

8.1.4 ORAL COMMENT DOCUMENTS—DRAFT EIS

Individuals who commented on the Draft EIS over the phone or at a city forum in Everett, Washington, are listed in table 8.1.4-1 along with their respective commenter ID number. This number can be used to find the transcript document and each speaker's comments and to locate the corresponding table on which responses to each comment are provided.

Transcript Comments

Exhibit 8.1.4-1 presents reproductions of the oral comment documents that were received in response to the Draft EIS. Comment documents are identified by commenter ID number, and each statement or question that was categorized as addressing a separate environmental issue is designated with a sequential comment number.

Response to Transcript Comments

Table 8.1.4-2 presents the responses to substantive comments to the Draft EIS that were received in oral form. Responses to specific comments can be found by locating the corresponding commenter ID number and sequential comment number identifiers.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table 8.1.4-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Oral Comments)

Commentor and Affiliation	ID Number
Barbara Ikeda	P-O-0001
Mary Ann Gianantoni	P-O-0002
Ann McLaren	P-O-0003
David B. Johnson	P-O-0004
Susan Dougal	P-O-0005
Elliott Menashe	P-O-0006
Ty Costa	P-O-0007
Lynn Hayes	P-O-0008
Billie King	P-O-0009
Susan Kampion	P-O-0010
Karina Johnson Werner	P-O-0011
Patricia Rohan	P-O-0012
Betty Shabbington	P-O-0013
Brown	P-O-0014
Linda Edling	P-O-0015
Pam Roy	P-O-0016
Susan Cyr	P-O-0017
Laura Hartman	P-O-0018
A. T. Young	P-O-0019
Bruno	P-O-0020
Thomas Mitchell	P-O-0021
Claire Bird	P-O-0022
Gloria Chou	P-O-0023
Chou	P-O-0024
No Name Provided	P-O-0025
Carly Davenport	P-O-0026
Richard Marshall	P-O-0027
Christine Giannini	P-O-0028
Pearl Beach	P-O-0029
Beverly Bruno	P-O-0030
Timothy Webb	P-O-0031
Deloris Bustad	P-O-0032
Annette Bustad	P-O-0033
Patricia Neel	P-O-0034
Mary Davidson	P-O-0035
Jason Brasfield	P-O-0036
Claudia Elliott	P-O-0037
Jeff McCune	P-O-0038
John Vandalen	P-O-0039

Table 8.1.4-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Oral Comments Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	ID Number
Martin Schmidt	P-O-0040
Evelyn Hayes	P-O-0041
Reis	P-O-0042
Casey	P-O-0043
Sara O'Farell	P-O-0044
Charlotte Laborde	P-O-0045
No Name Provided	P-O-0046
Nena O'Neil	P-O-0047
Karen Miller	P-O-0048
Ralph Minor	P-O-0049
June Evers	P-O-0050
Mary DiJulio	P-O-0051
Janice Hartson	P-O-0052
Bernadine Casey	P-O-0053
Govedare	P-O-0054
Diane Rogers	P-O-0055
Richard Marshall	P-O-0056
Betty Elliot	P-O-0057
Harry Elliot	P-O-0058
Juanson Kim	P-O-0059
Charles R. Burdshal	P-O-0060
Michael Martin	P-O-0061
Casey	P-O-0062
June Evers	P-O-0063
Charlotte Laborde	P-O-0064
unknown unknown	P-O-0065
Nena O'Neil	P-O-0066
Karen Miller	P-O-0067
Ralph Minor	P-O-0068
David Roodzant	P-O-0069
Christine Giannini	P-O-0070
Pearl Beach	P-O-0071
John McCoy - 38th Legislative District (state representative)	P-O-0072
Richard Jones	P-O-0073
Michelle Trautman	P-O-0074
Annie Lyman	P-O-0075
Ken Taylor	P-O-0076
Elizabeth Marshall	P-O-0077
Marianne Edain	P-O-0078

Table 8.1.4-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Oral Comments Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	ID Number
Stephanie Allen	P-O-0079
Mary Jane Anderson	P-O-0080
Michelle Kermoade	P-O-0081
Doris Olivers	P-O-0082
Vernon Huffman	P-O-0083
Karen Pauley	P-O-0084
Tim Reisenauer	P-O-0085
George Newland	P-O-0086
Sean Edwards	P-O-0087
David Gladstone	P-O-0088
Deborah Wright	P-O-0089
John Flowers	P-O-0090
Marion Skalley	P-O-0091
Melinda Gladstone	P-O-0092
Valerie Steel	P-O-0093
Olemara Peters	P-O-0094
Bob Jackson	P-O-0095
Bill Hawkins	P-O-0096
Maury Trautman	P-O-0097
Mike Papa	P-O-0098
Jean Burger	P-O-0099
Julian Dewell	P-O-0100
Desmond Skubi	P-O-0101
Berit Reisenauer	P-O-0102
Joe Hunziker	P-O-0103

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Message delivered: 18 Mar 03: 12:22 PM CST; 20 seconds

The name is Barbara Ikeda, it's about your SBX...whatever that is...please no more military stuff on this island...enough already...you're making us a target...we've been a target since World War II...so please, no, no...enough already...

COMMENT NUMBER
P-O-0001
1

Message delivered: 23 Mar 03: 2:36 PM CST; 51 seconds

Hello my name is Mary Ann Gianantoni...and I am a resident of Honolulu, Hawaii...and I am calling with regards to the proposal to place the SBX...the giant floating radar off Barbers Point...also called Kalaeloa here in Hawaii...and my comment is that I am very very strongly opposed to this...and I hope that it never happens...my number is... ..thank you very much.

COMMENT NUMBER
P-O-0002
1

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 23 Mar 03: 4:15 PM CST; 24 seconds</p> <p>Hello this is Ann McLaren...and I think the proposed Radar Station...it seems like its a very bad idea with a lot of potential health hazards...so I'm opposed to that proposal...thank you...</p>	<p>P-O-0003</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 6 Apr 03: 4:22 PM CST; 29 seconds</p> <p>Yes, my name is David B. Johnson. And I'd like to express my support for bringing the SBX Missile Defense Radar Platform into the Everett area. I'm a resident of Snohomish...I think it would be a good thing. I think the military presence in the northwest is eventually going turn out to be very positive for us here...thank you...My phone number is.....thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0004</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>Message delivered: 6 Apr 03: 4:12 PM CST; 3 minutes, 36 seconds</p> <p>Yes, my name is Susan Dougal, calling from Everett, Washington. My number is.... I live in Everett is close to where this new SBX and radar will be coming. We don't want it, we do not want it. Yesterday in speaking with Mr. Hasley, it seemed evident from the conversations with the group, that it was not a winner for Everett on any one of the areas of comment...health, safety, the rest of them...particularly health and safety. Now, my concern or suggestion is that one of the places that would want the thing built, should be considered, not one that has all the amenities for the government. Let's help the people. It seems from what Mr. Hasley said to me personally, that the ADAC up in Alaska, they would be grateful to have the job to build all the parts and pieces, and have it. Now to me that is a safer environment by far, less populated and all the other things. Personally, I don't want the thing at all, but if it has to be, that's a good consideration. Please, realize we do not need it in Everett...thank you. My name again, Susan Dougal...thank you. And consider ADAC, Alaska, or just keep it to the smaller range the way the papers would suggest...if you did not think it needed to go further, just keep it where it is. The kind of situation that is in your papers to provide the offer that is an alternative and I'm really for that too...no more than what we've got already...thank you.</p>	<p>COMMENT NUMBER</p> <p>P-O-0005</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 5 Apr 03: 10:38 AM CST; 54 seconds</p> <p>Hello, I'm calling to make comments on the SBX project and the Environmental Impact Statement. My name is Elliott Menashe, and I'm in Quinton, Washington...and I would like to state that from what I understand there is a definite potential threat to marine resources, there are potential health hazards, there would be enormous aesthetic impacts, noise impacts, many others...and that it would constitute a major target in a densely populated area. And from my understanding, it would be totally absurd to issue a DNS given the scope and size of the project. Thank you very much. Bye.</p>	<p>COMMENT NUMBER</p> <p>P-O-0006</p> <p>1</p>
--	--	--	--

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 7 Apr 03: 12:00 AM CST; 65 seconds</p> <p>Say, this is name is Ty Costa, Snohomish, Washington. Why at the cost of our public defense here, are we asking for an environmental statement on something that would protect us from a ballistic missile with a nuclear warhead on it and it won't come with a environmental impact statement on it. Are we asking for an environmental statement to propose this? I'm going to write a comment. I have some other questions...one question in particular, when this 20 second burst of electromagnetic field goes off, can you feel that?...i've got some real questions on that...give me a call...ask me, it's ...thank you.</p>	P-O-0007 1	<p>Message delivered: 11 Apr 03: 2:20 PM CST; 21 seconds</p> <p>My name is Lynn Hays, I'm calling from Whidbey Island, Washington. My family is completely opposed to the SBX that's proposed for Everett, Washington. I live on Whidbey and in complete view of it...and my entire neighborhood is opposed...please pay attention to what we have to say...thank you.</p>	P-O-0008 1

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 11 Apr 03: 3:02 PM CST; 59 seconds</p> <p>Hello, I understand that this is also the number that we call to protest to the SBX...this is Billie King. I have lived all my life in the city of Everett...and one of the best things about Everett is the old historic area and the views we have there and from other parts of the city of our waterfront. Our Navy does not impose on those views, and it's become a really good part of Everett...but the SBX in our harbor would really be something like having people come to Everett to look at the freak...so please put that thing somewhere else...thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0009</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 11 Apr 03: 10:56 AM CST; 40 seconds</p> <p>Hi, My name is Susan Kampion...I live on Whidbey Island...and no, no, I do not want this put in our region...these kind of...this is a dangerous thing and we really need to examine it closely...why do we only have till the 15th to comment...this is just amazing...I assume it's probably going to be pushed through without caring about what anybody thinks...and I would really like to see this not happen here...thank you...</p>	<p>P-O-0010</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 11 Apr 03: 1:03 PM CST; 59 seconds</p> <p>My name is Karina Johnson Werner...I live on Whidbey Island...and I am terribly oppose to the placing of this thing across from me...as a mother, as a therapist, as a gardener, as a human being, I fear the implication that it has. As far as I know, having gone to the meeting that was just shortly notified...is that the scoping has not been done properly...and I think you need to postpone that and get a better group on what the people here really want or don't want...and I hope that that makes a difference...the many voices that probably you would be hearing from...Karina Johnson Werner, ...I wish you a good day.</p>	<p>P-O-0011</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 10 Apr 03: 10:33 AM CST; 54 seconds</p> <p>This is Patricia Rohan...and I live in Clinton, Washington...and I want to comment on the SBX Project. I oppose the SBX radar project and all the Star Wars defense projects because they have been shown to be ineffective and I feel that our taxpayer's money can be better spent in many other ways. I am also concerned about the human and environmental health dangers that such a large magnetic radar station would create here in the Puget Sound...it is just not the place for something like this where there are so many people living...thank you.</p> <p>Message delivered: 10 Apr 03: 10:13 AM CST; 20 seconds</p> <p>Hello my name is Rohan...I would like to comment that I oppose this SBX radar project and all of the projects that go along with the Star Wars Program...they've not proven to be useful, effective...and it's a big waste of taxpayers money...thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0012</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 9 Apr 03: 6:29 PM CST; 2 minutes, 16 seconds</p> <p>My name is Betty Shabbington...I live just above the Naval Air Base...and I oppose the Department of Defense proposal to locate the SBX in Everett, Washington for a number of reasons. The possible negative impacts to human health and safety caused by receiving long term low level EM radiation has not been studied. The DoD indicates that the radiation scatter will be an issue despite its attempt to target the array so as to not irradiate the people. The size of this structure built on a converted Asian based oil drilling rig and its design for heavy industry, degrades the visual and aesthetic value of our local waterfront. Its placement would undermine the city of Everett's current and future efforts to promote economic redevelopment and attract investment in our waterfront and city corridor. The DoD has not pleased us that the potential interference to airborne navigation and commercial and communication systems, sensitive electronics, and hospital and clinic based medical diagnostic equipment. Especially unknown is the effect of the full powered test of the energy beam that much be run five to six times a week. I have little grandchildren and they come here and visit with me...and the last thing that I would ever want to even fear or consider would be any harm to the future...which is invested in my grandkids...so anything that has to do with putting something in the waterfront, clearly doesn't make any sense...you know we already have enough negative impact on our waters without having to building infrastructure out there...so I would appreciate it very much if my voice was counted and that you guys do not build...thanks...and have a good day.</p>	<p>P-O-0013</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	<p>Message delivered: 9 Apr 03: 8:14 PM CST; 62 seconds</p> <p>Last name Brown...at ..., Everett, Washington... received flyer regarding the SBX unit to be placed in or around Everett, Washington, waters. I'm opposed to this until further study has been made to advise us as to the possible problems this unit will cause in this area...I thank you...my phone number isresiding at ..., Everett, Washington...please advise...thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0014</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>Message delivered: 14 Apr 03: 10:13 AM CST; 19 seconds</p> <p>Linda Edling...and I'm suggesting that your scoping procedure was flawed and the environmental impact is inaccurate...and I think we need more time to explore this, thank you.</p>	<table border="1"><thead><tr><th>COMMENT NUMBER</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>P-O-0015</td></tr><tr><td>1</td></tr></tbody></table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0015	1	<p>Message delivered: 14 Apr 03: 6:22 PM CST; 41 seconds</p> <p>Hi, I'm calling to provide comment on a proposed SBX missile defense unit being proposed possibly for Everett, Washington...and I'm calling to voice a concern...I am oppose to the building of that in Everett for a number of reasons...it's a high density population area...and my name is Pam Roy, Everett, Washington,...., it's Monday, April 14...thank you very much...bye.</p>	<table border="1"><thead><tr><th>COMMENT NUMBER</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>P-O-0016</td></tr><tr><td>1</td></tr></tbody></table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0016	1
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-O-0015									
1									
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-O-0016									
1									

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 14 Apr 03: 4:21 PM CST; 3 minutes, 7 seconds</p> <p>Hello, my name Susan Cyr...I live on Whidbey Island, adjacent to Everett, Washington in Puget Sound. My phone number is ... and my address if you need it is ...; Langley, Washington. I'm calling to comment about the proposed SBX radar missile defense system, proposed for Puget Sound...I am very much opposed to this idea...I was opposed to it when Ronald Reagan was President...and I don't care if they are more advanced than they were at that time, I feel like that it is unsafe for the people of our community, it is a target and I believe that kind of defense is no defense at all, it is in fact more harassing to the world community than anything else...And I believe we need to invest our dollars in our children's education and in the environment and in being a presence of...a worthy presence in the world and not a bully and then we wouldn't have to worry about missile defense systems...I am very much opposed...and that was one of my sons in the background cheering...and my husband is in concurrence, his name is Craig Cyr...and again I'm very much opposed to this and if there is another period of public comment, I would like to come in person and do so...and we found out in our local newspaper on the following week that there had been a public meeting for input on Saturday the 5th of April and we found out about it after the fact...and I've worked in public information in various state and federal agencies for public comments for large public works, and things like that nature, I worked in Seattle doing that kind of communications work, and I know that sometimes the public information process is not as widely publicized as it ought to be...and I'd like to see that change...so perhaps we can start over and have another comment period...thank you very much for listening...and again, I am definitely opposed to this kind of defense, I believe it does not do anything except endanger our own people and further aggravate the world</p>	<p>P-O-0017</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<p>Message delivered: 14 Apr 03: 1:02 PM CST; 3 minutes, 14 seconds</p> <p>Yes, my name is Laura Hartman, and I live at ... , Snohomish, Washington...and I'm supplementing these comments with a email today, but I have a few questions actually to go with my comments...and that is that this program for a floating radar station seems a bit premature since we don't really have a ballistic defense system in place...and I have not been able to get the online version of the Environmental Impact Statement...and so I'm...I think that more information needs to be put out there regarding the funding source and what Congress has actually approved under the ballistic defense system...but the program budget, planning budget...I am opposed to this premature set up radar station for it's environmental hex on Puget sound...800,000 gallons of fuel, and this close to the sensitive fisheries and ecology area...is not, it's not appropriate...and the effects of radiation need to be more clearly established, not by FTC which is not authorized to claim that there...that the affects of radiation are benign, we need some input from EPA on this, which I haven't seen the environmental review, but since there has been no public review by the EPA on humans or I assume that this is similar with there being washed away...around there are known dead zones, there are known affects on birds, and it's completely an inappropriate place for an island of diesel fuel...and then there is the whole question on anti ballistic, the ballistic defense system in the first place...this close to a populated area, the radar system would act as a terrorist target, there is no guarantee that it will actually do the job its being slated for...until the defense department is further along in this whole concept, building a radar station seems to be premature...and I will be supplementing these statements in my email from.....thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0018</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 14 Apr 03: 11:44 AM CST; 55 seconds</p> <p>Hello, this A.T. Young, I live in Langley, Washington, which is right across from Everett, Washington...and I'm concerned about the SBX project because of a couple of things...one is the scattered radiation and Whidbey Island is right in line with the testing ray...it doesn't seem like there is enough known about that...and it concerns me, I think that I need a little more information to know about health affects and environmental effects about that...and also, you know I also sort of object to the fact that it has been such a short notice for us from the public hearing, to the comment period, it's very short, and you know I will do my best to keep up with it and study it, but I think this process is going too quickly and the effects is unknown...thank so much for the work you're doing...bye.</p>	<p>P-O-0019</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<p>Message delivered: 14 Apr 03: 11:25 AM CST; 47 seconds</p> <p>Yes, this is Mr. Bruno in Everett onI don't understand why you're putting such a monstrosity out there in the Bay that ruins our view and everybody else that comes up in the Grand Avenue Park to look out on the marina...when there's 65,000 other places to put this thing at...on the naval base of Whidbey Island or Port Angeles, I don't understand why you have to come in and ruin a city with something so obstructive, so I...this is my opinion against it...and I hope you can do a little more research in finding a proper place for this without ruining everybody's view and destroying property values, and etc., etc.</p>	<p>P-O-0020</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 14 Apr 03: 11:24 AM CST; 22 seconds</p> <p>Yes, first name is Thomas...Mitchell...and just calling to say that although I'm not oppose to this system, I'm oppose to having a structure that size based in the Everett vicinity...thanks...bye</p>	<p>P-O-0021</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 14 Apr 03: 11:19 AM CST; 1 minute, 7 seconds</p> <p>Hi, my name is Claire Bird...and I just want to say for myself and my family that we fully oppose the SBX...and located...possible location in Everett...Everett waterfront...for many reasons...property values, how that would affect our property values, the new development that's planned for the Everett waterfront would possibly be changed due to that, I know it would be changed...and just long term health issues as well...but mostly due to the fact that Everett has...you know...a lot of good potential and I see that as having a very negative impact on it...and we have just lovely homes just above that would overlook that and it would be very bad...so, we fully oppose that...and I just wanted to let you know, thanks...bye.</p>	<p>P-O-0022</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 14 Apr 03: 11:10 AM CST; 46 seconds</p> <p>My name is Gloria Chou...and I live on Whidbey Island, Washington across from Everett...and I'd like to register my strong opposition to the launching of the SBX. I know there are people whose health...many many people whose health would be affected very negatively...so I would like to make sure that Ms. Julia Elliott gets this message that I and many other people on Whidbey Island which faces Everett do not want this to be launched...thank you...</p>	<p>P-O-0023</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 14 Apr 03: 11:17 AM CST; 49 seconds</p> <p>Hello my last name is Chou first name (couldn't understand)...I live in Clinton on Whidbey Island, across from Everett...and I would like to leave a message for Ms. Julia Elliott...that I strongly oppose the SBX for launch in Everett. I think it has been established on the harmful affect of electromagnetic waves and radiation on soft tissues and babies, especially unborn babies...so please take this into consideration and stop it...thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0024</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 14 Apr 03: 10:13 AM CST; 22 seconds</p> <p>Yeah, I'm a citizen of the United States and I think that there needs to be public input...public input time needs to be expanded and also we need time for public input on SBX environmental impact statement needs to be redone...thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0025</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 11 Apr 03: 4:21 PM CST; 1 minute 16 seconds</p> <p>Hi, my name is Carly Davenport...I live at ..., Everett Washington...and I oppose the Department of Defense proposal to locate the SBX in Everett, Washington for a number of reasons. These are the possible negative impacts to human health and safety caused by receiving long-term low-level EM radiation...has not been fully studied...the DoD indicates that radiation scatter will be an issue despite its attempts to target the array so as to not irradiate people...the size of the structure built on a converted ocean based oil drilling rig and its design for heavy industry, degrades the visual and aesthetic value of our local waterfront. The placement would undermine the city of Everett's current and future efforts to promote economic re development and attract investment in our waterfront and city core. The DoD has not fully assessed the potential interference to airborne navigation and commercial communication systems, sensitive electronic, and hospital and clinic based medical diagnostic equipment. Especially unknown is the effect of the full powered test of the energy beam that must be run five to six times per week...thanks...good bye.</p>	<p>P-O-0026</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>Message delivered: 14 Apr 03: 10:03 PM CST; 1 minute, 50 seconds</p> <p>My name is Richard Marshall...I'm a resident of Seattle, Washington...and I'm calling regarding the editorial that was in the "Seattle Times"...we had heard about the project, the SBX project, and the possible location of this up in Everett, Washington...and it seems that this location for it, was one of several possible locations, some of which were certainly more remote from various aspects that would be involved with it including air national and domestic air transportation overhead, other types of civilian facilities and civilian populations, in its immediate vicinity...so it seems to me that what needs to be done at this point is to do more investigation of where this could be sited, where it could be permanently sited if possible, where it would not have much as infringing involvement on the local population as this would, and also be in that regard possibly even easier to carry out its mission away from other factors that might disturb it, I don't know what those might be as far as the local radiation problems or other things, but anyhow, this is just in a response to this because it sounded as though there was some input requested as far as citizens are concerned, so this is one of them...thank you very much.</p>	<p>COMMENT NUMBER</p> <p>P-O-0027</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 8:56 AM CST; 1 minute, 50 seconds</p> <p>Hi, I'm calling to make a comment on the draft environmental impact statement, and I just wanted to say that I just find it appalling that you would consider dropping this monstrosity into Puget Sound which is one of the most wildlife rich places in this entire country, if not in the entire world....this is not Lake Erie here and you need to research this much more deeply and look somewhere else...I think the people maybe came out and made the mistake of just looking at the area from the Navy base, this is not just the Navy Base here, when you go around the corner from that, you go up the Snohomish River which is the biggest (estuary) in Washington, on the west coast it is the biggest (estuary)....all kinds of birds come through here, and you just can't put this thing here with the EMRs that it puts out, with the diesel it's going to be burning and polluting the air...we're going to oppose this thing, and even if you put it here, we're still going to oppose it...just find somewhere in the middle or nowhere or just drop the whole idea of missile defense, there's nobody shooting missiles at us, we don't need this thing...my name is Christine Giannini and I'm a homeowner in Everett, Washington...please go away...take your big ball and take it somewhere else...thanks...bye.</p>	<p>COMMENT NUMBER</p> <p>P-O-0028</p> <p>1</p>
---	--	--	--

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 10:05 AM CST; 39 seconds</p> <p>Hello, my name is Pearl Beach and I live in the Everett area, and I think this is just a crazy paranoia thing, and I don't understand why they want to build the stupid thing in the first place, the Russian missile system...got a missile agreement and everything...so I don't understand why the heck they want the dumb thing in the first place...why here...so I think this thing is a bunch of nonsense...thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0029</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 13 Apr 03: 11:35 PM CST; 55 seconds</p> <p>This is Beverly Bruno, I live at ..., Everett...and I think that this would be a detriment to the neighborhood...and just when we're trying to clean up the whole city of Everett, and then to have this out there would devalue our city and what we're trying to accomplish in the Puget Sound area...I think that it could be located somewhere else where residents and businesses will not have to look at it or be affected by it...and I just recently found out about this in the last couple of days...I oppose...and I just don't know what else to say...thank you for taking my call and I hope that this can be resolved and put it some place where it won't be a hazardous or an eyesore...thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0030</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 11 Apr 03: 4:05 PM CST; 1 minute 9 seconds</p> <p>Yeah, hi...my name is Timothy Webb, I live on Y...and I oppose the Department of Defense proposal to locate the SBX in Everett, Washington for a number of reasons. These are the possible negative impacts to human health and safety caused by receiving long-term low-level EM radiation not been fully studied...the DoD indicates that radiation scatter will be an issue despite its attempts to target the array so as to not irradiate people...the size of the structure built on a converted ocean-based oil drilling rig and its design for heavy industry degrades the visual and aesthetic value of our local waterfront...its placement would undermine the city of Everett's current and future efforts to promote economic re-development and attract investment in our waterfront and city core...the DoD has not fully assessed the potential interference to airborne navigation and commercial communications systems, sensitive electronics, and hospital and clinic-based medical diagnostic equipment...especially unknown is the effect of the full powered test of the energy beam....must be run five to six times per week...thank youYbye bye.</p>	<p>P-O-0031</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	<p>Message delivered: 11 Apr 03: 7:51 PM CST; 32 seconds</p> <p>Deloris Bustad...I didn't hear all of what I was suppose to say...what all was I suppose to put in...oh ... in Everett...and the SBX I'm not in favor of it, it's got to many complications for health concerns as far as I'm concerned...and my husband is also not in favor of it...and we live real close to the waterfront.</p>	<p>P-O-0032</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 11 Apr 03: 6:57 PM CST; 2 minutes 58 seconds</p> <p>Hello, my name is Annette Bustad, I'm at ... in Everett, Washington.....I was commenting on the SBX...I am not in favor of having this put here in Everett, so I did want to call...and I have a lot of concerns about it...numerous concerns, I've attended a lot of the meetings, I'm a read the papers, I'm aware of what's going on...and I'm...one of the other things that's just been noted...I've been involved up at the Pre-Natal, the new Birthing Center on Pacific and Everett...I'm very concerned as far as the placement of the SBX being placed...you know...within just... you know...a two or three mile radius of not just...you know...ourselves, our lives, our homes, our TVs, a lot of things are going on even before the SBX is in that are very very skewed that everyone is talking about...so besides for all the other things that are going on...these babies...just so you all know...and I'm going to be contacting a couple of the...director and a couple of the doctors up there...I actually have a preemie grandchild that was born up there six weeks early...blah blah blah...they have oxygen, their heart, their movement, their blood level...they have them electronically hooked up to all these monitors...and these frequently go off...beep beep beep...they go off flat-line and the nurse comes in and she just resets it and she says oh that happens all the time, it happens all the time...so I'm going to be trying to get some more involvement...and just so you all are known...so you guys aren't all beat up on...that there is large issues to this Pre-Natal, the Birthing Center that's on Pacific...if any of...one of your top officials could get a hold of Providence Hospital...see if you can get a hold of one of the Directors, ask for comments from a couple of the head doctors up there...that would be of the utmost importance...I would just have all of the respect if one of the officials would do something like that...I'm going to do what I can on my end</p>	<p>P-O-0033</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 11 Apr 03: 6:44 PM CST; 2 minutes 7 seconds</p> <p>My name is Patricia Neel and I live in Everett, Washington...and I am opposed to even provisional or temporary testing of this SBX in the Port of Everett...at the Port Gardner Bay. I am concerned because of the hospitals, because of the impact on people, because of the number of people that are involved, because of the area of folks who would be impacted, because it's visually going to diminish what we've worked really hard for in Puget Sound...which is to have a...you know a environmentally safe and friendly area as well as visually beautiful...I think that it is in stark opposition to what the city of Everett is trying to do in terms of...rebuild the core part in the heart of our downtown and waterfront...just a few hundred feet from where this proposal, this proposed SBX radar thing is to be placed is a place I love to go for dinner to look out over the water...and a place where there is a Sunday market with farmers from the area coming...and I just don't think that being in the shadow of the size of this proposal will, it will negatively impact me personally as well as my community...so again my name is Patricia Neel...I'm very much opposed to the Sea Based Test X Band Radar...thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0034</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>Message delivered: 11 Apr 03: 6:19 PM CST; 11 seconds</p> <p>Hi, my name is Mary Davidson, I live on Whidbey Island...and I am definitely for this...go for it...we need the protection, o.k...bye, bye.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0035</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0035	1	<p>Message delivered: 12 Apr 03: 3:09 PM CST; 1 minute 14 seconds</p> <p>Hi my name is Jason Brasfield...and I would like to know you know...do I go into your lawn and throw trash in it...do I go in like, you know...trash your area where you live...like I do not, I'm absolutely opposed to you putting up a 25 story radar tower in the Everett sea port...that is serious, like, I don't even think that you have merit in what you guys need to do, I'm sick and tired of you guys spending billions of our budget just so you can destroy more of US property, o.k., you don't need it alright, and that's my opinion, and I'm going to voice it at the...and I am very very angry that we do not have enough time to protest this because you guys did not make it known to the public that you were putting this up until the deadline came down to that point...if you want to have this go, then let's rumble with this because we'll protest the hell out what you're trying to do...we do not need this, we have your damn base here, we don't need another 25 foot story here, I do not want this here...thank you, bye.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0036</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0036	1
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-O-0035									
1									
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-O-0036									
1									

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>Message delivered: 12 Apr 03: 10:55 AM CST; 1 minutes 32 seconds</p> <p>Hi my name is Claudia Elliott...and I'm just calling to tell you that I think your SBX Band Radar thing for the Port Gardner Bay and Everett is really a poorly thought through idea...I mean, my goodness you got several hundred thousand people in the radius of that thing including my daughter and son in law, and two grandsons, and a baby on the way...and I just don't think that's a good place to put it...I mean, I don't even know that we need to have it, but if you know there's some federal agency that says oh no we must have it to keep ourselves safe from Lord knows what...put it someplace were there is not so many that is going to be impacted by radar, that's just, that's just foolishness, that's like throwing the baby out with the bath water...I mean, the best way to fight terrorism is to help people...and that's not happening right now in the war, but hopefully it will...radar bands were there are people, you affect more innocent people than would be affected by terrorists act far away...so I'm just saying I'm opposed to SBX Band Radar in Port Gardner Bay, I know it's only just one person, but I'm one person who takes my responsibility as a citizen seriously. Thanks for your time...I pray that this has an impact on decision making things...Again my name is Claudia Elliott.</p>	<p>COMMENT NUMBER</p> <p>P-O-0037</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 12 Apr 03: 6:14 PM CST; 1 minute 21 seconds</p> <p>This is Jeff McCune...Saturday, April 12, about a little after 4:00 PM local time...I'm a resident of South Whidbey Island...I'm sorry I'm late getting this comment to you...I hope it's in time, according to the paper it talks about the 15th as the cut off time. I'm totally in favor of whatever it takes to deter these terrorists, etc., from invading our good democracy here...and I'd be happy to have this, any place and any time...we are at war and the sooner these ding bats in this country understands...these liberals understand this...they're going to get their heads out of their you know what...and we need to have this, of course we need to have it. If you need to reach me, you can reach me at.... I have...I can go on and on...I think it might be one of the ideas to design it...make it look a little bit more attractive to the public, but a dog gone aquarium underneath the thing...spruce it up a little bit...but the point is we need it...and I fully support it, and if I need...you need to get me put this in writing I will...thanks for the availability of this number, I appreciate it...bye for now.</p>	<p>COMMENT NUMBER</p> <p>P-O-0038</p> <p>1</p>
---	--	--	--

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>Message delivered: 12 Apr 03: 12:33 PM CST; 1 minute 16 seconds</p> <p>My name is John Vandalen...and I live at ... Avenue here at Everett, Washington...I have a view of the Puget Sound where the radar unit will be situated...if Everett was chosen...and I don't have a problem with it...my only concern is that a radio operator, a ham radio operator, that I would have some interference from it when it was active...other than that, the visual impact does not bother me and the economics that it would provide would be slight because it there would be just an additional crew to man it and it could probably be manned remotely anyway...I don't have a problem with it...I am in disagreement with the city government of Everett and that I think it should be here in Everett...any questions or comments from me...I'm atthank you and appreciate you guys looking at Everett....bye bye</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0039</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0039	1	<p>Message delivered: 12 Apr 03: 12:39 PM CST; 2 minutes 21 seconds</p> <p>Hi, my name is Martin Schmidt...that's Martin Schmidt...I'm a resident of Whidbey Island near Coupeville in Washington...the other day I learned for the first time that here on Whidbey Island, in Washington State, the beautiful Puget Sound, I learned that you hope to install an SBX radar station on a floating platform the size of a oil drilling platform, a total height of 250 feet...right in the city of Everett, or right in front of the City of Everett, in plain view of everybody in Everett as well as those of us on Whidbey Island here...and I thought to myself, you know, are you nuts...and not only that, but we learned that this all has to do with of course with Star Wars technology that's already cost the US taxpayer's 60 billion dollars so far, and doesn't even work...and no consideration was given as to how the people and I'm one of the people feel about it...I insist that you stop this, this is ridiculous to put something like this here, particularly without concern for the people who live here and what not...and I think you should be ashamed of yourselves. My name again is Martin Schmidt, I live in Coupeville, and my telephone isand your email that was given in our local paper, the "South Whidbey Island Record", as gmdetreis@smdc.arm.mil doesn't work...thank you...well not thank you...you should thank me.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0040</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0040	1
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-O-0039									
1									
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-O-0040									
1									

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 12 Apr 03: 12:33 PM CST; 19 seconds</p> <p>I am completely opposed to the SBX being located in the waters between Whidbey Island and Everett...I live on Whidbey Island, I have for many years, and I am completely and totally opposed to this...my name is Evelyn Hays...thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0041</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 13 Apr 03: 11:34 PM CST; 27 seconds</p> <p>This is a resident by the name of Reis. We live on the...near the Rucker Hill...and we'd like to comment that every effort be made to place the radar station that was from the discussion at a different location...thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0042</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 4:17 PM CST; 46 seconds</p> <p>My name is...my last name is Casey...I am a registered voter in the state of Washington...and I just want to comment that I am very much alarmed at the notion of setting up an SBX site near Everett, Washington...it is far too populated an area for risking such potentially dangerous a project...therefore I urge you to do what you can to prevent it...and my words would be addressed, I believe, to Ms. Julia Elliott...I didn't understand all that she said on your introduction...so anyway that's it, my last name is Casey...thank you very much.</p>	<p>P-O-0043</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 16 Apr 03: 12:50 AM CST; 45 seconds</p> <p>Hello, my name is Sara O'Farell, I'm calling representing myself, my mother Ann, and my father Douglas. We strongly oppose this project...the idea of positioning a large field of potential threat to human health and the health of wildlife using our tax dollars does not sound like a good idea when there are so many Washingtonians that need primary health care for instance...yeah, we very much oppose this project...and...thank you.</p> <p>Message delivered: 16 Apr 03: 12:54 AM CST; 23 seconds</p> <p>This is Sara O'Farell once again...and I just wanted to leave my address, , Langley, Washington, ...that's south Whidbey Island...just wanted to leave that in case you needed it for comment purposes...thank you so much.</p>	<p>P-O-0044</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 4:51 PM CST; 35 seconds</p> <p>My name is Charlotte Laborde...and I'm a resident of Everett and I oppose the SBX.</p>	<p>P-O-0045</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 4:58 PM CST; 1 minute, 4 seconds</p> <p>I want to voice my strong opposition to having the facility located off the coast of Everett, Washington. I think this is an entirely inappropriate facility to be so close to our shore lines...especially since our hospitals are located very very close to the coast...and I just wanted to express my strong opposition...I felt that there are other options for this facility that would not be so close to a city as the choice of Everett...so when I read it in the paper, Alaska and Marshall Islands, both of those especially at certain areas of Alaska would be not very populated...Marshall Islands far enough off water there, offshore would be away from a populated area...thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0046</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 6:12 PM CST; 47 seconds</p> <p>This is Nena O'Neil, ...I've lived here for nearly 50 years and I've seen Everett overcome a lot of obstacles, but this obstacle would be the crowning blow and the crushing blow for our wonderful city that's growing slowly but surely into the new world. Please do not put that...I've never been a MD in my life and I'm all in favor of defense completely, but we do not in our little small bay need a huge structure like that one...please do not bring it to Everett...thank you...</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0047</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0047	1	<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 7:33 PM CST; 1 minute, 27 seconds</p> <p>Hello, this is Karen Miller, I'm calling about the SBX proposed siting here in Everett, Washington...I'm a resident of Everett, Washington and I am concerned about the quality of the Sound, especially our local bay here, and I'm also concerned about the quality of life...I don't own a mega million dollar house on the bluff...so I can't really speak a lot to my property values, but I do own a little tiny house that I plan to retire to...and I really like north Everett and I don't really see what's left of its beauty spoiled by more structures that aren't aesthetically pleasing...I'm trying to say this a gracefully as I can, but, you know, it's kind of an ugly little eyesore thing...well it's not even little, I can't even say it's little...but anyway, you get my drift...thanks, my phone number is...and my address is..., Everett, Washington.....bye...</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0048</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0048	1
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-O-0047									
1									
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-O-0048									
1									

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 11:26 PM CST; 53 seconds</p> <p>Hello, my name is Ralph Minor...I live in Seattle, Washington. I just became aware of the plan to put this mammoth structure in the Port of Everett...and I wanted to express my extreme displeasure at this idea...I was raised in Everett, and I have many friends who still live there and they have alerted me to this...and I think this is a terrible terrible idea for all kinds of reason...the visual pollution, the possible danger from electromagnet radiation...and it sounds like you've got other alternatives out in the Marshall Islands or in Pearl Harbor if you can resolve the electromagnetic issues...but please, this does not belong in Everett...thank you very much..</p>	<p>P-O-0049</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 4:51 PM CST; 35 seconds</p> <p>Hello, I am June Evers...and I oppose to locate the SBX in Everett. I'm a resident of Everett, Washington, and I don't think enough research has been done and study has been done to be able to put this thing in the port...and I am also oppose to how large and how obstructive it would be to our view...thank you...bye.</p>	<p>P-O-0050</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>Message delivered: 16 Apr 03: 10:30 AM CST; 57 seconds</p> <p>My name is Mary DiJulio...at present I'm living and working in Puyallup, Washington...my phone number is.... I have lived in Everett, Washington and I may live there again. I wish to express my opposition to the project being forced upon Everett, Washington and its people. A suggestion by some friends who live in Everett...place this radar at one of the military sites that does not involved common communities...so please take this into consideration...and thank you...my name...did I spell it...DiJulio...</p>	<p>COMMENT NUMBER</p> <p>P-O-0051</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 11:57 PM CST; 2 minutes, 2 seconds</p> <p>Hello, yes, this is Janice Hartson....I am calling from the Everett area, and as a Everett resident to comment on the SBX naval platform that the defense department proposes to anchor at the Naval station in Everett. I am at this point against having it anchored in the area...it would be detrimental to the harbor activity as well as the visual environmental environment there...we are also voters in the area and do know that the area is sensitive as far as the wetlands and the estuaries that are nearby...the Navy in itself has impacted the area quite a bit with regards to wildlife and boating...the presence of the platform in itself, would, I believe, be a great eyesore...even if it is parked close to the anchored area where the Naval ships are and when not in use or in operation would be then, as commented earlier in the "Everett Herald"...be out in the bay area where it would be anchored and probably provide a visual discrepancy against the pristine panoramas that now occupy the Port Gardner Bay area...I hope that all comments that I have made are made with consideration and I hope that other people call in to make comments regarding the nixing of this project...thank you very much...home phone.....thank you.</p>	<p>COMMENT NUMBER</p> <p>P-O-0052</p> <p>1</p>
--	--	--	--

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

Message delivered: 14 Apr 03: 5:42 PM CST; 31 seconds

I am Bernadine Casey, a voter in the state of Washington, I'm not sure I have the right office, but I wanted to register opposition to the building of a SBX site near Everett, Washington. I believe that it is far too dangerous to sit in a highly populated area. I believe it would be a big mistake to put it there...thank you.

COMMENT NUMBER

P-O-0053

1

Message delivered: 9 Apr 03: 7:25 PM CST; 56 seconds

Yes, my last name is Govedare...I'm calling to strongly oppose any question of bringing this contraption, this SBX radar project ton Everett...I live on Whidbey Island and I would be absolutely appalled to have to look at this...85...250 feet tall contraption in our beautiful Puget Sound...not to mention the health ramifications which I understand is considerable...and I am simply calling to object to your considering this location...there are too many people living nearby...we have such a beautiful natural environment here...we do not need anything of this nature...so please do not continue to pursue this project in Everett...thank you very much...

COMMENT NUMBER

P-O-0054

1

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>Message delivered: 16 Apr 03: 6:51 PM CST; 45 seconds</p> <p>Yes, hello, my name is Diane Rogers...and I live right outside of Everett, Washington...and I just wanted to voice a comment regarding the radar platform...I've read a little about it and it seems to me that it's a necessary thing, but I think there would probably be a better place for it to be stationed than in a primarily residential area that is under development...I think that, you know, the powers to be would find a place that would be more suitable...There is an issue regarding the radiation and....I don't think that has been investigated thrououghly...so I would have to say I would vote against that being placed in the Everett Harbor...thank you...bye, bye.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0055</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0055	1	<p>Message delivered: 14 Apr 03: 10:03 PM CST; 1 minute, 50 seconds</p> <p>My name is Richard Marshall...I'm a resident of Seattle, Washington...and I'm calling regarding the editorial that was in the "Seattle Times"...we had heard about the project, the SBX project, and the possible location of this up in Everett, Washington...and it seems that this location for it, was one of several possible locations, some of which were certainly more remote from various aspects that would be involved with it including air national and domestic air transportation overhead, other types of civilian facilities and civilian populations, in it's immediate vicinity...so it seems to me that what needs to be done at this point is to do more investigation of where this could be sited, where it could be permantly sited if possible, where it would not have much as infringing involvement on the local population as this would, and also be in that regard possibly even easier to carry out its mission away from other factors that might disturb it, I don't know what those might be as far as the local radiation problems or other things, but anyhow, this is just in a response to this because it sounded as though there was some input requested as far as citizens are concerned, so this is one of them...thank you very much.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0056</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0056	1
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-O-0055									
1									
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-O-0056									
1									

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 11:46 AM CST; 54 seconds

Hello, my name is Betty Elliott...I live in Clinton, Washington, which is just across the water from the Everett Naval Base. I have talked with many people locally who are really fearful about this SBX installation that is expected to occur...and especially I hear fears for health concerns and the impact on many electronic devices, including pacemakers. I am vehemently oppose to this being put there, can't understand it, don't feel we were given any information ahead of time to deal with this...I know this is probably a losing cause...but I wanted to register my complaint loud and clear...thank you very much.

COMMENT NUMBER
P-O-0057
1
2

Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 12:07 PM CST; 1 minute, 27 seconds

Hi, my name is Harry Elliott...I live in Clinton, Washington...and I am strongly objecting to the SBX that's planned for the harbor in Everett, Washington...we live within site of that base and...the Navy base there...and it just, in my opinion from what I've read and what I've heard, it's just too dangerous to have that close to not only to individuals who live close to that, but also to hospital and other things...we know very well what the danger there is in radar and airport approaches and other places...controversy about radiation from power line and so forth, and yet we're putting this right in people's back yards. I think that too many decisions are made on the basis of paranoia by this administration and I just want to let you know that I strongly object to that and I hope that something could be done not to build this apparatus...thank you.

COMMENT NUMBER
P-O-0058
1

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 12:10 PM CST; 10 seconds</p> <p>Juanson Kim, Kim is the last name.</p> <p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 12:11 PM CST; 47 seconds</p> <p>This is Juanson Kim calling from Seattle, Washington...I live in Everett, Washington...and I'm calling to let you know that I would like to put in my vote against having the location of this SBX in the Everett Gardner Bay Port...we have a good relationship with the military currently with the base down there and I think that this probably would hurt that relationship as well as hurt our economy...I would hope that you would be able to find a better location much better suited to an area where there wouldn't be a population that would be adversely impacted by such a construction.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0059</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0059	1	<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 1:33 PM CST; 50 seconds</p> <p>My name Charles R. Burdshal...I oppose the going ahead with the SBX too at this time...I think further public comment needs to be allowed and further information needs to be developed for the public...it appears that the environmental impact is inaccurate in that it's..or it's lacking in its scope and research...so it...we need to remedy that...thank you.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0060</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0060	1
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-O-0059									
1									
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-O-0060									
1									

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 1:54 PM CST; 1 minute, 36 seconds

Hi, my name is Michael Martin and I live at ... in Everett...and I'm calling to put in my comments about the SBX system...we're very very strongly opposed to this for many reasons and...just want our voice to be heard and I'm sure you've heard some of the reasons why people are against it in this area...we feel it's going to have a very significant impact on economic and social issues of our community as well as most likely, unfortunately, a negative impact on our relationship with the Navy base there...I don't know how else to state that...the reality is that it's going to have a huge impact...we think that it's really best placed somewhere else due to the large population of the area and some of the economic issues of the community as well as the possible environmental issues to the community as well...so...again this is Michael Martin,...very opposed to the SBX system being placed here...and serious ramifications of it...thank you.

COMMENT NUMBER
P-O-0061
1

Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 4:17 PM CST; 46 seconds

My name is...my last name is Casey...I am a registered voter in the state of Washington...and I just want to comment that I am very much alarmed at the notion of setting up an SBX site near Everett, Washington...it is far too populated an area for risking such potentially dangerous a project...therefore I urge you to do what you can to prevent it...and my words would be addressed, I believe, to Ms. Julia Elliott...I didn't understand all that she said on your introduction...so anyway that's it, my last name is Casey...thank you very much.

COMMENT NUMBER
P-O-0062
1

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 4:51 PM CST; 35 seconds

Hello, I am June Evers...and I oppose to locate the SBX in Everett. I'm a resident of Everett, Washington, and I don't think enough research has been done and study has been done to be able to put this thing in the port...and I am also oppose to how large and how obstructive it would be to our view...thank you...bye.

COMMENT NUMBER
P-O-0063
1

Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 4:51 PM CST; 35 seconds

My name is Charlotte Laborde...and I'm a resident of Everett and I oppose the SBX.

COMMENT NUMBER
P-O-0064
1

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 4:58 PM CST; 1 minute, 4 seconds

I want to voice my strong opposition to having the facility located off the coast of Everett, Washington. I think this is an entirely inappropriate facility to be so close to our shore lines...especially since our hospitals are located very very close to the coast...and I just wanted to express my strong opposition...I felt that there are other options for this facility that would not be so close to a city as the choice of Everett...so when I read it in the paper, Alaska and Marshall Islands, both of those especially at certain areas of Alaska would be not very populated...Marshall Islands far enough off water there, offshore would be away from a populated area...thank you.

COMMENT NUMBER
P-O-0065
1

Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 6:12 PM CST; 47 seconds

This is Nena O'Neil, ... in Everett...I've lived here for nearly 50 years and I've seen Everett overcome a lot of obstacles, but this obstacle would be the crowning blow and the crushing blow for our wonderful city that's growing slowly but surely into the new world. Please do not put that...I've never been a MD in my life and I'm all in favor of defense completely, but we do not in our little small bay need a huge structure like that one...please do not bring it to Everett...thank you...

COMMENT NUMBER
P-O-0066
1

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 7:33 PM CST; 1 minute, 27 seconds</p> <p>Hello, this is Karen Miller, I'm calling about the SBX proposed siting here in Everett, Washington...I'm a resident of Everett, Washington and I am concerned about the quality of the Sound, especially our local bay here, and I'm also concerned about the quality of life...I don't own a mega million dollar house on the bluff...so I can't really speak a lot to my property values, but I do own a little tiny house that I plan to retire to...and I really like north Everett and I don't really see what's left of its beauty spoiled by more structures that aren't aesthetically pleasing...I'm trying to say this a gracefully as I can, but, you know, it's kind of an ugly little eyesore thing...well it's not even little, I can't even say it's little...but anyway, you get my drift...thanks, my phone number is and my address is Everett, Washington, ...bye...</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0067</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0067	1	<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 11:26 PM CST; 53 seconds</p> <p>Hello, my name is Ralph Minor...I live in Seattle, Washington. I just became aware of the plan to put this mammoth structure in the Port of Everett...and I wanted to express my extreme displeasure at this idea...I was raised in Everett, and I have many friends who still live there and they have alerted me to this...and I think this is a terrible terrible idea for all kinds of reason...the visual pollution, the possible danger from electromagnet radiation...and it sounds like you've got other alternatives out in the Marshall Islands or in Pearl Harbor if you can resolve the electromagnetic issues...but please, this does not belong in Everett...thank you very much.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0068</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0068	1
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-O-0067									
1									
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-O-0068									
1									

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

Message delivered: 9 Apr 03: 10:43 PM CST; 1 minute, 12 seconds

My name is David Roodzant...I live in Marysville, Washington...I would just like to give you a little bit of positive input on the SBX plan...I'm very thankful that the military and our Commander in Chief has the foresight to see the need for this installation...I hope that you won't be deterred by a few ball babies that want to cry about it...if you just look one mile north of the installation there in Port Gardner Bay you'll see Kimberly Clark which is far taller and uglier and smells a whole lot worse, and nobody's crying about that...I would like to see more of these built...I would like to see a supersonic long range Patriot missile system in conjunction with these...I think that this is very important to the defense of our country...I think it's something we need to do now...and it's just my input...I hope it's a positive input for you...thank you very much.

COMMENT
NUMBER

P-O-0069

1

Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 8:56 AM CST; 1 minute, 50 seconds

Hi, I'm calling to make a comment on the draft environmental impact statement, and I just wanted to say that I just find it appalling that you would consider dropping this monstrosity into Puget Sound which is one of the most wildlife rich places in this entire country, if not in the entire world....this is not Lake Erie here and you need to research this much more deeply and look somewhere else...I think the people maybe came out and made the mistake of just looking at the area from the Navy base, this is not just the Navy Base here, when you go around the corner from that, you go up the Snohomish River which is the biggest (estuary) in Washington, on the west coast it is the biggest (estuary)...all kinds of birds come through here, and you just can't put this thing here with the EMRs that it puts out, with the diesel it's going to be burning and polluting the air...we're going to oppose this thing, and even if you put it here, we're still going to oppose it...just find somewhere in the middle or nowhere or just drop the whole idea of missile defense, there's nobody shooting missiles at us, we don't need this thing...my name is Christine Giannini and I'm a homeowner in Everett, Washington...please go away...take your big ball and take it somewhere else...thanks...bye.

COMMENT
NUMBER

P-O-0070

1

<p>Message delivered: 15 Apr 03: 10:05 AM CST; 39 seconds</p> <p>Hello, my name is Pearl Beach and I live in the Everett area, and I think this is just a crazy paranoia thing, and I don't understand why they want to build the stupid thing in the first place, the Russian missile system...got a missile agreement and everything...so I don't understand why the heck they want the dumb thing in the first place....why here...so I think this thing is a bunch of nonsense...thank you.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0071</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0071	1	<p>Good afternoon. I'm John McCoy, M-C-C-O-Y, state representative for the 38th legislative district. My home address is ...; Tulalip, T-U-L-A-L-I-P, Washington 98271.</p> <p>I have had a number of folks come to me to express concern about the ship that you are bringing in. One of those issues that we still have to work out is the security buffer zone because of the recreational and commercial fishing that goes on in the area. That needs to be worked out.</p> <p>Then also you didn't mention how long this vessel was going to be here, how long is this program going to be. Again in regards to the fishery, commercial and recreational, would you be out in Port Gardner Sound, sitting out there in the middle of the fishing grounds? I think those -- and a lot of the other folks will bring forward more questions, but those are the more consistent questions that were brought to me. Thank you.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0072</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0072	1	2
COMMENT NUMBER										
P-O-0071										
1										
COMMENT NUMBER										
P-O-0072										
1										
2										

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>Richard P. Jones, Mukilteo, Washington; All the questions at once or one at a time? I didn't understand that part.</p> <p>It's been said that the decision-makers are not here. Who are they? That's the first question.</p> <p>To comment first, we have numerous air restrictions around here; in fact, more than almost any other place in the country. Will there be additional air space restrictions or permanent air space restrictions or restricted areas of any kind associated with this deployment here?</p> <p>Third question is: I have heard something about high-power radar testing and low-power testing. Did you intend to conduct high-power testing while you're in port here? That was not clear in the statement. Those are my questions.</p> <p>Which is a temporary flight restriction.</p> <p>You are saying, then, that you do not intend to extend that any longer than it would otherwise have been there?</p> <p>Are you now considering that to be a permanent flight restriction as a result of putting this facility there?</p> <p>Somewhat more blunt, then: If the current TFR was not there today, would you be asking for something?</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="919 224 1031 277">COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="919 277 1031 354">P-O-0073</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="919 354 1031 430">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="919 430 1031 506">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="919 506 1031 583">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="919 583 1031 659">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="919 659 1031 735">5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0073	1	2	3	4	5	<p>My name is Michelle Trautman, M-I-C-H-E-L-L-E, T-R-A-U-T-M-A-N. I live at ...in Everett, Washington.</p> <p>I would like to thank the representatives of the Department of Defense for being here today to answer the questions and concerns of this community. I would also like to thank the City of Everett and especially Kate Reardon, Communications Director, for providing this forum. Also a great thanks to the citizens of our area. Not just Everett, but our surrounding communities for coming out today.</p> <p>My first knowledge of the proposed SBX Test X-Band Radar came on February 25th, 2003, through Brian Kelly's first article in the Everett Herald. I immediately located the draft online and began studying it and then attended the DoD meeting two days later on February 28th, 2003. The purpose of the meeting was to provide comment on the DEIS. Strangely, the DEIS was not available at the meeting, nor were questions answered during the public comment format.</p> <p>The initial scoping process to develop the DEIS was to have involved this community. It did not. The five other sites that have been evaluated in the DEIS have had meetings within their communities. The scoping meeting intended for Everett, as you have said, was held on October 17th, 2002, in Seattle, King County -- not in Everett and not in Snohomish County. As a matter of record, in the DEIS no comments were taken at that meeting -- zero.</p> <p>As of Friday, March 14th, our own city government or a portion thereof had no information about the SBX and had not been able to locate the draft. The overwhelming majority of our residents still do not know about the SBX or its potential impact on our lives and environment, and substantive information has not been given to the residents albeit today.</p> <p>We have had no knowledge, and we have had no voice. This draft does not represent our concerns. It does not represent a realistic region of influence, and it most certainly does not adequately assess the impacts to this community or provide any mitigations. We have been forced by this lack of public process into a hyper mode to educate our constituents and get our comments to you by April 15th. I want to point out that this community has been denied one full year and one month of public process concerning the development of the DEIS. You have forced this community into a comment period of six weeks and four days, and in my opinion that is wholly inadequate. I respectfully insist that the entire process should be started from the</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1896 224 2007 277">COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1896 277 2007 354">P-O-0074</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1896 354 2007 430">1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0074	1
COMMENT NUMBER													
P-O-0073													
1													
2													
3													
4													
5													
COMMENT NUMBER													
P-O-0074													
1													

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>beginning. I would like to ask these four questions: Was there any communication to Snohomish County officials or City of Everett officials before February 2003? If so, what form did that communication take, from what agency, and to whom? Are these communications a matter of public record? Why was the scoping meeting held outside of Snohomish County or Everett on October 17, 2002? Thank you.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	2	3	<p>My name is Annie Lyman, A-N-N-I-E, L-Y-M-A-N. My address is ..., Everett, Washington.</p> <p>I'm glad to hear that you are not going to be operating fully while in port. Thank you for that information. You have raised some questions in my mind about transporting this large vessel out to the Pacific Ocean. How many trips a year do you foresee this vessel taking? To those points on the map that you showed us? To the Marshall Islands, to the Hawaiian Islands, to those areas?</p> <p>My questions then range around the environmental costs as well as the financial costs of that plan. The distance, the great distance from Port Gardner Bay out to the middle of Pacific Ocean, is quite a distance. We have a very fragile ecosystem in the Puget Sound that I think we all appreciate. We talked about the fishing industry and other things, but we also have a very fragile ecosystem here.</p> <p>So I understand this vessel will carry 800,000 gallons of diesel fuel. This is a concern to us, having been close to Alaska when those accidents have happened. The costs of the diesel fuel going and coming and the environmental risks are pretty great. I would certainly like to have more reassurances that this is going to be handled in a much more financially responsible manner.</p> <p>I would like to see it out in the Marshall Islands is what I'm trying to say. I think it's not a good idea to have it here in a populated area where you could be out away from -- this concerns me -- and be closer to your test site. I'm for homeland defense, believe me I am, but this -- I just want to question the financial and environmental concerns, the cost to our country.</p> <p>So six trips a year? That's actually 12 passes through our Puget Sound area.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0075</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0075	1	2
COMMENT NUMBER										
2										
3										
COMMENT NUMBER										
P-O-0075										
1										
2										

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

My name is Ken Taylor, T-A-Y-L-O-R. My address is ..., Everett, Washington.

My question is in regard to health and safety. I understand that during your high-power testing, you could be radiating as much as 300 volts per meter. I understand that you're trying to keep that above a 10-degree horizontal. My concern is that current avionic systems are typically only designed right now to about 100 to 150 volts per meter for commercial aircraft. Some systems that are being designed today are only 20 volts per meter, and the older systems are even less than that. My concern is the power that's being put from this could be anywhere from 3 to, say, 15 times what these systems are designed for.

I understand you'll have interlocks for safety and things to try and prevent aircraft from coming into contact with this energy, but also realize that we are talking about an aircraft system which doesn't even address commercial systems that aren't designed to withstand these types of levels.

My concern is that when your system fails, which there is always the potential, have you guys done an analysis in terms of health and safety that could cause problems to the community and to our systems? And if you have done that analysis, would you make that information public?

COMMENT
NUMBER

P-O-0076

1

My name is Elizabeth Marshall, E-L-I-Z-A-B-E-T-H, M-A-R-S-H-A-L-L. I live at ... in Everett.

I'm a family practice physician, and I have worked in this community for 10 years. I've practiced medicine for 15 years. I'm primarily concerned about the health effects on our local community of the SBX. I have been doing research into electromagnetic radiation in the scientific literature, and it's unclear at this point as to whether or not EMR is dangerous.

There are studies that indicate that children growing up under these power lines have increased risk of leukemia and lymphoma, and there are similar studies indicating other forms of soft-tissue tumors in primarily children exposed to environmental electromagnetic radiation. As a physician, I know that for 15 years we've prescribed estrogen to woman with studies showing pros and cons of the benefits and adverse effects of estrogen. And 15 years later as of 2002, we now have a definitive study showing that estrogen is harmful and increases the risk of stroke and breast cancer in women. I believe that we have not yet determined whether electromagnetic radiation is dangerous, and similar to estrogen, we don't want to find out many years from now that we have radiated our children in Everett because of the SBX.

I also know as a physician that there is a scatter effect with radiation. You may angle it at 10 degrees, but when we do an x-ray in the office, the technicians or any family members present wear a lead shield. That is a direct, single beam that's focused on an individual, but there is a lead shield worn because of scatter effect. I am convinced that you cannot have a high-power -- I don't know the term -- radiation beam that is not going to scatter to our local citizenry and potentially affect the children and the adults here.

Therefore, this leads me to a question: As a mother and physician, I want to know, yes or no -- and I believe the answer is no -- can you definitively tell us there have been rigorous scientific studies showing that low-dose radiation is not harmful?

I just would like to say that four days ago in the proceedings of the National Academy of Science, a report came out. This is on April 1st, and I will quote this: A team said they exposed human cell cultures to varying x-ray doses in the lab. To their surprise, they found that damage from low radiation levels lingered days to weeks longer than damage caused by more powerful radiation. The radiation can cause breaks in DNA that go across both strands of the double helix

COMMENT
NUMBER

P-O-0077

1

2

<p>structure. Scientists had assumed that the body moves to repair these breaks at the same rate, no matter what the dose of radiation, but Lobrich's team found this may not be true. It could be, they propose, that the body simply does not recognize lower levels of damage and does not move to repair it. When these damaged cells divide and multiply, the unrepaired damage multiplies along with them, they suggested. We have not determined this. I would like you to answer that question.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">COMMENT NUMBER</p>	<p>My name is Marianne Edain, spelled M-A-R-I-A-N-N-E; last name E-D-A-I-N; ..., Langley, Washington. I'm from that part of Puget Sound that evidently the Navy hasn't figured out exists: Island County. What you are proposing is going to have dramatic effects on Island County. As far as I can tell, no jurisdiction in Island County was given any sort of information. I spoke with the county commissioner's office this week, and they were shocked, surprised, and had never heard of such a thing. I am at a great disadvantage because nobody in Island County had heard of this and therefore had no opportunity to examine DEISs or otherwise. It's very difficult to comment on a document one has not seen. That being the case, I heard you say that the original scope of this document did not include the proposal to put this SBX here. That being the case, the document is fatally flawed under NEPA and needs to go back to the beginning. I'm sorry. You need to start at a scoping which includes the actual proposal. That being the case, I ask that you stop this process right now, go back to the beginning, do a proper scoping in the communities where you actually intend to place this thing, and hear from the public. A scoping meeting where zero public comment is taken is not a scoping meeting. I'm sorry. On the issue of the ionizing radiation and using the FCC limits, there is a concept of prudent avoidance. In fact, NEPA requires that if one does not have all of the information, one assumes a worst-case scenario. A worst-case scenario then requires prudent avoidance of the potential damage. That being the case, we suggest that the place for this, if anywhere on this planet, is somewhere far out to sea. But even then, I have not had the opportunity to examine your DEIS, but I suspect that the review of the effects on marine mammals, for instance, has been shallow -- is probably the term -- and again, I'm speaking without having seen the document. If you do not go back and scope this proposal over, at the very least it is absolutely essential that you provide appropriate time for comment, that you extend the comment period, and that you notify all of the jurisdictions which will be affected by your proposal.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">COMMENT NUMBER</p> <p>P-O-0078</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p>
--	--	---	---

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>Stephanie Allen, S-T-E-P-H-A-N-I-E, A-L-L-E-N; ..., Mukilteo, 98275. I just actually had one question. This was with regard to, as we heard before, the temporary restricted air spaces. I don't know -- the people here are probably not pilots. I'm a pilot based in Paine Field. I've also been a resident here for a while. This temporary restricted air space that we have here with three others, of which I believe there are only 25 left now in the nation except for maybe New York -- that we have four temporary flight restrictions. These were put in after 9-11 because they say that we are a perceived risk for a terrorist attack. Supposedly this is unsubstantiated, but it is supposed to be a perceived risk.</p> <p>Now, if we put something like this SBX system out there, it seems to me that our risk is going to be up because we have essentially a system here that looks like it might be a little bit more fragile than the Lincoln. Is this going to happen? Are we going to find out -- because nobody has asked this question. It's a risk, a potential, even though supposedly it's been unsubstantiated in the past. Is our risk for a terrorist attack going to go up with this kind of equipment sitting out here in our bay?</p> <p>Just to define, what our restricted air space is the 3-nautical-mile radius centered around the Lincoln at the home port. This, as far as I can tell you as a pilot, is completely, completely inadequate for protecting anything. You are not really. It's gotten to me to look more like an agenda of promotions to make you think that we are safe, and that is not true. I am concerned as a resident and as a pilot about any potential increase in the risks that we have here.</p>	<p>P-O-0079</p> <p>1</p>	<p>My name is Mary Jane Anderson. That's Mary -- two words -- Jane. Anderson is A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N. ..., Everett, Washington.</p> <p>I have two separate, distinct questions. I'll ask the first one because I think it will be a short answer. You have a concept of this SBX at a certain size. I'm in product development, and I know that nothing ever comes out the way it starts. What's the possibility that this thing could grow in size?</p> <p>What about the dome itself?</p> <p>Thank you. My other question is in the EIS it does say that your region of influence is Naval Station Everett. A couple other people have commented that we feel that this isn't quite enough. My specific question is: If you know anything about the history of Everett, we were a mill town. We're trying desperately to raise our socioeconomic viability here. We have done a lot with redoing the marine waterfront area and getting more people.</p> <p>I notice that on your slide show you said that socioeconomic impact was not included in this review. Why not? I think we should go back and do a socioeconomic review based on what Everett needs to survive.</p>	<p>P-O-0080</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>My name is Michelle Kermoade -- Michelle with two Ls, K-E-R-M-O-A-D-E. I live at ... in Everett, Washington.</p> <p>For the record, I would like to express that on March 19, 2003, I sent both an e-mail and a letter in timely response to the initial question and comment period. As of yet, I have not received a response. So today I would like to reiterate a few of my concerns, but as time is of the essence, I'll not attempt to review the entire letter. However, I'm hoping that my initial response will be considered in its entirety.</p> <p>That being said, my questions are as follows -- and I came in late, so I'm not sure what you've already answered. I'll just, for the record, go through my questions, and maybe you can answer whatever hasn't been touched on.</p> <p>In order for my safety engineer friends to properly calculate the exact EMR exposure to my home and my three children, ages 2, 3, and 5, I'm told that it is essential to be informed about the power or energy emanating from the source.</p> <p>Secondly, there have been conflicting reports about the length of time the SBX will sit at port. Could you please clarify what will my exposures be during this time frame, how often will my family be exposed, and at what dosage.</p> <p>Are there reliable safety records available from either another working facility of this type or its prototype that may offer conclusive data as to the effects or illnesses that we should anticipate? Will diesel fuel residues be emitted? I have been hearing about diesel fuel. If so, what will the exposure to my community's air and water be, and how will that be controlled?</p> <p>Have you consulted with safety and health professionals about this project? If so, can you provide additional results? In your GMD ETR draft, mention was made about small quantities of hazardous waste that could potentially spill or be emitted.</p> <p>Could you tell us about these substances and how much and if any other by-products or materials, which have not been disclosed yet, will be leak into the environment?</p> <p>Your report stated that no visual impacts are anticipated because this type of activity consistently -- quote, unquote -- occurs at the Naval Station Everett. I beg to differ. This has never consistently occurred. It does not compare to the Lincoln. Statements like this only perpetuate distrust in the same way that conducting your initial citizen comment meeting in Seattle did.</p>	<p>P-O-0081</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p>	<p>Doris Olivers, O-L-I-V-E-R-S, ... in Everett.</p> <p>I'm opposed to the SBX being located in Everett, and I think that it's imperative that you consider all the other communities that are around this area and the county. One of my concerns is the negative impact on economic development around Port Gardner Bay. The City has promoted local development with the saying "Great thinking with a view."</p> <p>It's still unclear nine months in port -- I think your description of it being 83 feet taller than the Lincoln and less in length are a little disingenuous because it's a huge bulk. It's as large as Husky Stadium. It's half the height of the Space Needle for comparison. I think the SBX structure impacts the view negatively and would be harmful to local promotion including condominium construction downtown and marina development. Property values could be negatively impacted.</p> <p>From the angle of my property, much of the view would be filled with the SBX when it's in port. What is the impact on our local economics? I think that you've discounted the microwave radiation, but I personally believe in the precautionary principle. I would prefer not to take risks and have a choice about what risks I do take.</p> <p>I'm not sure that the questions about electronic interference have been responded to well enough. It's my understanding that there could be local effect to hospitals and electronic interception and the emergency response. I think this needs to be looked at more closely. I'm concerned about the truck travel on already burdened roads. You haven't said anything about how many supply trucks there would be coming in.</p> <p>About the fuel spill possibilities, is this a double-hull construction? On air pollution, I think that we don't need to add to our already troubled air. We have a lot of inversions here on this side of the Cascade Mountains. Nobody has addressed the noise of these generators running. I would like to see you put it in a less populated area. Thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0082</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>I'm Vernon Huffman, H-U-F-F-M-A-N, from ... in Everett. I have only just recently found out about this, and I would like to add my voice to the protests about the process that's been followed. Not having read the EIS, I'm not sure exactly what's in there, but from what I heard today, it sounds like you are saying if it's in base, if it's in Everett, it's only going to be used for maintenance and testing. You won't actually be running it at full potential. I hope you are not telling me that if you get word that there is a missile coming in, you're not going to kick this thing up to its full potential and use it for the best you can to save us from incoming missiles. If we heard that one has been launched and you're sitting in port, you're going to start it up in port, Right? Even if it turns out that that was a false alarm, we are all going to feel the radiation effects. Is that in the EIS? I wish I had the confidence that you do that the military never makes mistakes. My life experiences just can't back that up.</p>	<p>COMMENT NUMBER P-O-0083 1</p>	<p>My name is Karen Pauley, P-A-U-L-E-Y. I live at ... in Everett. First of all, I don't think that you adequately answered the question about the socioeconomic effects of this on our community. There are no assessments of the impact to the City of Everett's future economic development plans or the future waterfront redevelopment plans. Plans to draw new business and higher income living to our waterfront and downtown areas are in jeopardy because of the negative impact of the SBX. Why is this completely ignored in the DEIS? Also I wondered if any of the other neighboring communities such as Mukilteo -- I know there are people here from Whidbey Island. Have they been informed of the meetings that are occurring? I guess I'll just leave it at that.</p>	<p>COMMENT NUMBER P-O-0084 1</p>
--	--	--	--

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

My name is Mr. Tim Reisenauer, R-E-I-S-E-N-A-U-E-R. My address is

I have a private practice near Naval Station Everett. I also write a regular guest column in one of the local newspapers. I am concerned about how the electrical magnetic radiation from the SBX will impact the MR fields around any of the number of the devices that we use in our neighborhood. I'm concerned about the cardiac telemetry unit at our hospital, about the medical diagnostic equipment near my office, and also about the PCs and the data storage systems that we use. I want to tell you a story. It has to do with the electromagnetic scanner. It's a story about something that happened to me recently. One morning I woke up and I kissed my wife and kids, and I headed out the back to get into my car to go to work. Like all mornings, I pressed the remote which raises the bay door in my detached garage. Nothing happened. I re-pressed it several times. Still nothing happened. 15 minutes later after several new batteries for my remote, I was no nearer to getting my car untrapped from the garage. By the time I got to work, I was muddy, sporting skinned knuckles, and was late for my first patient of the day.

This story has repeated itself multiple times since then. More startling yet, my garage bay door spontaneously opens by itself. With a repairman scratching his head and me wanting to find out what was broken, I began asking neighbors for advice. Surprisingly, I learned that I don't have a faulty garage door at all. Instead I discovered that whenever the DoD tests ship-board radar systems two miles away, the electromagnetic radiation from the array causes difficulty with electronic systems like -- you guessed it -- garage door openers. It turns out my neighbors' garage doors were also doing the hokey-pokey. The DoD promised to fix it; said it would stop. It hasn't.

Here is another story: It's a related could-be story not unlike my experience. Imagine it is two years from now, and the SBX is moored in the harbor. Also imagine, Commander, that the DoD is doing its high-power test that day and, quote, trying not to radiate things they don't want to, end quote. Now, this is a concern because in my office sits my first patient of the day. She's a young gal waiting for a heart transplant because the damaged one she has can't do it any longer. She has a miniature cardiac defibrillator implanted in her heart. It's a device similar, as you know, I'm sure, to the ones medic squads and ERs use to help when the heart stops from a heart attack.

COMMENT
NUMBER

P-O-0085

1

Its job is to zap her back to life whenever it senses unhealthy electromagnetic charges around the heart.

She is crying, and she tells me that many times her device fired that last month because her heart is so weak. I'm holding the computer that I use in my hand to take notes. That digitally converts my written notes into a type of electronic medical record. It also puts out patients' entire medical history. Suddenly the screen on my tablet goes blank, and my computer won't reboot. The motherboard is scrambled, and this patient's medical records are gone -- vanished. I also want you to know and the people here to remember what I told you about my patient's implanted heart device. Remember this device decides whether or not to fire based on sensing electromagnetic activity in the area near her heart. Ask yourself what happens to her next in my story. I will tell you this: My patient's garage door will not open either.

COMMENT
NUMBER

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>My name is George Newland, N-E-W-L-A-N-D. I'm at ... here in Everett.</p> <p>I heard a lot of good input here today. I guess if I can follow up with a few questions: Is there really any strategic reason this thing has to be in Everett other than easy maintenance access? The vision impact is huge. I don't know if many of you remember that not too many years back we had an oil platform in here, and the noise coming off it was terrific. The light issue was terrific to everyone that was within any distance of it, particularly the hospital. That's a real concern I do have. The radiation effects, I wholeheartedly agree. I don't think there has been enough study on it, and it scares the heck out of me. It's not the government's kids. It's our kids and our grandkids that live here. Also when you do have it in port, how is this thing going to (inaudible) other than, I think, someone mentioned that if you do have an alert, you may or may not fire it. That's pretty spooky. Third, why can't it be located in a much less populated area?</p>	<p>P-O-0086</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p>	<p>Thank you very much. My name is Sean Edwards. The first name is spelled S-E-A-N. Last name is E-D-W-A-R-D-S. My address is ... Everett, Washington 98201.</p> <p>I live in the Port Gardner neighborhood. I look right out over the harbor from my second-story apartment. I value my view very much. It's one of the nice things about living here in Everett. I'm also able to walk to work. I think that's pretty great. I'm concerned about the SBX Draft EIS because I think it does not address a number of issues. I will state my opposition as a resident of the city to this proposal. In particular I'm personally concerned about, as I stated, the visual impacts of this. I also think that some very good points have been raised today about the potential health impacts of this.</p> <p>I'm also concerned about the local socioeconomic impacts, and as the presenters stated earlier, the socioeconomic item was not one of the bold items. That means, I think, that it wasn't addressed in detail for Everett. I might be wrong about that, but in any case, I think that's a major problem here because myself and many other people in this community are working hard to revitalize this community economically and in other ways.</p> <p>However, my main point here has to do with the section in the EIS in Volume 2 regarding biological resources, potential impacts on biological resources. I believe that there is a serious omission there. It's not surprising, considering that the location of Everett was added late in the process, but if you take a look at that section, it's pretty clear that the authors did not take into account our local environmental and habitat conditions and our local ecosystem.</p> <p>It talks about Pacific Ocean animals and habitats, blue whales and other things, dolphins and things. We have a gray whale here. We have a few different kinds of dolphins. Importantly for Everett and this region of Puget Sound, we have Dungeness crab, which is an important economic resource. We have forage fish, which are important elements of the food chain. For other organisms like salmon, chinook being listed as threatened, and bull trout being listed as threatened as well, those have not been addressed in this DEIS. I'm surprised that state and federal agencies haven't alerted you to that already. I'm sure they will.</p> <p>Anyway, finally I would like to say thank you for your time, and I'm sure you have been working hard.</p>	<p>P-O-0087</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>My name is David Gladstone, G-L-A-D-S-T-O-N-E. My mailing address is ...Snohomish, Washington 98291.</p> <p>Firstly, I think this entire project is a total waste of taxpayer money. With all the other important issues that we have to deal with in this country this is a waste of our money and should be stopped before any more money is expended on it.</p> <p>More specifically, I agree with the previous speaker's comments about our biological resources. The Everett area is also well known for its osprey colony, and I would say that of all the material I saw in the presentation so far, the only reference to harmful material was radiation. There were no slides and nothing spoke to the electromagnetic factors, and my understanding is that's a significant part of this SBX. There are health risks and problems associated with electromagnetic waves that certainly were not addressed in the presentation and need to be taken into account.</p> <p>As far as the visual impact, I think the device is a monstrosity and has a significant adverse impact on anyone trying to enjoy the natural surroundings that we have, that we came to live here with. The naval base is bad enough as it is. Don't add anymore to it. We don't want you in Everett.</p>	<p>P-O-0088</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	<p>I am Deborah Wright, D-E-B-O-R-A-H, Wright, W-R-I-G-H-T, at ... in Everett, 98203. I am almost into Mukilteo. The base surrounds where your site is proposed to be, and I can see directly over there to the Navy base.</p> <p>I agree with the past speakers. I have many concerns about this project of yours. Michelle Trautman had asked some questions, and I didn't feel like I heard the answers to her questions as well as some others of my own.</p> <p>I don't know on what date the City of Everett or Snohomish County were informed about this proposal. I don't know what -- I did hear there was an advertisement in the paper. That went way below my radar. I don't know to whom, if there was any official notified, or from what agency. I didn't hear the answer to that. Also, are these correspondences on public record? I also would like to make a Public Information Request for all documents relating to the SBX both received and sent from July 2002 to present.</p> <p>That's really important because even though the scoping was done, we weren't aware of it. So we are feeling rushed. We are feeling scared. We are feeling threatened. It's hard to be appropriate in that kind of frame of mind. I do oppose the project based on what I know. Thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0089</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>John Flowers, J-O-H-N, F-L-O-W-E-R-S, ..., Everett, 98251.</p> <p>I welcome the opportunity to speak in vigorous opposition to this entire Antibalistic Missile Defense System because I think it poses a grave and serious danger to the health and safety of our nation. I thought this system was put to bed and cancelled back in the '80s, but now it's reared its ugly head again. The reason it was cancelled in the '80s is because it was technically not feasible. Now, the defense establishment and the military industrial complex wants to deploy it now before it's even fully tested.</p> <p>That's not my main concern. My main concern is that it will reignite the arms race. In order to even do the testing that you're referring to, we had to cancel the Antibalistic Missile Treaty because these tests would be in violation of that. I'm very concerned about what this does to the arms race. We will be testing it, and other nations will try to overcome it. Every Maginot Line defense kind of thing like this in the world throughout history has been overcome with a defense mechanism, a countermeasure that costs a tiny fraction of what the system costs to build.</p> <p>I understand the Administration wants to share it with other countries like China, Russia, and other people. What I want to point out to you and everyone else who is listening is that we've shared these terrible weapons with people in the past, with what we thought were friendly regimes. Then they had a regime change, and we had to fight against the weapons we dispersed to them. Osama Bin Laden comes to mind. Saddam Hussein comes to mind. The Shah of Iran comes the mind. There are a number of people.</p> <p>We are creating that kind of situation here. We are going to spend billions upon billions of dollars perfecting it, and it will trigger off the arms race because people will try and overcome it. They can overcome it with a one-percent expenditure of what we are spending. Then when we give it away and then when they have a regime change, we will have to fight against it.</p> <p>Lastly, we are dumping the cost of all this on our children and grandchildren. I think it's outrageous. It needs to be stopped.</p>	<p>P-O-0090</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<p>I'm Marion Skalley, M-A-R-I-O-N, S-K-A-L-L-E-Y. I live at ... in Everett. I am a mother of three children ages 6, 8 and 9. I'm very concerned about the health implications of the SBX in our community. I firmly believe that the SBX will negatively impact our community. I have no doubt that Everett will see existing families leave the area. The few military families and personnel that the SBX would bring to the community I think is a drop in the bucket and a laughable argument in favor of the people that will leave.</p> <p>I'm an attorney. I'm skilled in the asking of questions and of analyzing answers. I sat through the entire first session, and I am disappointed in the answers that I received. I think that most of the answers were evasive and the questions were not answered.</p> <p>I might add in reference to the comment on the garage door opening, my garage door opens constantly, and on my security system on occasion the panic button has gone off for no reason, and the police have showed up at my house. I have one simple question, and it's really not a sarcastic question. As I sat here in the first session and sat here now, my question is: What can we do to keep the SBX from coming to our community? Is it signatures? Is it petitions? What can we do to keep it from coming?</p>	<p>P-O-0091</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>My name is Melinda Gladstone -- M-E-L-I-N-D-A, Gladstone, G-L-A-D-S-T-O-N-E. I live full time at the south end of Camano Island. My permanent mailing address is ..., Snohomish, Washington 98290-0803.</p> <p>I have three specific questions, and one is rhetorical: What is the genesis of this ludicrous program? Is it terrorism? I don't expect an answer from that. I'm just asking myself and asking everyone in this room.</p> <p>Then I have two specific questions. One goes back to the woman who gave comment three people before I did, and I want to know: If there were public comment periods in Hawaii -- I believe you said, David, in Hawaii and Alaska and in Seattle, I who read the public notices, I because I gave you my permanent mailing address, want to see photocopies of the public notices. That's a question in front of all these people. I want to see it in my mailbox.</p> <p>I'm here for two reasons: The health concern for humans and the planet and the health of other species. Right now I'm here because of my concerns for the democratic process which is why I want to see the public notices. I would have been in Seattle had I known. Something of this impact should have been first page, first page. Not in the public notices that are in like 6-point type.</p> <p>My second question is to you, Commander, and specifically during the slide where you had conceptual sea-based test of the X-Band Radar, your quote is: What is good for the oil industry is good for us. Could you please tell me what that means? That is so bizarre.</p> <p>If you are timing me for three minutes, their input was part of that three minutes. I just want to say I'm in control of my health, and what's good for the oil industry is not good for my health. Secondly, I heard about this yesterday. That is ludicrous. I heard about this yesterday. I would have had 20 of my friends here today.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0092</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0092	1	<p>My name is Valerie Steel, V-A-L-E-R-I-E, S-T-E-E-L. My home is at I'm glad to see we're using flags here. I was kind of taken aback when I attended the meeting at the end of February when the moderator used a closed fist as a symbol to stop the public from commenting. I thought it was a pretty pugnacious gesture. I think you guys would really be well served to use these in the future.</p> <p>I live directly east and about four blocks away from where this is going to be. I appreciate a drawing that shows this in direct relation to the brick building that is at Kimberly Clark.</p> <p>I think it's about 13 stories high, 12 stories high. It would give me some really accurate perspective on how this looks. Speaking of Kimberly Clark, she is going to be your nextdoor neighbor, and it's the largest polluter in Snohomish County for airborne particulates. It pumps over 1,289,520 pounds of garbage into the air per year. This is based on EPA studies from 2000.</p> <p>Two questions: One, did you calculate the cumulative effect of that pollutant and your pollutant? And two, how does this radar stuff effect airborne particulates? Does it morph them into something new? Does it cause them to be heavier and possibly fall to the water sooner, creating bad sediment for the biological features and activities that have to occur in our Sound area?</p> <p>The people of Washington have worked hard for years under the Shoreline Management Act to protect, enhance, and preserve our shorelines. Granted, you are not in the shoreline, but you are directly adjacent to shorelines of statewide significance. The estuary is home to hundreds of thousands of species. This thing is sited in a federal migratory bird path. To me this is going to disturb flight patterns. I guess the question I would really like answered is: Is it true that this thing will fry birds if they fly in its path? I heard this to be the case. What about the effect of the beam on airborne particulates?</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0093</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0093	1	2	3	4
COMMENT NUMBER												
P-O-0092												
1												
COMMENT NUMBER												
P-O-0093												
1												
2												
3												
4												

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>My name is Olemara Peters, O-L-E-M-A-R-A, P-E-T-E-R-S. I'm at ..., Redmond, Washington.</p> <p>I want to thank you all for traveling to hear us. I for one heard about this whole phenomenon first at 8 o'clock this morning and then only passed along by several layers of word of mouth; although, I listen to three radio stations several hours a day. I have to concur with the proposal to restart the process in each community that's concerned. Not that this is the only public process that hasn't been public. I have seen a lot of them lately, but I would like to see a lot of them a little more public.</p> <p>I question safety and health based on FCC safety and health criteria. The FCC's Radio Frequency Safety Guidelines -- they are not even standards -- are 2,000 times more lax than those of some European countries. And even at that level, they are not being monitored in this country. The Telecom Act of 1996 preempts local authority over wireless emissions, safety, and health violations; yet all violation complaints to FCC headquarters get farmed out to EPA and the FDA, and they don't have the personnel either. FCC is planning to further loosen those guidelines. Almost nobody I encountered has heard about any of this preemption.</p> <p>Relatedly, the Telecom Act dismantled most of our antitrust protection about media relations, and the FCC is now planning to dismantle what's left. So big money will have complete control over what we're allowed to know. The SBX proposal, from what I've heard so far, sounds like one more layer of the rising tide of electrosmog that the people are not being told the impacts of and that no agency is monitoring the total of. I would not trust any RF emission plan based on FCC health and safety standards until our representative government, including that regulatory agency, is left more intact than they have been demonstrating so far.</p> <p>With all due respect and thanks to each of you individually, I would be glad to hear your project associating itself with a more credible standard than the FCC's whether it's here or Pearl Harbor or anywhere else. Thank you.</p>	<p>P-O-0094</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<p>My name is Bob Jackson. I live at ... in Everett, 98201.</p> <p>Thank you for coming back to Everett for a hearing and for extending the deadline for comments. I think it's a compromise, and I hope that it would be extended further than this. I hope you will consider that. If it's possible, I would like a copy of the PowerPoint presentation to be given to Michelle Trautman.</p> <p>Now it's time for the people of Everett to fulfill our democratic role by giving our response to the proposal, and I hope everybody will take advantage of this time and make their comments by the 15th.</p> <p>I'm a little concerned about the objectivity of the Draft EIS and the rigger of the science that's being used to justify some of your conclusions. For example, in Chapter 4 on Page 244, there is a discussion about the electroexplosive devices like fire extinguishers, air bags in the cars, and ejection seats in military aircraft. The X-Band Radar emissions could have two possible effects on these devices: They could be made not to work or they could be inadvertently initiated. There is a chart showing the required separation distance of these devices from the SBX. If the SBX were tied up to a dock, it appears that cars with air bags may come within that distance. You seek to assure drivers by saying that, quote, there is no predicted potential for an inadvertent initiation of vehicle airbags because of metallic body/frame; the vehicle provides sufficient shielding. This fails to take into the account the cars which have bodies which aren't made of metal. These include fiberglass bodies on some models of Corvette, Taurus, Monte Carlo, Grand Prix. Saturns are made from sheet-molded composites. I would urge you not to let speed drive your deadlines when it's concerned with safety.</p> <p>As has been said before, we in Everett are really striving hard to improve our negative image. If you had come here 20 years ago, 30 years ago, it really smelled. That's pretty much gone now. It's a thing of the past, but we are really trying to build on a positive image. I don't think this ungainly SBX in the Port Gardner Bay is going to be helpful. We realize that we're surrounded by water, and it's our greatest opportunity to define Everett in a positive way.</p>	<p>P-O-0095</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>I just hope that before you leave, you go out to some of the parks and take a look from those parks and see what the views are like. I suggest Harborview Park. Go down to Pigeon Creek No. 1 to see the little park that we're going to build down to the waterfront or go to Grand Avenue Park. Thank you very much.</p>	<p>COMMENT NUMBER</p>	<p>My name is Bill Hawkins, H-A-W-K-I-N-S. I live at ... in Everett, 98204.</p> <p>Thank you for coming today. Thank you for coming to an All-American city: Everett, Washington. There was a comment made a long time ago by none other than, I believe, Thomas Jefferson who said that we have a responsibility to be skeptical of our government, respectfully skeptical. I believe some days I don't even fall into the respectable part, but I'm deeply concerned about the overall prospects of this project, what it has to international treaties, what it has to the idea of accelerating an arms race. I know I don't have to tell people in the military because that's probably the last thing that you want to be involved in is some kind of nuclear altercation with some other nation. At the same time, I wanted to call to your attention a couple of things that came to my mind when I saw this. First of all, I was disarmed by an early newspaper report that seemed to imply that this would simply be a storage place for this device between its actual being out at sea and used there. This morning I was listening to KUOW and came to the conclusion that no, it doesn't sound like it's a storage place but has the potential of actually being operated here in the port, and at least on the maintenance basis it would be operated.</p> <p>These are my concerns that come out of that: I would like to echo what other people have said about the radiation concerns, particularly low-level radiation as a human impact and also the potential to interfere with so many devices that we now run our lives with daily from our computers to our pacemakers to our automobiles. I have a car that's fully computerized. If that computer goes down, I'm locked in it -- never mind it won't run.</p> <p>The other point I would like to say in that, too, is I've work with antenna systems in my life -- phased arrays -- before they were called phased arrays. I can guarantee you that there isn't anyone out there that actually radiates exactly where you point it. You know there is spillover. So I'm concerned about that. I'm concerned about noise pollution not being considered in there. I live six and a half miles south. I hear the diesel trains.</p> <p>The other thing is the power consumption in this county. The statement was made recently by the Board that they intended to fill in our future power needs as much as possible by conservation.</p>	<p>COMMENT NUMBER</p> <p>P-O-0096</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>
---	-----------------------	---	---

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>I think you owe it to the community to tell us exactly what the load will be as a percentage of the present Navy load and what it will be projected in the future. If there is a moment that comes that you have to run it off bayside, off the power mains, what that will be.</p> <p>The final point also is the air pollution. We live in a state that has a three -- we're in a tricounty air pollution district. They're essentially worthless. They're not the EPA. They have no measuring capability. When all these generators are running, the emissions accumulative with that mill, I have a feeling we are going to have a problem on certain days and particularly when there is any kind of conversion. I hope that those issues will be adequately addressed, and the others I will send to you in writing. Again, thank you for coming to an All-American city.</p>	5	<p>My name is Maury Trautman, ..., Everett, Washington 98201. And yes, I do belong to Michelle.</p> <p>I'm a fourth generation resident of Everett. My children represent the fifth generation. Hopefully their children will be the sixth. I share ownership in several businesses in Everett that employ approximately 200 people. The deployment and home-basing of the SBX Radar System in Port Gardner Bay is a great concern to both myself and my employees. We have chosen to live and work in Everett because of the opportunities the future of the city represent.</p> <p>Much has been done; much is in process; much is planned. From the revitalization of the downtown corridor, Evergreen Way, and the transportation center to the new Everett Event Center and county administration buildings under construction and the initiation of contracts between the Port of Everett and Maritime Trust Corporation for the development of the North Marine Site, Everett's view is changing. Let's not block that view.</p> <p>Recently the city adopted a new slogan, one designed to enhance its image and attracting new business and families to settle and prosper in Everett: Everett: The thinking city with a view. What will happen to that view?</p> <p>The SBX brings the threat of long-term electromagnetic radiation on the health and safety of the citizens of Everett, the potential degradation of air and noise pollution, decreased access to our shorelines and waterfront, negative impact on property values, and the unarguable blight on the views and vistas of the city and waterfront. I ask you: Who will come? Then I would ask you: Who will stay? I for one, as a business owner, would look very seriously at relocating my businesses out of the sphere of influence of the SBX. I will take those jobs with me. To try and attract good employees to live and work in an environment burdened with potential threats represented by the SBX will be very difficult. The citing of the SBX in the areas of population density the size of Everett is inappropriate. Each generation of Everettites is given custody of the legacy of those generations who have come before us. It is our duty to grow and enhance that legacy and pass it on to the next generation. Let's not let the SBX be the legacy of this generation.</p>	<p>P-O-0097</p> <p>1</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>I do have a couple questions that I would like to ask. One, you say that the SBX will not be sited in the bay, in Port Gardner Bay. What happens when piers at the Navy base are at capacity and the Lincoln is in port and all supported ships? Where will the SBX be moored at that time?</p> <p>Is the endorsement or rejection of home-basing in Everett of the SBX tied to the next round of base closures in any way?</p> <p>I'm glad to have that on public record. Thank you.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>3</p>	<p>I'm Mike Papa, The last speaker asked, I guess, the question I ask. I'm a recreational boater, and that was one of my concerns of what effect this might have on recreational boats because, to say the least, The Herald just confused me because it implied it would be anchored out in the bay. For the record, it won't be anchored out in the bay?</p> <p>The other question I had, and maybe this is kind of minor, but when it's entering or leaving port, is the distance that boaters will have stay away from it any greater than any other Navy ship?</p>	<p>P-O-0098</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>My name is Jean Burger, J-E-A-N, B-U-R-G-E-R, ..., Everett. I retired here last year to be with my daughter and grandchildren. I would like to say one thing about the advertising. I know it's been discussed a lot, but if that picture would have been in a paper, you would have had a good turnout. If nothing else, maybe a low-flying Navy plane could have dropped leaflets. You would have had a big crowd; trust me.</p> <p>As far as the noise goes, I live on the ravine, and I hear everything at the base. I have had to complain to the City. Sometimes they're redoing their ships and they say, well, they'll stop the generators at 4 in the morning, which is nice because at least I get two hours of sleep. For you that have this, is this your report? Let's look at where it says Impacts and Mitigation Summary, Naval Station Everett. Air quality: This Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would not be considered a stationary source and would not require a Prevention of Significant Deterioration Review or a Title V Permit. Air emissions from the operation of this Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would be in compliance with appropriate State Implementation Plans. Now, it's disingenuous to call this mobile when it will be stationary at our port for how many months did you say? -- in order for you to get around appropriate testing. My question is: Is it mobile or is it not? But how many months is it going to be in? I see. How months do you consider permanent versus mobile?</p> <p>So you're saying it's going to be in our port at least nine months out of the year, and that's not permanent? So that way you don't have to have these extra tests. Nice.</p>	<p>P-O-0099</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p>	<p>My name is Julian Dewell, J-U-L-I-A-N, D-E-W-E-L-L. I reside in ..., Everett, Washington.</p> <p>I have a number of questions which I will submit in writing to the addresses that were listed. I have one question, though, that I would like to have answered: As I understand the Draft Environmental Statement that you have prepared, it is for the purposes of the test of this dome and not for the permanent use of the dome after the testing. As I understand it, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is based upon the testing analogy. What you have said to me is that the speed of this dome to leave the dock to arrive out in the middle of the harbor is at a speed of about 5 or 6 knots or something in that neighborhood. Not the speed of a sailboat. If it was to be used for purposes of detecting a ballistic missile coming from a foreign shore, it would be necessary for it to be, if I understand it correctly, to be located in the middle of the harbor someplace in order to detect those ballistic missiles because it's not going to be doing its job from dockside in Everett.</p> <p>If the test is correct -- in other words, you decide to go forward with it -- does that mean that this device will then be docked out in the middle of the harbor as opposed to bringing it in for maintenance periodically but leaving it out there on the a permanent basis?</p> <p>Then the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is solely for your testing purposes. I assume there would be another Environmental Impact Statement issued in connection to wherever the permanent location of this device is.</p> <p>Is there any reason for a water-based as opposed to a land-based location?</p>	<p>P-O-0100</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p>

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

<p>My name is Desmond Skubi, D-E-S-M-O-N-D, S-K-U-B-I. I live at ... here in Everett, 98201.</p> <p>I would just like to state my opposition to the expenditure of huge sums of money on this program. Here in Washington state our legislature is trying to cope with a \$2.6 billion deficit that will result in tens of thousands of people losing access to their health care services. That will degrade the quality of our public education and have many other adverse impacts here in our local state.</p> <p>In our federal government we have gone from a surplus of funds to a huge and growing deficit at least in part because of such expenditures on programs such as this. We have abrogated international and high ballistic treaties unilaterally. I'm opposed to this project.</p> <p>I would also like to pose one question that I have not heard addressed here: I'm curious what alternative locations were considered for stationing this proposed project, and what the basis of deciding to move forward with Everett is. Thank you.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0101</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0101	1	2	<p>My name is Berit Reisenauer, and I'm 10 years old. It's spelled B-E-R-I-T, R-E-I-S-E-N-A-U-E-R. If this comes to Everett, we would move. I don't want to move. Thank you.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>COMMENT NUMBER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P-O-0102</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-O-0102	1
COMMENT NUMBER										
P-O-0101										
1										
2										
COMMENT NUMBER										
P-O-0102										
1										

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

Message delivered: 13 Mar 03: 11:30 AM CST; 116 seconds

My name is Joe Hunziker...I'm calling regarding the extension of the missile range program...and to express my full support and encouragement to proceed with the program. I feel qualified to comment on it...strongly qualified in as much as that I have been involved mentality clear back for 52 years starting in 1951 at the Naval Air Missile Test Center where I spent three (3) years under Commander Eric Bruce Bower and I was assigned to Island Facility's Department...a special department...logistical department that tracked missiles from Mugu to San Nicholas Island, and Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa...I've been on all of those islands...and I'm calling to give you guys full support and encouragement to proceed with this very...very necessary extension of our security arm for this country...especially now. I've resided in Burbank these past 45 years...my phone number is ...again good luck and I wish you guys all the encouragement in the world to proceed with this excellent program. The Navy takes great care of those islands by the way...as far as any preservation of any historical artificacts...like Indian burial grounds...I know all about that stuff...good luck to you...bye.

COMMENT NUMBER
P-O-0103
1

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

COMMENT NUMBER

Exhibit 8.1.4-1: Reproductions of Oral Comments (Continued)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table 8.1.4-2: Responses to Oral Comments

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Barbara Ikeda	P-O-0001-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Mary Ann Gianantoni	P-O-0002-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Ann McLaren	P-O-0003-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
David B. Johnson	P-O-0004-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Susan Dougal	P-O-0005-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Elliott Menashe	P-O-0006-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Ty Costa	P-O-0007-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Lynn Hayes	P-O-0008-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Billie King	P-O-0009-1	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
Susan Kampion	P-O-0010-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Karina Johnson Werner	P-O-0011-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Patricia Rohan	P-O-0012-1	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
	P-O-0012-2	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Betty Shabbington	P-O-0013-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-O-0013-2	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
	P-O-0013-3	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4

Table 8.1.4-2: Responses to Oral Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Betty Shabbington	P-O-0013-4	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
Brown	P-O-0014-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Linda Edling	P-O-0015-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Pam Roy	P-O-0016-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Susan Cyr	P-O-0017-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-O-0017-2	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
Laura Hartman	P-O-0018-1	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
	P-O-0018-2	Biological Resources	4.8.3	See P-E-0209-4
	P-O-0018-3	EIS Process	2.1.4.2 4.8.5	SBX operating parameters are described in section 2.1.4. Section 4.8.5 discusses potential health and safety issues related to SBX operation at the Naval Station Everett PSB.
	P-O-0018-4	Program		See P-E-0006-1
A. T. Young	P-O-0019-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-O-0019-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Bruno	P-O-0020-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Thomas Mitchell	P-O-0021-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Claire Bird	P-O-0022-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Gloria Chou	P-O-0023-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1

Table 8.1.4-2: Responses to Oral Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Chou	P-O-0024-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
No Name Provided	P-O-0025-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
Carly Davenport	P-O-0026-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-O-0026-2	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
	P-O-0026-3	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
	P-O-0026-4	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
Richard Marshall	P-O-0027-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Christine Giannini	P-O-0028-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Pearl Beach	P-O-0029-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Beverly Bruno	P-O-0030-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Timothy Webb	P-O-0031-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-O-0031-2	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
	P-O-0031-3	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
	P-O-0031-4	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
Deloris Bustad	P-O-0032-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Annette Bustad	P-O-0033-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1

Table 8.1.4-2: Responses to Oral Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Patricia Neel	P-O-0034-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Mary Davidson	P-O-0035-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Jason Brasfield	P-O-0036-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Claudia Elliott	P-O-0037-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Jeff McCune	P-O-0038-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
John Vandalen	P-O-0039-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	See P-E-0208-4
Martin Schmidt	P-O-0040-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Evelyn Hayes	P-O-0041-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Reis	P-O-0042-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Casey	P-O-0043-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Sara O'Farell	P-O-0044-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Charlotte Laborde	P-O-0045-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
No Name Provided	P-O-0046-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Nena O'Neil	P-O-0047-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Karen Miller	P-O-0048-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Ralph Minor	P-O-0049-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
June Evers	P-O-0050-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Mary DiJulio	P-O-0051-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Janice Hartson	P-O-0052-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Bernadine Casey	P-O-0053-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Govedare	P-O-0054-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Diane Rogers	P-O-0055-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Richard Marshall	P-O-0056-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0338-1

Table 8.1.4-2: Responses to Oral Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Betty Elliot	P-O-0057-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	Section 2.1.4.2 and appendix G of the EIS discusses potential interference with communications and electronics equipment. Under proposed SBX operating conditions, full power operation would involve tracking objects in space with the beam pointed up and constantly moving. The beam would not remain stationary for any period of time. Thus, the odds that communication-electronics equipment could be affected by the SBX because of high power effects during the course of one day are 1/1,000,000 or 0.0001% of the time (roughly 1/10 of a second per day). If interference occurs, the short-term effects would not damage any electronic equipment. These odds are based on conservative calculations that assume the SBX would operate in full power mode for 20 minutes each day at maximum duty cycle. New information on the potential effects of EMR on human health and communications-electronics has been added as appendix G of the EIS.
	P-O-0057-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
Harry Elliot	P-O-0058-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 3.8.2 4.8.2	Sections 2.1.4, 2.1.8, 3.8.2, and 4.8.2 of the EIS indicate the SBX operating and mooring areas and potential influence on airspace. Additional information on the potential effects of EMR on communications-electronics, including avionics, has been added as appendix G of the EIS.
Juanson Kim	P-O-0059-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Charles R. Burdshal	P-O-0060-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
Michael Martin	P-O-0061-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Casey	P-O-0062-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
June Evers	P-O-0063-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Charlotte Laborde	P-O-0064-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
unknown unknown	P-O-0065-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Nena O'Neil	P-O-0066-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Karen Miller	P-O-0067-1	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
Ralph Minor	P-O-0068-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
David Roodzant	P-O-0069-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Christine Giannini	P-O-0070-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Pearl Beach	P-O-0071-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1

Table 8.1.4-2: Responses to Oral Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
John McCoy - 38th Legislative District (state representative)	P-O-0072-1	Program		It is anticipated that the security zone required by the SBX would be similar to the existing security in use currently at Naval Station Everett. However, it would be the subject of an interservice support agreement.
	P-O-0072-2	Program		The testing has been scheduled through 2007 for the SBX, anything beyond that is not known at this time. It is anticipated that between 2005 and 2007 the SBX would be in port as much as 9 months out of the year, underway 1 month at a time for 3 months or more. The SBX is not intended to stay out in the Sound, it is anticipated that it would only be in the Sound during transiting.
Richard Jones	P-O-0073-1	Program		General Holley, the program manager for GMD, is primary decision maker. General Kadish, the Director of the MDA, reserves the right to make the decision as well. He will be consulted and will be issuing the ROD. As we go through, we are doing the cost analyses and mission operation effectiveness. These will first be presented to Colonel Smith, the X-Band Program Manager, who will in turn go to the GMD program manager with a recommendation on siting. They will in turn go to General Kadish, who will issue the ROD on the GMD ETR.
	P-O-0073-2	Airspace Use	4.8.2	See P-E-0236-4
	P-O-0073-3	Program		The need could arise to use high power to track satellites while in port. However, the angle of the beam would be at 10 degrees to avoid anything the FAA requires for aircraft protection.
	P-O-0073-4	Airspace Use	4.8.2	See P-E-0236-4
	P-O-0073-5	Airspace Use	4.8.2	See P-E-0236-4
Michelle Trautman	P-O-0074-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
	P-O-0074-2	EIS Process		A agency coordination meeting with local, Federal, and State agencies was held at the Naval Station Everett in October 2002.
	P-O-0074-3	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Annie Lyman	P-O-0075-1	Program		As the schedule stands, it is anticipated that six trips per year would be performed. There could be more as the schedule evolves.
	P-O-0075-2	Program		The cost of testing operations are being considered and analyzed. The 3,028,329 liters (800,000 gallons) of fuel would be broken up into multiple tanks. In the event of a collision, a smaller amount of fuel would be at risk of being spilled. The same restriction currently observed by other vessels would be observed during the fueling of the SBX.

Table 8.1.4-2: Responses to Oral Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Ken Taylor	P-O-0076-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2	As indicated in section 2.1.4.2, the SBX can exceed the 300 V/m average power threshold at 12 kilometers (7.5 miles). The average power threshold is based upon reducing the time of exposure of aircraft avionics to high intensity radiated field environments in order to preclude shortening the life of the aircraft avionics. The concern is not interference, but a reduction in life of the aircraft avionics. Additional on the potential effects of EMR on communications-electronics, including aircraft avionics, is provided as appendix G of the EIS. Mitigation measures such as the redundant software that would help minimize potential interference to aircraft systems are discussed in section 2.1.4 as well as in appendix G.
Elizabeth Marshall	P-O-0077-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	Sections 2.1.4, 2.1.8, 4.3.5.2.5, 4.6.5.2, and 4.8.5.2 of the EIS indicate the SBX operating and mooring areas and general operational effects. A large body of evidence was used in determining the current IEEE human exposure and measurement practices standards (IEEE C95.1-1999 and IEEE C95.3-1999) on which the EIS EMR analysis is based. The IEEE standards afford the public protection and have safety factors built in. Through the use of software controls, constraints placed on the SBX operating area, and coordination with local, state, and federal agencies, potential interference levels would be below the IEEE standards. The odds that communication-electronics equipment could be affected by the SBX because of high power effects are negligible, (roughly 1/10 of a second per day). New information on the potential effects of electromagnetic radiation on human health and communications-electronics has been added as appendix G of the EIS.
	P-O-0077-2	Safety and Health	Appendix G	As indicated in appendix G, the SBX is not in the same frequency band, nor would it exceed the 10 mW/cm ² required to affect pacemakers. Mitigation measures to reduce potential RF interference caused by radars would include safe distance separations and redundant RF Radiation Hazard Safety software controls. Similar software controls have been effectively used on the large XBR currently operating at Kwajalein Island in the RMI.
Marianne Edain	P-O-0078-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0346-1
	P-O-0078-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
	P-O-0078-3	EIS Process		See P-E-0242-1
Stephanie Allen	P-O-0079-1	Program		See P-E-0018-5

Table 8.1.4-2: Responses to Oral Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Mary Jane Anderson	P-O-0080-1	Program		The vessel portion of the SBX would consist of a commercially manufactured platform and is anticipated to be unchanged. The design of the dome itself is close to completion and is also not expected to change.
	P-O-0080-2	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0222-1
Michelle Kermaode	P-O-0081-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	SBX emission patterns, power levels, separation distances and calculated power densities are discussed in section 2.1.4.2 and in appendix G of the EIS. For the fully populated radar at a distance of 150 meters (492 feet) and for the 65 percent populated radar at a distance of 85 meters (279 feet) the power density was calculated to be 2.5mW/cm ² . Under proposed SBX operating conditions, full power operation would involve tracking objects in space with the beam pointed up and constantly moving. The beam would not remain stationary for any period of time and two separate, redundant radio frequency radiation hazard safety software controls, similar to controls effectively used on the large XBR at Kwajalein Island in the RMI, would monitor all emission energy levels at locations around the radar and would not allow a full power beam to come in contact with any personnel, on the SBX platform or on land.
	P-O-0081-2	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.3.1.8	Sections 2.1.4 and 2.3.1.8 discuss the SBX basing and test activities. The SBX would not enter most of the proposed PSB port facilities after leaving its assembly point in the Gulf of Mexico, and in the case of PSB Naval Station Everett while USS Abraham Lincoln is in port. In this case, the SBX would moor or anchor offshore between GMD test missions for a total of approximately 3 months per year. While in port or moored/anchored offshore, operation of the XBR would include system testing, calibration, and tracking of satellites. Radar emissions would occur in 15- to 20-minute periods totaling approximately 1 hour per day as indicated in section 2.1.4.6.
	P-O-0081-3	Safety and Health	2.1.4 Appendix G	As indicated in section 2.1.4, the redundant RF radiation hazard safety software controls proposed for the SBX radar are similar to controls effectively used on the GBR-P at Kwajalein Island in the RMI. The radar has been operational for 5+ years. Additional information on the potential effects of non-ionizing radiation on human health has been added as appendix G of the EIS.
	P-O-0081-4	Air Quality	4.8.1.2	See P-E-0208-3
	P-O-0081-5	EIS Process		A multi-disciplinary team of experts coordinated with State and Federal agencies, concerning health and safety issues and concerns about the proposed project.
	P-O-0081-6	Hazardous Materials		See

Table 8.1.4-2: Responses to Oral Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Michelle Kermoade	P-O-0081-7	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0008-1
Doris Olivers	P-O-0082-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
	P-O-0082-2	Safety and Health	Appendix G	See P-O-0077-2
	P-O-0082-3	Transportation	4.8.6.2	See P-E-0318-5
	P-O-0082-4	Program		The SBX is not double hull. However, fuel tanks are located on the inboard side of the pontoons so are less vulnerable to external impact.
	P-O-0082-5	Air Quality	4.8.1	See P-E-0025-1
	P-O-0082-6	Noise	4.8	See P-E-0208-2
Vernon Huffman	P-O-0083-1	Program		At this stage, the SBX is set up as a testing system and not hooked into a system that could respond to national tasking. In the event of a false alarm, the generators would be turned off and no radiating would occur. Other entities would have to be tracking in order for the system to be activated.
Karen Pauley	P-O-0084-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
Tim Reisenauer	P-O-0085-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	See P-O-0057-1
George Newland	P-O-0086-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0338-1
	P-O-0086-2	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0340-1
	P-O-0086-3	Program		Criteria for location is based on operational and support requirements as well as potential environmental impacts, cost, and other considerations.
Sean Edwards	P-O-0087-1	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0017-1
	P-O-0087-2	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2

Table 8.1.4-2: Responses to Oral Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Sean Edwards	P-O-0087-3	Biological Resources	4.8.3	An appendix has been added to the document providing a brief discussion of potential listed species (terrestrial and marine) that may be found in the areas affected by the Proposed Action. As stated on page 4-242, the SBX vessel would incorporate marine pollution control devices such as keeping decks clear of debris, cleaning spills and residues, and engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices in compliance with the UNDS provisions of the Clean Water Act. No significant long-term adverse impacts to biological resources are anticipated. As stated on page 4-241, no significant long-term impacts to species such as the fish and whales in the area are anticipated.
David Gladstone	P-O-0088-1	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
	P-O-0088-2	Biological Resources	4.8.3	See P-O-0087-3
	P-O-0088-3	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0340-1
	P-O-0088-4	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0017-1
Deborah Wright	P-O-0089-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0242-1
John Flowers	P-O-0090-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-O-0090-2	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
Marion Skalley	P-O-0091-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0290-1
Melinda Gladstone	P-O-0092-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-O-0092-2	EIS Process		Copies of public notices are not provided to individuals. Thank you for your comment.
	P-O-0092-3	EIS Process		The oil industry builds platforms like the platform proposed for the SBX due to their stability, providing a large working area that can lift several thousand tons, and seaworthy. It turned out that the oil industry has created a market for these semisubmersible, mobile, offshore platforms, and there was on on the market that was available.
Valerie Steel	P-O-0093-1	Air Quality	4.8.1.2	See P-E-0230-7
	P-O-0093-2	Air Quality	4.8.1	The radar beam is not known to affect airborne particles.

Table 8.1.4-2: Responses to Oral Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Valerie Steel	P-O-0093-3	Biological Resources	4.8.3	Comment noted. However, the radar beam would be in motion, making it extremely unlikely that a bird would be in the intense area of the beam and would remain there for any considerable length of time. The power density is also not expected to exceed levels that could impact birds.
	P-O-0093-4	Air Quality	4.8.1	See P-O-0093-2
Olemara Peters	P-O-0094-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
	P-O-0094-2	Safety and Health	4.6.5.2 Appendix G	As indicated in section 4.6.5.2 and appendix G of the EIS, the health effects criteria for DoD and civilian personnel used in the EIS analysis are based on the 1999 IEEE MPELs (IEEE C95.1, IEEE Standard for Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Radio Frequency Electromagnetic Fields, 3 kHz to 300 GHz, 16 April 1999). The FCC regulations are primarily based on the 1986 National Council on Radiation Protection Report, but also incorporate portions the 1991 IEEE standard.
Bob Jackson	P-O-0095-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	See P-O-0057-1
	P-O-0095-2	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
Bill Hawkins	P-O-0096-1	Safety and Health	Appendix G	As indicated in appendix G, the main beam and side lobes of the SBX could illuminate EEDs on the ground in the presence/shipping phase. However, the potential radiation hazard would exist only 10 meters (33 feet), in front of the radar, which would be limited to the deck of the SBX. Therefore, EEDs on the ground, including those associated with airbags in vehicles, would not be affected.
	P-O-0096-2	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0340-1
	P-O-0096-3	Noise	4.8	See P-E-0208-2

Table 8.1.4-2: Responses to Oral Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Bill Hawkins	P-O-0096-4	Utilities	4.8.8.2	<p>The SBX would basically be self contained; when in port, however, a utility hookup would be required. This "shore power" requirement would be typical of other ships that currently utilize Piers Alpha and Bravo (section 4.8.7.2), thus posing no unusual demands upon current infrastructure.</p> <p>Potential construction of a new 900- to 1,500-square-meter (3,000- to 5,000-square-foot) environmentally controlled warehouse could be required for utilization as the PSB, and any new facilities being constructed would require utilities installation. Average daily utility demands for the maximum of 25 personnel would be at typical levels, and any new or refurbished facilities would be required to accommodate the increase in demand.</p>
	P-O-0096-5	Air Quality	4.8.1.2	See P-E-0208-3
Maury Trautman	P-O-0097-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
	P-O-0097-2	Program		The proposed SBX operating procedures are in section 2.3.1.8. Current plans call for the SBX to be potentially docked at Naval Station Everett when USS Abraham Lincoln is in port, at either Pier A or B.
	P-O-0097-3	Program		See P-E-0250-1
Mike Papa	P-O-0098-1	Program		See P-O-0097-2
	P-O-0098-2	Program		It is anticipated that the distance required by the Navy would be the same as required by the SBX.
Jean Burger	P-O-0099-1	Noise	4.8	See P-E-0208-2
	P-O-0099-2	Air Quality	4.8.1.2	See P-E-0275-4
	P-O-0099-3	Program		Based on five tests per year, the SBX would be at its PSB for 7 months per year. The GMD ETR testing activities would likely occur over a period of approximately 10 years following a decision to proceed.
Julian Dewell	P-O-0100-1	Program		See P-O-0097-2
	P-O-0100-2	EIS Process		The GMD ETR EIS addresses testing of the SBX, it does not address any additional defensive operational capabilities specifically. In the event of locating the SBX at a permanent PSB, additional analysis would be required.
	P-O-0100-3	Program		Sea-based provides mobility to be able to position the radar in the optimum location for each different test.
Desmond Skubi	P-O-0101-1	Policy		See P-E-0026-1

Table 8.1.4-2: Responses to Oral Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Desmond Skubi	P-O-0101-2	Program		Alternative locations for the SBX PSB include Pearl Harbor, Hawaii; RTS; NBVC Port Hueneme, California; Port Adak, Alaska; and Port of Valdez, Alaska. The decision is based on mission effectiveness, availability of testing on maintenance, ability to get out to the operation area, cost effectiveness, maintenance support, infrasture, transportation, homes and schools to support the crew, facilities, and security infrastructure. At this time, no one site has been selected nor will it be until the ROD has been issued.
Berit Reisenauer	P-O-0102-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Joe Hunziker	P-O-0103-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK