There is also the incorporation of the marine resources study and other studies, surveys, and reports done since the issuance of the DEIS in 2005. Finally, the Army offered the public 75 days to review the DEIS; 60 days to review the Marine Life Study, Archaeological Survey, and DEIS in 2007; and 45 days to review the SDEIS in 2008.

PT175

20 You cannot mitigate the impacts of bombing a
 21 church. There is no mitigation of that. You either do
 22 it or you don't. You guys are bombing burials; you're
 23 bombing sacred grounds; you're prohibiting us from
 24 going forward to try and build a sustainable place for
 25 our children to grow up, destroying our resources and

PT175

The training alternatives discussed in the Draft EIS will not have an impact on known burial sites. Monitoring of sites will continue during training and if it appears that impacts may occur further consultation will be undertaken. Although MMR is an active training complex, the Army at this time allows limited public access to cultural sites. Public access depends in part on training requirements, safety and other applicable policy, requirements, regulations/laws.

Comments

Responses

PT175

37

1 our means of existence. And I hate you for it,
 2 America, and the Army.

3 And, you know, I hope my children can live
 4 here and survive and grow a sweet potato in the ground,
 5 because you guys are destroying it all day by day. And
 6 that's all I have to say.

7 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.

8 Iwani Kaiwi followed by Miranda McQuade.

9 IWANI KAIWI: Aloha. My name is Iwani, and I
 10 just kind of wanted to know what's going on with the
 11 community. And I do hate the military, and I do hate
 12 America for what -- all the lies that they tell us
 13 Hawaiian people. I am a native Hawaiian, and I was
 14 raised up in the old ways as using the land for our
 15 source of pilaipoi*. Our survival is based on the
 16 land. And the only difference between me and you guys
 17 is you guys shop at the grocery store and you guys go
 18 to markets to eat. I pick up everything off the land.
 19 That's how I eat. You know, I dive. I hunt.

20 And Makua Valley, that place is so sacred to
 21 our people, and you guys have no business up there.
 22 You know, you guys want to train for wars. You know,
 23 this isn't the Hawaiian people's war; this is your
 24 guys' war. You guys started this on the basis of what
 25 you guys thought was right, and that's to go in and, I

PT175

The training alternatives discussed in the Draft EIS will not have an impact on known burial sites. Monitoring of sites will continue during training and if it appears that impacts may occur further consultation will be undertaken. Although MMR is an active training complex, the Army at this time allows limited public access to cultural sites. Public access depends in part on training requirements, safety and other applicable policy, requirements, regulations/laws.

Comments

Responses

38

1 guess, take the oil or do whatever you guys got to do.
2 Whatever you guys do is destroy and wreak havoc and
3 create chaos, and the only ways that you guys can get
4 out of it is deceive people, lead them all to
5 procrastinate in the plans that you guys have made to
6 do things more on the basis of helping our people. I
7 haven't seen anything that you guys have done to help
8 us. And I'm just standing up here as a regular person
9 that pays my taxes, you know, works every day to feed
10 his family.

11 And it's getting hard to speak English. I
12 got to speak local terms to you guys. You know, we no
13 like you guys here, straight up. You guys don't belong
14 here. You guys the evil leader, and, you know, I'm at
15 the point where I'm stepping in and I want to do
16 something about it, and I'm going to do everything in
17 my power to stop you guys, brah. That's just how life
18 goes. You guys stop people from hurting you guys; we
19 stop people from hurting us. It goes back and forth.
20 You guys' war senseless. Everything you guys do is
21 senseless, basically, to me. You guys not protecting
22 anything. You guys not helping our children understand
23 what's going on with life. You know what I mean?

24 What we came from, what we like teach our
25 children is the old ways, not you guys' new ways on how

Comments

Responses

39

1 to shop, "Oh, let's look in the Sunday ads for some
 2 discount prices or some coupons." We like go teach
 3 them, "Okay, this is how you set one trap, boy. This
 4 is how you catch one fish, boy. This is how you cook
 5 'em and clean 'em." Simple. That's us, simple people.
 6 We don't need all of this drastic stuff you guys doing,
 7 the highways, the mass transit. Everything you guys
 8 doing.

9 Bombing the island? You know what I mean?
 10 Just think of it, bombing one island. All the islands
 11 put together isn't even equal to one of you guys'
 12 states, probably. Why you guys cannot have them up in
 13 the U.S.? What is the difference of having them on our
 14 island? You know what I mean? Our island. Why? What
 15 is the cause? You know what I mean?

16 You guys never answer that question for me.
 17 Every time I came to one of these things, I asked the
 18 same thing, and nobody come up with no answers. All
 19 they know is, "Okay, this is what we're doing to try
 20 and fix the problem, and this is how long it's going to
 21 take." You know what I mean?
 22 And as the years go by, the lie changes, and
 23 as the lies change, the thing just gets procrastinated
 24 and procrastinated, and everybody loses out, especially
 25 you guys. So the best thing to you guys is just go

PT176

PT176

Alternatives that do not advance the purpose and need are not considered reasonable alternatives. The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried foPTard for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5. This section discusses the reasons the Army considered but eliminated other identified alternatives. There were no locations outside of Hawai'i that could meet all four screening criteria.

Comments

Responses

40

1 home. You know what I mean? Fold up, take you guys'
2 stuff elsewhere. That's all I get.

3 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.

4 Miranda is the last speaker for tonight. And

5 I know that there is some of you who didn't -- who felt

6 like there was not enough time to complete your

7 testimony; so at this time, if you would like to repeat

8 and come up, you can go to the back of the room and

9 sign in again for another four minutes.

10 MIRANDA McQUADE: Aloha. Good evening. My

11 name is Miranda McQuade, and I'm currently a resident

12 of Kurtistown, and I would like to say a few words on

13 behalf of young people in the United States and all

14 over the world.

15 We don't want to fight, and we don't want to

16 kill people. No one does. We want education, but in a

17 country like the United States, the cost of an

18 education has become too high. And the military has

19 used our vulnerability to recruit us in order to reap

20 the benefits of their empire.

21 Instead of using the sacred land of Hawaii to

22 foster common ground and create community, I feel that

23 the military has chosen to preach violence and

24 manufacture murderers of women and children and men in

25 places that don't wish to bear the burden of empire.

Comments

Responses

41

1 That's wrong. If you want to fight, then go; but leave
 2 our youth alone to create art and music and peace among
 3 each other and to clean up the pieces all around the
 4 world.

PT177

5 An expansion of military bases and live fire
 6 is not healthy, it's not necessary, and it's not
 7 welcome here. Please take the warnings of those
 8 tonight and consider that. Thank you.

PT177

The expansion of military installations in Hawai'i is not part of this EIS.

9 KU'UMEAALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.
 10 I see Rick coming up here with another card.
 11 Mahalo.
 12 Herring Kalua?
 13 HERRING KALUA: I guess when I finish, we all
 14 can go home, because I came here at 5:30, and they said
 15 7:00; so things change. But first of all, I want to
 16 thank the military for giving us this opportunity to
 17 say the things, to voice your opinion.
 18 Secondly, I'd like to thank those who were
 19 responsible for making this happen, the facilitator and
 20 all that, so we have a controlled thing.
 21 In the world today -- I just give you a
 22 little bit of history -- people talk everything. I
 23 cannot talk for Makua on Oahu, because I wasn't born
 24 and raised there, but I can talk about the Big Island,
 25 because my mom, my dad, all born here. My dad is Kona

Comments

Responses

42

1 and Puna; my mom is Kohala and Ka'u. So anytime I like
2 talk in that area, I can give my genealogy, so that is
3 good. But if I go to Makua, you know what they going
4 to tell me? Who the hell this guy coming from talking
5 about us? Okay? So tonight I just talking to the
6 military in general.

7 In my family, there's a history, a -- born
8 and raised in Keaukaha. If you guys don't know where
9 it's at, it's a homestead back here two miles from this
10 area. A lot of things happen there. It's because we
11 misunderstand. Historically, my grandfather was in
12 World War I; my dad was World War II; my uncles and
13 relatives Korean War; and I'm a product of the Vietnam
14 War.

15 And I know how it feels to be young. Also,
16 I'm a retiree. I'm just one of the fortunate of those
17 millions soldiers out there can stand here today and
18 try to help them, try to make the community understand
19 what we're going to do.

20 We tell the military "Go home." We can tell
21 them anything you like. But I tell you what, if shit
22 come here today, we going to be crying for them to come
23 help us. And you know who going to save us? All the
24 disabled veterans, all those who get history in all
25 those war going to be out there fighting for our

Comments

Responses

43

1 freedom. We are lucky we have freedom here, and people
2 who wear the uniform, you raise your hand and you take
3 a oath, you get penalized, too. You get penalty once
4 you put on the uniform and raise your hand. So I'm
5 proud to be one Hawaiian; I'm proud to be one American
6 citizen.

7 And the last thing I want to say is my
8 grandchildren, my great-great-grandchildren to be
9 fighting in a war, now is the time we all sit at the
10 table, we solve the problem, and make it right so we
11 have peace for the rest of our life. I for that. I
12 for everything you guys talking about here. I one
13 generation. I can talk. I understand the braddah
14 about hunting, fishing, land. I walk the talk, so I
15 can talk. I walk the talk. I understand. I feel for
16 them, because you know what? Some of them are the same
17 age as my children, so I understand that.

18 So it's very important that we sit here
19 today, and like Kupuna Louie said -- kupuna, because
20 anybody older than you, we respect. And I just like
21 respect all of you here tonight. I like Mr. George to
22 stand up, George Mukai. George, please stand. Why I
23 want him to stand? Besides his standing, I might
24 forget some other -- Ho Zotu* or Hanji Patelli*. If
25 you in this room tonight, stand up. Okay. Thank you,

Comments

Responses

44

1 George.

2 Now, this person, Ho Zotu*, they fought the
3 freedom for us Korean War. That's good generation
4 historically about war. And us is the Vietnam War.
5 All of this war. But guess what? We get one surprise.
6 The nations out there want to be the best, so they use
7 nuclear -- all what you talking about. We never had
8 that. It was face-to-face, hand-to-hand combat and you
9 name 'em. I pretty sure Mr. Mukai never like go there,
10 too. I never like go there, too. But I so happy no
11 more the draft, because all the young ones were talking
12 today, they probably would be there.

13 So it's very important that we remember the
14 history of America. If you one American citizen, then
15 you stand up, you say the flag pledge, you sing the
16 National Anthem, and you better be proud of it, because
17 they be at your back door, you going to wish they all
18 was here. And that's important. And that's important.
19 And I want to say thank you very much tonight.

20 I know we have differences, but guess what?
21 America the beautiful. Love America. And that's what
22 it's all about. Let's put all our differences aside,
23 like Uncle Louie say, sit at the table. Environmental,
24 you name 'em, sit at the table.

25 I have one more minute, and I'm the last one,

Comments

Responses

45

1 and I want to make sure that everybody tonight, you
2 understand, because we need go all over the place and
3 talk. You know -- can tell you why? Because the ones
4 don't want to speak up like ourselves, they're home
5 sleeping. They could care less what's happening around
6 there. But guess what happen? When the chips are
7 down, you -- you cannot even come in this room. We
8 come here all the time. We come here. But I promise
9 you, when the chips are down, we going to be out there;
10 they going to be in here. Thank you.

11 KU'UMEALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.

12 I guess there's no more testimony. No more?
13 Okay. Nobody else has signed up, or repeats, so we
14 come to the end of our public comments tonight. It's
15 an early session.

16 I want to thank everyone for coming here.
17 Thank you for your very powerful testimony tonight.
18 And please remember that the deadline for the public
19 comments is November 3rd, 2008.

20 I want to thank the U.S. Army for their team
21 of people back here at the poster boards who took the
22 time to interact with you. And if you have more
23 questions, please go up to them. They will be here a
24 little while longer.

25 Again, thank you all for coming out. And

Comments

Responses

46

1 thank you for your testimony tonight.

2 Thank you, Colonel Margotta, thank you, Paul,
3 for being here, and thank you to all the veterans who
4 came out tonight. Mahalo.

5 (The testimony concluded at 8:14 p.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Comments

Responses

47

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

I, TERI "SERAH" HOSKINS, CSR 452, do hereby
certify:

That the foregoing transcript is a true and
correct record of the oral statements taken on
October 8, 2008, at Auntie Sally Kaleohano's Luau Hale, Hilo,
Hawaii;

That said oral statements were taken by me
stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting
under my supervision.

Dated this 29th day of October, 2008.

TERI "SERAH" HOSKINS, RMR, CSR #452

Comments

Responses

9 October 2008 Public Meeting

1

1

2

3

4

5 In Re:

Supplemental Draft

6 Environmental Impact

Statement for Military

7 Training at Makua

Military Reservation, Hawai'i

8

9

10 TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING

11

12 Held on October 9, 2008, at Waimea Community Center

13 Waimea, Hawai'i

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 REPORTED BY TERI "SERAH" HOSKINS, RMR, CSR #452

Comments

Responses

2

1 CONTENTS

2 ORAL TESTIMONY GIVEN BY: PAGE

3 SHANNON RUDOLPH 8

4 REYNOLDS KAMAKAWIWOOLE 8

5 SHANNON RUDOLPH (again) 18

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 * Denotes reporter unsure of spelling

25 ** Denotes reporter could not understand or hear

Comments

Responses

3

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: Hello. Aloha --

3 THE AUDIENCE: Aloha.

4 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: -- and welcome to

5 tonight's public hearing and Draft Supplemental EIS for

6 military training activities at the Makua Military

7 Reservation on Oahu.

8 This is the final of four hearings that have

9 been scheduled. Two were on Oahu, one at Nanakuli and

10 Wahiawa, last night in Hilo, and tonight here in

11 Waimea.

12 Although this is the last hearing, the public

13 comments are still being accepted up until November

14 3rd, and those comments can be e-mailed. And there are

15 sheets with the e-mail address on them.

16 Can you tell me where those are for people

17 who want to?

18 JULIE HONG: Yes. They're at the

19 registration table outside of this room to the left,

20 for public comment.

21 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: It looks like this, if

22 you haven't gotten it yet. It looks like this, and the

23 e-mail address is on this as well as the mailing and

24 fax. And this is the public comment form if you want

25 to fill this out or go online to do it. Okay?

Comments

Responses

4

1 Let's see. You have different ways of
2 presenting testimony that include:

3 The written response form, which is this.
4 And these are at the registration table. If you don't
5 feel like giving any kind of oral testimony, you can
6 fill this out.

7 Also, there is -- the court reporter is here,
8 Serah, who is recording the entire session.

9 And are you also taking people's testimony?

10 COURT REPORTER: If they like.

11 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: Serah, also, if you
12 want to talk to her directly and get your testimony
13 that way, you can sit with her.

14 Also, is Julie is doing -- are you doing the
15 video tonight?

16 JULIE HONG: Yes, I am.

17 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: Julie is doing video.
18 If anybody wants to do your presentation through video,
19 Julie will do that with you.

20 Then you can come up to the podium. Some of
21 you have signed up to do that. If you want to come up
22 to the podium, up here, to do your testimony, the
23 sign-up sheet is there on the counter.

24 And we have two people who, so far, are
25 testifying for this evening.

Comments

Responses

5

1 The testimonies are limited to four minutes
2 per person, just as they have been at all the other
3 sessions, and we will continue to use that tonight.

4 Also, Leimana DaMate will be recording your
5 comments on newsprint.

6 If anyone wants to do their testimony
7 maka'olele* Hawaii, Malia Morales is there to take your
8 testimony and interpret it into English for the record.

9 Okay. So -- let's see. Again, each person
10 will have four minutes to testify, and we'll go through
11 the list and then exhaust that list.

12 This is not a question-and-answer period.
13 Although Colonel Margotta, Garrison Commander of the
14 U.S. Army Hawaii, and Dr. Paul Thies, U.S. Army
15 Environmental Command**, are sitting at the table,
16 they're here to accept your comments, but not to answer
17 any questions. This is not a Q and A. This is limited
18 to public testimony only.

19 Okay. So at this time, I'd like to call on
20 Colonel Margotta, Garrison Commander of the U.S. Army
21 Hawaii, who has a few words to say.

22 COLONEL MARGOTTA: Good evening, aloha, and
23 welcome to tonight's public meetings.

24 First off, I would just like to thank
25 everybody that's going to give testimony tonight for

Comments

Responses

6

1 participating in this public process. The NEPA process
2 has two real purposes behind it:

3 The first one is to ensure that government
4 officials have sufficient knowledge and the appropriate
5 information to make informed decisions. And tonight
6 that decision is about the future use of Makua Training
7 Area.

8 The second part of the NEPA process is to
9 ensure that we receive public feedback as part of that
10 process. And that's what we're here about tonight.

11 So when I say I thank you for coming to make
12 testimony tonight, I sincerely mean that, because your
13 comments, your input, and your feedback is very, very
14 important to the Army. We do consider your comments as
15 part of our decision-making process. I think, if you
16 take a look at the current Draft EIS, you'll see over
17 750 pages devoted to responses to public comments and
18 public concerns that have been given in the past, and
19 we'll continue to do that when we publish the final
20 EIS. So, once again, I sincerely thank you for
21 participating in tonight's public forum.

22 I would also like to reiterate tonight's
23 topic of discussion is the future use of Makua, so we
24 would just ask if you would please keep your comments
25 to Makua. I know that's probably not going to happen,

Comments

Responses

7

1 but we would ask you to do that. I know the
2 facilitator said that you had four minutes per. Since
3 we've only got a couple speakers tonight, if you want
4 to take a little bit longer, we don't have any problem
5 with that.

6 Once again, thank you for being here, and
7 we'll get started.

8 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: Okay. Before we get
9 started, I just want to set some basic ground rules so
10 that we can have a very respectful and powerful kind of
11 presentation tonight.

12 So, basically, this is a neutral space, and
13 we don't have very many protest signs, as we have had
14 in other meetings, but if there were, this space would
15 not have any of that. That's to maintain its
16 neutrality.

17 I also ask that our speakers tonight are
18 respectful of everyone, and so we will not condone --
19 or I will not condone any profanity and will interrupt
20 you if that does occur; but I doubt that it will.

21 So without further ado, I would like to call
22 on our first speaker, Reynolds Kamakawiwo'ole.

23 Reynolds?

24 REYNOLDS KAMAKAWIWO'OLE: Can I go second? I
25 have something I have to pull up.

Comments

Responses

8

1 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: Okay.
 2 Shannon? Mahalo, Shannon.
 3 SHANNON RUDOLPH: Aloha.
 4 THE AUDIENCE: Aloha.
 5 SHANNON RUDOLPH: Well, I've been to many of
 6 these, and I have to admit I haven't read the EIS,
 7 because I've read too many of them, and too many times
 8 our comments are like speaking into a brick wall. And
 9 not to disparage you military folks; it's the same way
 10 with our Congress. And I really am concerned about
 11 Depleted Uranium at Makua, very, very concerned, and
 12 I'm concerned about military toxins in general.

13 Now, I know that the military has to have a
 14 place to train. I realize that. But I also realize,
 15 according to -- the Defense Environmental Restoration
 16 Report to Congress 2006 states that there are 824
 17 contaminated sites in Hawaii, and that concerns me
 18 greatly, because I live here. And that only includes
 19 non-active bases. All those sites -- there's many,
 20 many more that haven't been reported because they don't
 21 report on active bases.

22 I don't feel the military has been good
 23 stewards for a long, long time, and I know that their
 24 clean-up money is running out. I know that there's a
 25 reported 28,000 sites in the United States, and those

PT178

PT178
 Restoration is outside of the scope of this EIS.

PT179

PT179
 Cleanup of contaminated sites within the contiguous United States is outside the scope of this EIS.

Comments

Responses

PT179

9

1 numbers are old, too. And I've read that in California
 2 alone, it will take 300 years to clean up contaminated
 3 military sites and a whole lot of money.

4 Now, what I don't understand is if we have
 5 our military, we pay our military to protect us, and
 6 what they're doing to protect us is actually killing
 7 us. Now, that doesn't make a lick of sense to me as a
 8 taxpayer, and I'm very, very concerned that you're not
 9 cleaning up your mess.

10 So that's basically what I have to say. And
 11 I don't think there should be any expansion anywhere in
 12 Hawaii until you guys start cleaning up your act.
 13 Thank you.

14 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.
 15 Reynolds?

16 REYNOLDS KAMAKAWIWOOLE: Aloha. My name is
 17 Reynolds Kamakawiwoole. I'm sorry to see only a few
 18 people here to testify.

19 I was in the military. I served in
 20 Vietnam.** I went to war, an opportunity to see what
 21 happens in real war situation and actually see what
 22 happens to people in real war situation. And I believe
 23 that what's going to be happening very soon is that we
 24 need to look at what we doing to Mother Earth. As
 25 we've been talking about, that effect even the

PT179

Cleanup of contaminated sites within the contiguous United States is outside the scope of this EIS.

Comments

Responses

10

1 presidents now -- candidates are talking about that.
 2 And that's why you got a female running, because there
 3 needs to be a female inside the state. It's happening
 4 to all of us. Mother Earth. There's only one Hawaii,
 5 and we have very sickened sites here.
 6 I practice as a kahuna. You're looking at
 7 one. I know everything that's here. That's part of my
 8 work. I know everything that's on Mauna Kea. That's
 9 another part of my work. And that's why, last night --
 10 I was hoping that much more people would be at the
 11 Mauna Kea meeting than had last night.
 12 I'm here to testify also to the fact that so
 13 many places have been, you know, damaged by other
 14 people without the knowledge of what they can do to our
 15 place, Makua and also the fact -- Pohakuloa has the
 16 same thing. Makes no difference where you go. You
 17 cannot drop anything into the earth without touching
 18 the sacredness of these islands. These islands are all
 19 sacred. They have heart. What you don't have inside
 20 of there is unbelievable, because there's much more to
 21 what you have -- supposed to know about. The Army only
 22 being told certain amount of archeological sites
 23 because it's huna* that keeps it away from the Army,
 24 and they will never tell you anything about it. Okay?
 25 Because that's the way it is.

PT180

PT180

The Army understands that we are not in possession of knowledge concerning all culturally important sites at MMR or PTA. This is unfortunate because we cannot make efforts to protect these resources if we do not have even a minimum of understanding of where they are located.

Comments

Responses

11

1 You know, when I was in the war, I trusted
 2 that something would come out from this thing, and I
 3 went there ** first in Airborne, and I felt that I was
 4 doing my country a big thing.

5 Peace is supposed to be a goal. This is the
 6 spiritual way**. Whether you like it or not, it will
 7 change you, and this will be the islands to change
 8 everyone. And this is how it's going to be. And
 9 that's why I'm saying that you got to come off of this.

10 We're going to turn it all around and look at non-fire
 11 type of situations where you folks be using only blanks
 12 in each one of your -- on these islands, use only
 13 blanks, and that's the only thing you can do. Because
 14 you're going to do it, whatever it is. You're going
 15 still train. The Army is going to **, and that's how
 16 it's been.

17 The Hawaiians have told you for years, since
 18 the time that you guys have been practicing -- I was
 19 looking at the date. That was during the time ** right
 20 after the war 1943, there was constant times where the
 21 Army had opportunity to build in its place.

22 Your place now is to bring peace. This is
 23 what the war is now, and it can be no changing. If you
 24 won't change it, God will change it, and that's the way
 25 it is.

PT181

The Army has proposed a No Action Alternative and four Action Alternatives. These are described in Section 2 of the EIS.

Alternatives that do not advance the purpose and need are not considered reasonable alternatives. The Army developed four screening criteria based on the purpose and need: 1) range capacity, 2) range design, 3) quality of life, and 4) time and cost. To be carried foPTard for full evaluation, an alternative must meet all four screening criteria. A full description of these criteria is included in Section 2.5. This section discusses the reasons the Army considered but eliminated other identified alternatives.

PT181

Comments

Responses

12

1 This is why I'm sharing to you, because
2 nobody is being told the truth, and every day what
3 we're doing to Mother Earth we are doing to ourselves;
4 and years from now, my grandchildren will suffer what
5 you guys are doing there, what you guys are doing
6 there. I don't care what you say. They will suffer
7 because of what goes into the ground, what goes into
8 the ground, the sacredness of our soil. We connect
9 with the Hawaiians. The Hawaiians are connected. We
10 don't separate. This is all part of us. I'm native
11 Hawaiian, for one. This is my home. You folks are
12 foreigners. You have no right to do what you are doing
13 to these islands.

14 The problem is there's no one -- no one --
15 really standing up to you, ** upset, and you're making
16 our people die from stress, which is the biggest
17 killer, and causing our people to be sickly about what
18 they have to do. And I'm saying to you folks, no more
19 of this. That's why a kahuna stands up now. You want
20 to talk, we talk. We sit down and we share what needs
21 to be done, the way it has to be done, and according to
22 the way the Hawaiians want it. This is still our
23 place, and taken -- taken -- everybody knows about
24 this -- taken by the military. Upset.

25 I have to have -- somebody came in and sent

Comments

Responses

13

PT182
 1 me an e-mail that said that there were so many things
 2 that you have to look at. Wildfire fires -- wildfires.
 3 It was sent me -- let's see. I think it was section
 4 ES-33 to 35, the types of weapons and ammunition have
 5 disturbed** wildfire ignition efforts. Because of the
 6 explosive and flammable properties, live-fire training
 7 would occur during the daytime and nighttime. It is
 8 difficult to extinguish a fire at night probably
 9 anywhere.

PT182
 The 2007 Mākua BO does not allow nighttime live fire training of any kind until helicopter usage is approved for fighting wildfires at night. Also, there is no history of large fires starting at night due to military training.

PT183
 10 The proposed action would increase the amount
 11 of ** used weapons that have the potential for igniting
 12 the wildfire, anticipated impacts, and significant and

PT183
 The Army recognizes the potential for unmitigable significant impacts to resources in the SDEIS.

PT184
 13 unmitigable wildfire impacts **. Most fire ** files
 14 for MMR and PTA are incomplete and were primarily
 15 retained as many records which were destroyed after
 16 five years. So you can see what happens here and share
 17 the wildfire thing. That probably -- that won't be
 18 reported because wildfires -- you know, it's started by
 19 the military and **. Potential wildfires.

PT184
 The potential impacts from military training associated with the proposed action is fully described in Section 4.14 of the EIS.

PT185
 20 Use of weapons with a high potential to cause
 21 wildfires. ES-40 would increase potential wildfire
 22 ignition beyond the Army's military to adequately
 23 manage the resources of ignition.

PT185
 Although the Army recognizes the potential for unmitigable significant impacts as a result of wildfire ignition, Section 4.14 of the EIS details mitigations the Army has recommended for consideration that may help reduce the severity of significant impacts. In addition, the Army has hired a wildfire manager for O'ahu as required in the Integrated Wildfire Management Plan and 2007 BO. In addition, the Army has also hired a 20-man wildfire strike crew, the only one of its kind in Hawai'i

PT186
 24 Hazardous material for ES-104. Maneuver,
 25 training activities at WPAA. ** explosive residues to

PT186
 You are correct. The mistake has been corrected in the EIS. There should be no explosive residues at WPAA from the proposed action.

Comments

Responses

| | | | |
|-------|--|--|---|
| PT186 | 14 | 1 soils. | <p>PT186 You are correct. The mistake has been corrected in the EIS. There should be no explosive residues at WPAA from the proposed action.</p> |
| | | 2 ES-122, training at WPAA. The proposed | |
| | | 3 action would involve simulated rather than live | |
| | | 4 artillery fire. The Army has also said there would be | |
| | | 5 no Stryker live-fire at WPAA. Where would the | |
| | | 6 explosive residues come from? | |
| PT187 | | 7 ES-24. The risk due to the explosive and | <p>PT187 Overall, the sum of the carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic risks, based on the available soil sampling data and using the PRGs to estimate risk, is less than the EPA threshold for worker exposure. It is unlikely that troop exposures to RDX or other chemicals on the ranges would be similar to worker exposures in an industrial setting. For example, workers are assumed to ingest 100 milligrams of soil per day, 250 days per year for 25 years. This assumption over-estimates troop exposures, because troops are likely to be exposed only temporarily, and only for short durations.</p> <p>Also, no public contact with these soils will occur.</p> |
| | 8 contaminated soils by soldiers would be low. | | |
| PT188 | | 9 4-217 to 218. There is little or no risk | <p>PT188 Although DU is slightly radioactive and is considered a toxic metal, such as nickel and lead, a wide range of governmental and independent non-governmental bodies have studied the environmental effects of DU for decades and indicate that the health risks associated with DU exposures are low. Uranium is a naturally occurring heavy metal that is mildly radioactive. Humans and animals have always ingested particles of this naturally occurring substance from the air, water and soil.</p> |
| | 10 from DU. | | |
| PT189 | | 11 Cultural resources, ES-29 and 30. | <p>PT189 The Army recognizes the potential for unmitigable significant impacts to resources in the SDEIS.</p> |
| | | 12 Significant impacts would result in decreased ** access | |
| | | 13 to ATI in archeological sites with potential damage to | |
| | | 14 landscapes, shrines, and burials. Hm. This damage | |
| | | 15 includes soldiers, during training exercise, tampering | |
| | | 16 some resources, damage resulting from the ground troop | |
| | | 17 presence, and ammunition grounds damaging resources | |
| | | 18 with greater magnitude for PTA actions. Future access | |
| | | 19 and cultural use of any Hawaiian ** would be | |
| | | 20 restricted. | |
| PT190 | | 21 So what he's telling me here is that we have | <p>PT190 The Army is completely aware of the significance of the cultural resources which are located underground at PTA and the relationship of the shrines above ground with the resources below. In an effort to get a better understanding of these below ground resources we have partnered with the community to map these underground tube systems and identify the resources which they contain.</p> |
| | | 22 to be careful. These shrines are not shrines for | |
| | | 23 something that's on the top. I'm going to start again. | |
| | | 24 It's not shrines that's something that's on top. They | |
| | | 25 are shrines of something that's underneath. So when | |

Comments

Responses

PT190

15

1 you fire something and you hit the underneath, you're
 2 destroying what's underneath. That's what it is. So
 3 they have the heiaus and all the different parts of the
 4 heiaus. It's all what's underneath, and that's what
 5 you don't know about, and we cannot tell you, but you
 6 must listen. And that's why I want to tell you over
 7 here first so you folks know what you are doing to our

PT190

The Army is completely aware of the significance of the cultural resources which are located underground at PTA and the relationship of the shrines above ground with the resources below. In an effort to get a better understanding of these below ground resources we have partnered with the community to map these underground tube systems and identify the resources which they contain.

PT191

8 land. Each and every time you fire any kind of weapon,
 9 whatever that be, a Hauser**, 105s, if they still
 10 using that. I was able to use it. It blow up
 11 everything.

PT191

Table 2-5 lists a comparison of weapons systems proposed for use under each alternative in the SDEIS.

12 You cannot really cause any disturbance to
 13 the land. Makua is calling, is telling you make a
 14 change. ** Look where you're walking. Even to be on
 15 the ground, we need to go to protocol. You will now
 16 learn the protocol. Each and every one that walks onto
 17 that property needs to learn the protocol. Hawaiians
 18 practice it; you will practice it. No difference. You
 19 need to learn the protocol. If you're going to be on
 20 the land and you're going to do something there, you
 21 need to know what is pono, and what you're doing is not
 22 pono; so you're going to be walking inside of there,
 23 you need to make and -- establish yourself so that you
 24 be pono. See, that's some of the things that's really
 25 coming to me.

Comments

Responses

16

1 She's telling me that we have one minute to
2 go. Okay.

PT192

3 For ES-139, because of the impact areas on **
4 surveys for listed ** cannot be conducted over time and
5 all land -- tree, land ** inhabited with the impact
6 area will be lost.
7 Impacts to the Hawaiian, that and another
8 species has occurred. Potential impacts on certain
9 species are unknown. Invasive plant species pose a
10 threat to listed species and habitat will then the
11 troops on equipment, construction sites will be **
12 destruction of species. This impacts with a
13 significant and not mitigable to less than significant.

PT192

The passage the commenter is reading is unrecognizable. After searching the SDEIS thoroughly the Army was unable to find specific reference to any of the identified phrases relevant to each other.

Also, the executive summary only encompasses 56 pages.

Finally, the Army recognizes the potential for unmitigable significant impacts to resources in the SDEIS.

PT193

14 Noise is another aspect. 4-45, ** noise
15 standards are not unacceptable because the training
16 activity noise is generated by mobile and not
17 stationary sources.

PT193

Page 4-45, Section 4.5.3 Summary of Impacts, actually states, "As described in Section 3.5.3, Hawai'i's community noise standards are not applicable to the Proposed Action because training activity noise is generated by mobile and not stationary sources. Impulse blast noise may occasionally range from 80 to 130 dBP on the beach, generating a startling short-term impact for humans and wildlife."

PT194

18 4-59, residents of the area continue to --
19 continue complaints about low-flying aircraft,
20 helicopters.

PT194

The Army's full assessment of noise from aircraft operations is found in Section 4.5.

PT195

21 Unexploded ordnance, ES-8. You're going to
22 have to take this prior to range construction at PTA.

PT195

The range boundaries of the PTA alternative (Alternative 4) are located entirely within the impact Area. Clearance of unexploded ordnance would be necessary to ensure the safety of personnel during the range construction phase.

23 Although I see you folks -- you say that you
24 come here to **. You got Honolulu and you got Hawaii.
25 I'm not too sure if this group has gone to Maui.

Comments

Responses

17

1 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: No.
 2 REYNOLDS KAMAKAWIWOOLE: No.
 3 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: It's not part of the
 4 public hearing.
 5 REYNOLDS KAMAKAWIWOOLE: Okay. And because
 6 of that, I'm saying that it's an unjust state to the
 7 people of Maui. What happens here and what happens at
 8 Makua is a direct correlation to hale ahua*. The
 9 kahunas tell you what it is about.**

10 I'm just saying that to you that, Colonel --
 11 that the Army needs to know -- the Army really needs to
 12 study what is sacred here, and the Army needs to know
 13 that we have a responsibility as Hawaiians to make sure
 14 you, as a tenant, comes here to do your work, knows the
 15 right thing to do, so that you won't constantly be in
 16 trouble.

17 I share this because my ancestors tell me not
 18 to let things continue to go on as this goes on. Our
 19 Tutu Pele present time showing her explosions, showing
 20 her feelings about what's going on here, and showing
 21 how much respect the people in the world is having in
 22 this. ** no respect.

23 And so what I'm saying is that we need to
 24 change, and I'm hoping that this here will help you
 25 change and find out, and work with the kahunas, work

PT196

PT196

The Army derived its basis for the archaeological and cultural resource analysis from site specific baseline reports from cultural resource firms with extensive local experience, as well as from oral histories, public meetings and interested individuals. In addition, the Army encouraged the public and Native Hawaiians to share their knowledge of resources and incorporated this information into the EIS. The Army continues to work with the community to identify the sacred sites and sacred landscapes at PTA. If you wish to be involved with this effort we invite you to join the PTA advisory committee.

Comments

Responses

PT196

18

1 with the people, work with the kahunas, because they
 2 will teach you the right way. Because the Army know
 3 that we going to continue to train and we cannot do
 4 much.
 5 Thank you very much. Mahalo.

6 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: Mahalo.

7 Is there any more testimony?

8 SHANNON RUDOLPH: I would like to say a
 9 couple more things, if I can.

10 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: And someone just came
 11 into the room. Are you testifying tonight?

12 SHANNON RUDOLPH: And I just wanted to say a
 13 little bit more about Uranium. In Hanford -- the
 14 Hanford Reservation in Washington state, they said that
 15 the contamination of Uranium wasn't as bad as they
 16 thought, but now they've just figured out that the
 17 plume -- that Uranium plume into the groundwater is
 18 three times worse than they thought it was originally.
 19 They've just figured that out. And that really
 20 concerns me about the Depleted Uranium in Hawaii that
 21 may be going into the groundwater.

PT197

22 Now, they say it's not, but I don't believe
 23 them; so I wanted to talk about the background
 24 radiation from the research that I have done in --
 25 before the 1900s, background radiation in the

PT196

The Army derived its basis for the archaeological and cultural resource analysis from site specific baseline reports from cultural resource firms with extensive local experience, as well as from oral histories, public meetings and interested individuals. In addition, the Army encouraged the public and Native Hawaiians to share their knowledge of resources and incorporated this information into the EIS. The Army continues to work with the community to identify the sacred sites and sacred landscapes at PTA. If you wish to be involved with this effort we invite you to join the PTA advisory committee.

PT197

Natural background levels have increased worldwide from those before the 1900s primarily due to atmospheric weapons testing. Current Army activities are not increasing these levels.

Comments

Responses

PT197

19

1 atmosphere was about 4 or 5, and now it's about 20. So
 2 the radiation in the atmosphere has gone up, and it's
 3 not entirely from the sun; it's from what we've done.
 4 And that really concerns me.

PT197

Natural background levels have increased worldwide from those before the 1900s primarily due to atmospheric weapons testing. Current Army activities are not increasing these levels.

PT198

5 And what also concerns me as far as nuclear
 6 testing in the Pacific Islands, for a long time, the
 7 military said, "There's nothing to worry about. Just
 8 cover your eyes, and you won't be harmed." But I know
 9 a lot of people that were there -- that are grandkids
 10 of guys that were there that are harmed, and they're
 11 still having grandkids today born with blisters from
 12 head to toe.

13 My friend just had a grandbaby born, and the
 14 mutagenic effect throughout the generations of her
 15 family is still going on. The testing that they did at
 16 Kiritamati, Christmas Island, it took them -- the
 17 military down there, British government, 50 years to
 18 say sorry to those people. And now we have the
 19 Marshallees' island. Marshallees have moved down into
 20 South Point. They have relocated them there, and they
 21 can't go home again because their land is poisoned
 22 forever; so they moved to Big Island.

23 And, also, for a long time, the military said
 24 that there was no harm with the nuclear testing there
 25 and the Uranium and different -- Plutonium and

PT198

Nuclear testing is outside the scope of this EIS.

Comments

Responses

PT198

20

1 different toxins involved with those tests, but
 2 finally -- just like Agent Orange -- finally, they
 3 started admitting that, yes, it was a danger, even
 4 though they denied it for a long time; and a lot of
 5 people think that they may have known about it, but
 6 just didn't tell.

7 And now there's 400,000 Americans that are
 8 getting disability checks that were atomic veterans,
 9 and many of the South Pacific Islanders are getting
 10 those checks, too. Now, just like Orange, it took them
 11 a long, long, long time to admit that, and they stalled
 12 and they drug their feet.

13 So I just wanted to say about Uranium in
 14 Hawaii, I'm really concerned about it because I think
 15 it's -- it's worse than what we're hearing.

16 So, again, guys, you got to clean up your
 17 act. Thank you.

18 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: Is there any more
 19 testimony? So that's it for tonight.

20 Because the notices have gone out that the
 21 public hearings will be until 9:30 -- were scheduled
 22 from 7:00 to 9:30, personnel will be around for a
 23 little while to allow folks -- if folks are going to be
 24 coming in, we know people might think, because it's
 25 scheduled for this time, that they will be coming after

PT198

Nuclear testing is outside the scope of this EIS.

Comments

Responses

21

1 dinner or something. So personnel will be here.

2 For those of you who aren't testifying but
3 would like to hang out and talk to personnel in the
4 other room, you're invited to do that. Okay?

5 Reynolds, did you want to say more? You are
6 kind of like looking at me like --

7 REYNOLDS KAMAKAWIWOOLE: Yeah, I'm surprised.
8 I thought there was to be more discussion.

9 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: It's not a discussion
10 thing. It's not a Q-and-A thing. Yeah, it's public
11 testimony, and that's what is required by the DNS.

12 COLONEL MARGOTTA: Yeah.

13 KU'UMEHAALOHA GOMES: So if there is no more
14 testimony, then we will stop for right now, and folks
15 can interact with the Army personnel in the other room.
16 Yeah, so they are the people who can answer your
17 questions in the other room. Okay?

18 (The testimony concluded at 7:28 p.m.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Comments

Responses

22

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

I, TERI "SERAH" HOSKINS, CSR 452, do hereby
certify:

That the foregoing transcript is a true and
correct record of the oral statements taken on
October 9, 2008, at Waimea Community Center, Waimea, Hawaii;

That said oral statements were taken by me
stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting
under my supervision.

Dated this 29th day of October, 2008.

TERI "SERAH" HOSKINS, RMR, CSR #452