

## Comments

8

## Responses

1           FACILITATOR AMARAL: The comment period remains  
2 open until September 21st so further comments are still  
3 being accepted and can be placed into the formal record.  
4 They can be transmitted either via snail mail or fax or  
5 e-mail. At the entrance you should have seen someone  
6 there with sign-in sheets. Dawn also has available the  
7 sheet that would give the information on how to fax or  
8 e-mail the material you'd want to turn in for the  
9 record. So you may want to take some of these comment  
10 forms home with you if you wish to make further comment.  
11 All comments are given equal weight regardless of the  
12 form that they come into this process in. So you should  
13 keep that in mind as well.

14           And should you have any questions about this  
15 process or about anything that's taking place here we  
16 invite you to see Mr. Gary Shirakata towards the back of  
17 the room. He's the fellow with the raised hand and the  
18 aloha shirt. He's with the Army Corps of Engineers.  
19 Gary is coordinating this and he can probably answer any  
20 questions you have.

21           If you wish to speak today we ask you to please  
22 go back to the sign-in table and to let Dawn know that  
23 you wish to speak. And cards are prepared and they are  
24 then given to myself and my co-facilitator, that's  
25 Kuumea Aloha Gomes, and we call the names from the cards

## Comments

9

## Responses

1 that are submitted to us.

2           The role of the facilitator, quite frankly, is  
3 to monitor testimony for time. We have to be out of  
4 here by six o'clock this evening. We want to give  
5 everyone the opportunity to speak. And so we will be up  
6 here asking you if you are proceeding in a very lengthy  
7 loquacious way to try to summarize. We'll give you  
8 little cards that will tell you, you know, you have two  
9 minutes, and then one minute, and then we request that  
10 you stop. We hope that you will grant the facilitators  
11 the courtesies, and we do not intend to be rude to you,  
12 we simply want to provide an opportunity for all people  
13 to be able to speak.

14           The other role of the facilitator is to monitor  
15 for conduct. We assume that everyone comes in here with  
16 a good heart and with respect and that we all treat one  
17 another with respect. And so that's what we're watching  
18 for as well. It doesn't matter whether we agree or  
19 disagree with the things that are uttered in this  
20 microphone and going into the record, what does matter  
21 is that everyone has an opportunity to be heard and that  
22 their mana'o is taken for what it is intended, their  
23 sincere utterance and beliefs on these issues.

24           So we ask that you consider every testimony in  
25 the manner within which it is given, with sincerity, and

## Comments

10

1 that you treat all speakers with respect. We ask that  
2 you not interrupt them, that you not make rude comments.  
3 And that's what we're here to watch for also.

4           Beyond that I think, oh, I try to remember,  
5 well, I will call the names of people so that the court  
6 stenographer gets the name on the record. If I forget  
7 can you remember to say your name before speaking if I  
8 haven't said your name. We're going to stop at the top  
9 of the hour each time in order to allow the court  
10 stenographers to change and the cameraman to change his  
11 tape and all of us to stretch our legs. As I said  
12 earlier we are here until six o'clock and then we're  
13 pau. So we're going to try to keep on schedule and keep  
14 on time.

15           The first speaker, the first three speakers,  
16 quite frankly, have requested to be put first because  
17 they must leave early. And so we are accommodating  
18 them. Oh, okay. So we're going to accommodate whatever  
19 adjustments you ask us to make, we're going to try to  
20 allow you to speak first if you have to leave early or  
21 make whatever accommodation you need.

22           So the first four speakers have been given to me  
23 as people who may proceed even though you may have  
24 signed up before them. The first speaker is a former  
25 Trustee of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, in fact the

PACIFIC REPORTING SERVICES UNLIMITED (808) 524-7778

## Responses

## Comments

11

## Responses

1 mother of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, a respected  
2 community leader, and that is Aunty Frenchy DeSoto.

3 Aunty Frenchy?

4 MS. DeSOTO: Hi, Bill, I love you. Is Peggy all  
5 right?

6 MR. PATY: Yes, thank you.

7 MS. DeSOTO: Mana'o'i'o.

8 (Speaking in Hawaiian.)

9 I share some of my makaukau with you. These  
10 three hearings, dog and pony shows as they are, no fault  
11 of yours.

12 So you know who I am, I'm not Hawaiian because  
13 the United States congress says I'm Hawaiian, or  
14 Hawaiian Homes upon examination with a dipstick said so,  
15 I am a Native because I am a descendant of Natives and  
16 can prove it.

17 Today I bring documents proving who I am all the  
18 way back to 1645. That's as far as I can go. I also am  
19 one-half German. My father was German. So attempts to  
20 lead you to believe that the anger and frustration you  
21 have heard is just anti-haole rhetoric is asinine and  
22 ludicrous. The issue continues to be your EIS and its  
23 failure and its threats. Hewa ki'i.

24 My culture is alive, living and flourishing.  
25 Allegations that my culture is no more, as alleged, is a

## Comments

12

## Responses

1 pathetic admission that their ipu wai is empty or piha.  
2 (Speaking Hawaiian.) Kuleana given to me by my kupuna,  
3 Kahiko, is to malama ka aina. Why? So that our ohua  
4 will flourish.

5           Why try to make a difference? Our people have  
6 said since the abuse began, and I quote, "Ua mau ke ea o  
7 ka aina i ka pono," end quote. "The life of the land is  
8 perpetuated in righteousness." To turn our backs on the  
9 warnings of the kupuna is the same as cutting our own  
10 throats or the throats of our ohua. Or allowing others  
11 to do so. 'E miki oe ku.

12           The efforts to continue this charade tires us,  
13 frustrates us, humiliates and angers us. We have no  
14 money to analyze your 50 pounds of whatever that is,  
15 especially since you have paid thousands to have it done  
16 and complete as it is.

17           The reasons for expansion is nothing more than  
18 military greed and reflects the capitalistic culture  
19 much alive today. If it looks like a duck, walks like a  
20 duck, it's got to be a duck. I learned that in English  
21 standard school.

22           You know, I wanted to talk about when I was  
23 invited earlier to a talk story session that really  
24 wasn't a talk story session, it was a presentation of  
25 information, and then later it was called a dance with

## Comments

13

## Responses

1 the public or whatever that word is. So when I'm  
2 invited to talk story it's not what is being presented  
3 as talk story. You got to ask the oldtimers what they  
4 mean talk story. You sit down eyeball to eyeball.

5 (Speaking Hawaiian.) Mahalo.

6 FACILITATOR AMARAL: Mahalo. As we had  
7 indicated, because of the number of speakers that will  
8 come up the facilitators will set rules with respect to  
9 time limits in presentations. We'd like to try to limit  
10 presenters to five to 10 minutes if possible. And so  
11 we're up here and we're passing notes to speakers often  
12 asking them to summarize.

13 We have been asked, however, to make some  
14 accommodation for David Henkin, the next presenter. Not  
15 only does David have to leave early but his presentation  
16 will take a little longer than normal. So I will watch  
17 for time and remind him as it gets beyond the 15 minutes  
18 he has requested.

19 So David Henkin is the next speaker.

20 MR. HENKIN: Aloha kakou. I am David Henkin.  
21 I'm an attorney at Earthjustice. And when I was here on  
22 Tuesday night I was told that on Saturday we did not  
23 have to leave at six p.m. and that therefore people  
24 should come prepared to express their views more fully  
25 than they were allowed to do on Tuesday night.

## Comments

14

1 I'm going to try to stay to the point. But I do  
 2 think that an important part of having public hearings  
 3 as opposed to only written comment is that others get to  
 4 hear the mana'o that others share, so that hopefully it  
 5 can provoke additional thoughts that will help the  
 6 Army's analysis. So I'm going to try and keep it to the  
 7 point but don't appreciate the constraints that have  
 8 been placed on this meeting.

9 On Tuesday night I discussed the facts regarding  
 10 the Army's historic use of Makua, both in the period  
 11 from 1988 to 1998, when it ceased using it on a regular  
 12 basis, and then in the last seven years where it has  
 13 only trained with live fire 26 times. That's all  
 14 branches of the military, including non-Army units.

15 One thing that I failed to point out on Tuesday  
 16 that I think bears some emphasis is that up until 1995  
 17 there were three Army brigades stationed in Hawaii. In  
 18 1995 the first brigade was moved to Fort Lewis. So when  
 19 you look at the figures for utilization of Makua for  
 20 training from 1988 to '95 recognize that there was  
 21 one-half again as many soldiers or brigades stationed  
 22 here in Hawaii.

23 And despite that fact in 1988 the Army used  
 24 Makua for training only on 98 days; in '89, 86 days;  
 25 '90, 160 days; '91, 104 days; '92, 106 days; '93, 140

PACIFIC REPORTING SERVICES UNLIMITED (808) 524-7778

## Responses

T42-1

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. Using historical data to assess future needs is faulty logic. 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.

While units have been assessed in the past as ready for combat without conducting live-fire training exercises at MMR, the lack of live-fire training at MMR reduces a unit's readiness level and increases the potential for casualties, as the Army is forced to undertake work-arounds. The lack of a home-based live-fire training range also has an impact on Soldier morale because more time is spent away from family, which in turn affects performance and readiness.

Further as set forth in the Draft EIS, MMR is intended to be used by other military branches, and, therefore, the number of exercises represents the maximum to be undertaken.

T42-1

## Comments

15

## Responses

T42-1

1 days; '94, 107 days, and then '95, 101 days. None of  
2 these training totals, whether it was with three  
3 brigades or two brigades or all of the military combined  
4 anywhere approaches the 242 days of training that the  
5 Army now proposes to conduct at Makua. It's important  
6 that the Army and the public bear in mind that we have  
7 never seen this level of training at Makua.

8 Today I'm going to focus on the alternatives  
9 analysis and its deficiencies because the alternatives  
10 analysis lies at the core of an environmental impact  
11 statement. Because that's where the Army and the public  
12 and elected officials have an opportunity to see the  
13 different ways that the Army could accomplish its goals.  
14 And it is the place where you have an opportunity to  
15 evaluate whether there are alternatives out there that  
16 could accomplish the Army's goals with fewer impacts on  
17 the environment.

18 So this is not a question of whether it's going  
19 to happen in Waianae's backyard at Makua as opposed to  
20 somewhere else, it's not a question of shifting the same  
21 burden around, it's a question of doing an objective  
22 analysis as to whether there are other ways to  
23 accomplish the goals that would overall impose less  
24 environmental harm. In that regard I don't mean any  
25 disrespect to those who believe that no level of Army

## Comments

16

1 training is appropriate in Hawaii when I suggest  
 2 alternatives that would involve training elsewhere.  
 3           It's important in the environmental impact  
 4 statement to provide this comparative analysis of all  
 5 reasonable alternatives so that everyone can see whether  
 6 the Army has made a wise choice. And that by necessity,  
 7 because of the definition of the undertaking, involves  
 8 consideration of alternate locations for training. It  
 9 is not Earthjustice's intent to advocate any level of  
 10 training in Hawaii or any training at any particular  
 11 location, but that's just what the document needs to do.

12           The first thing is the analysis of the no-action  
 13 alternative is completely deficient. The no-action  
 14 alternative is meant to be a baseline against which the  
 15 Army would measure any of its proposals for action. The  
 16 no-action alternative is supposed to reflect what is  
 17 currently the environmental status quo.

T42-2 18           The no-action alternative, however, in this  
 19 document is not the environmental status quo because it  
 20 calls for radically reducing the level of environmental  
 21 protection that the Army is currently carrying out at  
 22 Makua. If you look at page 2-8 it says "There would be  
 23 at most one full-time employee, a decrease from the  
 24 current staff of 14. Maintaining the fuel breaks would  
 25 be the only maintenance activities conducted. No

## Responses

T42-2

The Draft EIS accurately represents the level of management that the Army expects to provide in the absence of training at MMR. The level of management and onsite staff is directly related to the level of activity at MMR. If no training or other activities are planned, there would be no need for permanent staff, and the management activities would be greatly reduced.

## Comments

17

## Responses

1 integrated training area management projects would be  
2 conducted. And there would be implementation of minimum  
3 measures from the integrated wildland fire management  
4 plan."

5 In other words, they would start from a current  
6 level of environmental protection at Makua that's up  
7 here, and reduce it way down to the bare minimum, the  
8 bare bones, and I would suggest even below the bare  
9 bones of what is responsible so that they can exaggerate  
10 in the EIS what the effects would be of not training at  
11 Makua.

12 So you end up with the paradoxical result that  
13 eliminating all live-fire training at Makua, which is a  
14 major source of fires, 270 in the 1990s alone, including  
15 major wildfires, and when I talk about training-related  
16 fires it's not just from live fire it's from the  
17 controlled burns and the other activities that they  
18 conduct to allow them to do live fire.

19 So getting rid of all of that will actually pose  
20 a serious, a significant impact to biological resources  
21 at Makua. So getting rid of the fire producing activity  
22 will actually harm the environment according to this  
23 EIS, because they get rid of all of their firefighters  
24 and all of their efforts to control fires and basically  
25 abandon the place. That's not the no-action

T42-2

## Comments

18

## Responses

1 alternative.

2           The no-action alternative would be maintaining  
3 your current level of activities there and then  
4 comparing that with adding the layer of training on top.  
5 You would have to do an environmental impact statement  
6 to change the environmental status quo from what you are  
7 currently doing to this radically reduced level of  
8 protection. You would have to do that. So that's not a  
9 no-action alternative for this EIS.

T42-2

10           And if you're going to propose such a radical  
11 reduction in your stewardship obligations you need to do  
12 that against the backdrop of your other legal  
13 responsibilities. Your responsibilities to implement  
14 your integrated natural resource management plans under  
15 the Sykes Act, your responsibilities under the  
16 Endangered Species Act, Section 7, to conserve  
17 endangered species, and avoid pushing them to  
18 extinction. You can't just say we're going to abandon  
19 the whole place and that's the baseline against which  
20 you measure your training. You would need to do a  
21 full-on environmental impact statement in order to  
22 change the -- in order to change the environmental  
23 status quo.

T42-3

24           So if you wanted to do that what you should be  
25 doing is examining a realistic appraisal of what really

T42-3

Because future disposal of the property is not proposed at this time and identifying subsequent uses would be highly speculative, those actions are not considered components of the No Action Alternative.

## Comments

19

## Responses

T42-3 1 would happen if the Army left Makua. Because what  
 2 really would happen if you left Makua and stopped  
 3 training there is not one staff person sitting around  
 4 maintaining the fire break roads. You would be  
 5 accessing that property to the Fish & Wildlife Service  
 6 or to the State of Hawaii or the people of Hawaii to do  
 7 something productive and beneficial with it, which would  
 8 involve management of those resources, protection of  
 9 those resources.

T42-2 10 . So if you really want to go there and talk about  
 11 a change to the environmental status quo you have to be  
 12 honest about it. Because an EIS does not fulfill its  
 13 function if it distorts the comparison of costs and  
 14 benefits.

T42-4 15 From what we talked about on Tuesday you also  
 16 need to take a serious look at whether you can in fact  
 17 accomplish your training goals without Makua. In other  
 18 words, whether the no-action alternative really is the  
 19 best choice when you look at the environment, the people  
 20 of this island and the military's needs. Because if you  
 21 look at your historic use of Makua, and in particular  
 22 how you've been getting by and waging wars the last  
 23 seven years without Makua, perhaps the honest response  
 24 is that it's really not that necessary after all.

25 And so the no-action alternative should go and

T42-4

Training requirements are constantly changing based on lessons learned in combat, training events, new equipment, and new commanders. Using historical data to assess future needs is faulty logic. Times of war, such as now, drastically change training requirements. While units have been assessed in the past as ready for combat without conducting live-fire training exercises at MMR, the Army was forced to undertake training work-arounds to include training at locations outside of the state of Hawaii. These work arounds were both time consuming and costly. Additionally, 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.

## Comments

20

T42-4 1 be beyond something that is merely a benchmark against  
2 which you judge what you really want to do. And it  
3 should be something seriously considered as a reasonable  
4 outcome of your decision making process.

5 But if you do conclude that you need to conduct  
6 some additional level of training you need to do an  
7 honest appraisal of how much training and where.

8 And let me break that down. First, how much  
9 training? As we've seen in the last ten years that you  
10 used Makua never have you trained 242 days a year as you  
T42-5 11 now propose. You should be looking at an alternative  
12 that is not what you say is alternative one, two and  
13 three, which basically is more training than we've ever  
14 done at Makua, alternative one; yet more training,  
15 alternative two, including weapon systems tracers we  
16 haven't used since 1998 because of their fire risk; and  
17 even more training with more fire producing weapons,  
18 which is alternative three.

19 You should be looking at an alternative within  
20 your range of alternatives that actually reflects  
21 historic use of Makua. Or if you're not going to do  
22 that you need to put out for the public's information  
T42-6 23 some analysis that justifies how you came up with 242  
24 days of training, why that is something that you  
25 actually need to do.

PACIFIC REPORTING SERVICES UNLIMITED (808) 524-7778

## Responses

T42-5

Training requirements are constantly changing based on lessons learned in combat, training events, new equipment, and new commanders. Using historical data to assess future needs is faulty logic. 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. Moreover, based on the Standards in Training Commission (STRAC) requirements for the 25th Infantry Division (Light) and training requirements for other military units, the estimated types of training and amount of training are reasonable and feasible for MMR.

During the period in question, many additional training events were actually conducted during those years. These events involved primarily platoon events. The EIS now explains how many events of different types can be expected to occur at MMR. It is important to note that since 1998, the training requirements of units have changed because of their changing missions and evolving doctrine. In addition, the Stryker Brigade's use of Makua is limited and is discussed in Chapter 2.

T42-6

Please see response to Comment T42-5].

## Comments

21

## Responses

T42-5

1           So in terms of the amount of training that's  
2 done look at no action seriously, and if you need some  
3 additional training really look honestly at how much  
4 more and with what weapon systems. Because you haven't  
5 trained with tracers or tow missiles or rockets at Makua  
6 since 1998. You abandoned them then because of their  
7 fire producing potential. You need to seriously look at  
8 whether you need them.

9           As far as where you're going to do the training,  
10 the EIS as it's currently written makes it a foregone  
11 conclusion that if you do need to do more training  
12 you're going to do it at Makua. And what that's telling  
13 the world, what that's telling the people in this room  
14 and the people of Hawaii, is that there is no other  
15 location that could possibly realistically accommodate  
16 the type of training that you're talking about.

T42-7

17           And I'm not saying the ideal location, because  
18 NEPA tells agencies that you need to look at things that  
19 are other than your preferred alternative, other than  
20 what you believe to be the best possible way of  
21 addressing the problem. So that you can look creatively  
22 to see if other things that may be slightly less than  
23 perfect can reasonably accomplish your goals, or at  
24 least most of them, at much less environmental and  
25 cultural cost.

PACIFIC REPORTING SERVICES UNLIMITED (808) 524-7778

T42-7

The EIS considered other alternatives in Section 2.5. The EIS now includes evaluation of an alternative in which training proposed for MMR would be conducted at the Pohakuloa Training Area, island of Hawaii (See Chapter 2 for a description of this alternative). This alternative was added in response to public comments received on the Draft EIS. Use of MMR, however, remains the preferred alternative.

## Comments

22

T42-8

1           When you went out with scoping you told the  
 2 public that you were going to look at realigning base --  
 3 realigning facilities at Schofield Barracks in order to  
 4 accommodate the type of training that you had previously  
 5 done at Makua. And you hinted to the public that with  
 6 the incoming hundreds of millions of dollars for Stryker  
 7 conversion that you would use that money to realign the  
 8 ranges at Schofield, so that you could do the training  
 9 that you used to do at Makua over at Schofield and thus  
 10 consolidate your holdings, consolidate your footprint,  
 11 eliminate the impacts on resources at Makua.

12           Suddenly that has completely disappeared and I  
 13 want to know why. There is an exchange, and this is in  
 14 your training binder from the last round of litigation,  
 15 Tab 35, an exchange between John Gallup, your  
 16 consultant, and Major Allen Paty and Mark Schleming at  
 17 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. And there was an exchange  
 18 about how long it would take to build an alternate CCAAC  
 19 site at Schofield Barracks. And the answer was that  
 20 including all of the design funds and the planning and  
 21 everything else it would take two years. So at least in  
 22 2001 you thought it was possible to move things around  
 23 and build a new facility at Schofield and that's what  
 24 you told us in 2002 at scoping.

25           And now all of a sudden that alternative is not

PACIFIC REPORTING SERVICES UNLIMITED (808) 524-7778

## Responses

T42-8

While the MMR and SBCT projects were designed so either one could be implemented independently of the other, SBCT forces may use MMR if the ranges are available after completion of the MMR EIS and ROD. Accordingly, the MMR EIS contains an analysis of the potential environmental impacts associated with dismantled CALFEXs for current forces and the SBCT forces. See Chapter 5.

## Comments

23

1 only not a preferred alternative but it's not even an  
 2 alternative that gets complete analysis. It gets  
 3 rejected off the bat. And I want to know why. And I  
 4 want to know if the answer to that question is because  
 5 your decision to proceed with Stryker training precluded  
 6 changing the configuration of ranges at Schofield to  
 7 accommodate training for Makua. And if that's the  
 8 reason, that Stryker has precluded you considering  
 9 moving training from Makua I want to know why the  
 10 Stryker EIS you did not look at the indirect effect on  
 11 Makua of deciding to do Stryker conversion here in  
 12 Hawaii. Because that is an indirect impact if you have  
 13 to train at Makua because of Stryker.

T42-9

14 I have the same questions for Pohakuloa, because  
 15 the EIS suggests that you cannot rearrange your training  
 16 at Pohakuloa because it's being bumped by Stryker  
 17 training. Is that true? Is that why you cannot build  
 18 or even consider building at Pohakuloa? And, if so, why  
 19 was that not discussed in the Stryker EIS as an indirect  
 20 impact?

T42-10

21 Also with respect to Pohakuloa you say you can't  
 22 do training off of the island of Oahu, and this would go  
 23 to any other island in the state, because of the time of  
 24 transporting soldiers. Well, the Army is now planning  
 25 to bring, I believe it is, 12 of these Spearhead, what

T42-11

## Responses

T42-9

Because the actions proposed for MMR and as part of Stryker Transformation are not connected, the EISs prepared for those projects also are not connected. These projects were designed so either one could be implemented independent of the other.

T42-10

The EIS considered other alternatives in Section 2.5. The EIS now includes evaluation of an alternative in which training proposed for MMR would be conducted at the Pohakuloa Training Area, island of Hawaii (See Chapter 2 for a description of this alternative). This alternative was added in response to public comments received on the Draft EIS. Use of MMR, however, remains the preferred alternative.

T42-11

Please see response to comment T42-10

## Comments

24

## Responses

1 are they, 700-ton theater support vessel 1X Spearheads,  
2 which could carry soldiers from Pearl Harbor to  
3 Pohakuloa in seven hours.

4 To my mind it is a reasonable alternative to add  
5 a day to the, what is it, I believe it's one CALFEX that  
6 each company needs to do each year. So is the Army  
7 telling the public that it is unreasonable even to look  
8 at transporting a company and adding a day on either  
9 side to get it over to Pohakuloa rather than to do it  
10 here on Oahu? And why is that? Why is that so  
11 unreasonable, so beyond the pale, that it won't even be  
12 analyzed in this EIS? Because you could use those seven  
13 hours aboard that ship for classroom lecturing, for  
14 getting ready for the mission, for after-action review.  
15 That could be useful time when all the soldiers are on  
16 board with all of their weapons.

17 So I want you to really let us know why it is  
18 that Pohakuloa not only is not your preferred  
19 alternative but it can't even be considered. And it  
20 can't be the terrain, because you routinely modify  
21 terrain at your facilities and at Pohakuloa. You're  
22 doing it for Stryker in order to create better training  
23 conditions by crushing the lava and such. So why won't  
24 you consider that as a replacement facility for Makua?

25 And if you do conclude that because of Stryker

T42-12

Please see response to comment T42-10

T42-11

T42-12

T42-13

## Comments

25

T42-13

1 transformation you cannot use the existing facilities at  
 2 Schofield or Pohakuloa why is it that it's not realistic  
 3 to consider purchasing another, I believe 1,400 acres is  
 4 how much you need for this training facility? Why can't  
 5 you purchase some additional land in an area that is not  
 6 as ecologically and culturally sensitive as Makua to do  
 7 your training? Again, I'm not advocating spreading the  
 8 Army's footprint. I'm just saying that you need to look  
 9 at it if you want to have an objective analysis of costs  
 10 and benefits.

11 For Stryker transformation you were willing to  
 12 spend \$16 million to buy 1,400 acres here on Oahu. You  
 13 were willing to spend \$30 million to buy 23,000 acres on  
 14 the island of Hawaii. Undoubtedly as you were doing  
 15 Stryker conversion you looked at a number of different  
 16 areas as candidates for land acquisition. You should  
 17 put those studies in front of the people of Hawaii so  
 18 that we can know why there's not another square foot of  
 19 ground other than Makua in the state where you could do  
 20 this type of training. And particularly with these  
 21 Spearhead vessels why you can't get the troops there in  
 22 an efficient and reasonable amount of time, particularly  
 23 given that all you need to do is one company level  
 24 CALFEX per year? That's why you're saying you need to  
 25 use Makua.

PACIFIC REPORTING SERVICES UNLIMITED (808) 524-7778

## Responses

T42-13  
 Army policy (for environmental reasons) is to avoid creating new  
 ordnance impact areas. Because MMR has an established impact  
 area, it is more environmentally sound to conduct live-fire train-  
 ing there than to acquire land elsewhere and convert it to a train-  
 ing facility.