

Date submitted (Pacific Standard Time): 1/13/2017 4:04:11 AM  
First name: Donna  
Last name: Osseward  
Organization:  
Title:  
Official Representative/Member Indicator:  
Address1: 13245 40th Ave NE  
Address2:  
City: Seattle  
State: WA  
Province/Region:  
Zip/Postal Code: 98125-4617  
Country: United States  
Email: osseward@gmail.com  
Phone: 206-949-7020  
Comments:  
Subject: OBJECTION Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range

Dear Reviewing Officer, Reta LaFord:

I, Donna Osseward, appreciate this opportunity to object to the issuance of a Forest Service Special Permit that would allow the change of venue of an electromagnetic warfare training range from Idaho to the western half of the Olympic Peninsula. As a citizen of the United States, the state of Washington and the city of Seattle, I have spent 70 years making trips to the area being affected by the proposed venue change. I have personally walked, in various trips, the Pacific Coast from Shi Shi to Oil City. I have also enjoyed many trips into Olympic National Forest and Olympic National Park. The noise that will be created by the Navy activities will destroy the tranquility I and my friends seek on these trips to the Peninsula. I submitted pertinent and timely comments on the Draft EA in 2014.

Based on my Draft EA comments in 2014 and the information I have learn since, I argue that this project violates the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), Endangered Species Act of 1973, and The National Forest Management Act (NFMA). Because it violates the spirit of the Wilderness Act of 1964, I contend it also violates the Wilderness Act.

Therefore, I object to the issuance of the Special Use Permit, as proposed November 29, 2016 in the Draft Decision.

The number of confusing, contradictory, and incorrect statements found in the Draft Decision indicates to me that only an EIS can answer the questions of how this project will actually affect the environment of the Olympic Peninsula.

I also request that an extension of time be given for comments to the USDA Forest Service Special Use Permit as proposed, November 29, 2016.

I ask that a meeting be held with Superintendent Reta LaFord, Olympic National Forest (ONF), so that all objectors to the permit may ask questions and provide documents when relevant.

While it is acceptable to use studies by other agencies, it is incumbent on the Forest Service to verify that the studies are relevant to the Special Use Permit (SUP) being considered.

Therefore, I argue that the USFWS Biological Opinion is: 1) Insufficient because it does not study all wildlife, only endangered species of the area, and 2) Has errors because of assumptions due to incomplete information provided by the Navy, and so does not provide the information needed to determine the effect on the wildlife of the Olympic Peninsula of the project under the SUP proposed. Such as: ""Without knowing the location and flight pattern of each training flight, we assumed that the training flights will be evenly distributed throughout the Olympic MOAs." [p. 214, USFWS Biological Opinion, July 21, 2016]. Assumptions such as these create suspicion of any valid conclusions. This is unacceptable.

Insufficient data was provided to substantiate the many claims of "no significance" Many of the studies used

were badly outdated. Invalid conclusions were drawn from other studies.

The Forest Service has failed to follow the requirements of NEPA by illegally segmenting its environmental review of the mobile emitters from the environmental review of the impacts of the aircraft that will be directly associated with the mobile emitters.

This SUP would not be necessary if no aircraft were involved with the training of the pilots included in the stated project's Purpose and Need. Therefore, the conclusions that claim no responsibility for the noise and pollution brought by the jets flying these training missions is deceptive and ignoring the facts regarding this project.

"In making my decision, I considered its relationship to the project's purpose and need. This decision to select Alternative 1, modified as described above, meets the project's purposes and needs in the following ways:

To sustain and enhance the level and type of EW training currently being conducted as described in the 2010 NWTRC EIS/OEIS and authorized in its Record of Decision.

My decision supports required EW basic, intermediate, and sustainment training activities and certifications for air and surface, units in the NWTRC.

To provide the ability to accommodate growth in future training requirements and to maximize the ability of local units to achieve their training requirements on local ranges.

My decision accommodates anticipated future training requirements by expanding the current use and activity of the long-established Military Operations Areas in and around the Olympic Peninsula.

To maximize the ability of local Naval units to achieve their training requirements on local ranges.

My decision allows local Navy units to train in the local Olympic Military Operations Areas, as opposed to traveling longer distances to sites. Local training reduces training costs and reduces the use of fossil fuels. It also maximizes and balances the quality training with quality of life by reducing the time of Navy personnel away from home." [p. 5, The Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact, Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range]

HOWEVER, the Draft Decision than states, ""The project is limited in scope and duration and is designed to minimize environmental effects through mitigation measures (2014 EW Range EA, Section 3.1.1.5; this document, Appendix C, Exhibit B). The Pacific Northwest EW range activities will be localized to specific sites within the Pacific Ranger District. Mobile Electronic Warfare Training System vehicles will utilize 11 pullout sites along NFS roads, using 3 sites per day, for 8 to16 hours per day for approximately 250 days per year. The EW range activities will be authorized under a SUP for a duration of 5 years. Based on these factors, I believe the effects of this project will be localized, and will not contribute to significant environmental effects within or beyond the project area." [p. 9, The Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact, Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range]

I would ask, what mitigation measures? The Draft Decision's attempt to separate jet planes and their noise from the project is an attempt to divorce itself from its responsibilities to the environment of the Olympic Peninsula it should protect. I argue that is a violation of NEPA.

The need for the Special Use Permit is not just for the operation of emitter trucks, as is claimed in the Decision Notice, the Navy desires it because the pilots training will find the emitter trucks by using search patterns flown over the western Olympic Peninsula. No emitter trucks would be needed if jet pilots didn't need to find them as part of their flight training.

I question the conclusions made from the Biological Opinion of July 2016 because the species studied were limited to endangered species in the areas in question. One of the purposes for creating Olympic National Park was to protect the Peninsula's elk. These same elk migrate into Olympic National Forest. If noise can damage the human species, it should be assumed unless proven otherwise that, it will also do similar damage to the mega-fauna of the Peninsula. Another environmental question not answered. I consider this another violation of NEPA because it is ignoring wildlife valuable to ONP and ONF.

Because of the report "Inspector General's Forest Service Administration of Special Use Program issued June 2011, I am concerned that the resources are not available to the Forest Service to properly vet and manage the SUP for this project. I need assurances that the vetting and management of this SUP will not violate NEPA standards.

## LACK OF TRANSPARENCY, INACCESSIBLE INFORMATION, & INSUFFICIENT RESPONSES

The timing of the Nov 29, 2016 announcement appears, unfortunately, to reduce transparency and ability of citizen involvement in this issue. After delaying the decision for two years, and then including the Christian-Judean holidays within the comment period is a further example of the Forest Service's apparent attempt to reduce citizen input.

In addition, links given in District Ranger Millett's letter announcing his decision became inoperative resulting in documents being unavailable. It required a call to the USFS Washington, DC office to obtain another link to the documents. The link provided in Millett's letter did not provide linkage to the operative link, to my knowledge, from 12-20-2016 for, at least, several days following phone and email objections to the situation. The same happened with the Draft EA in Oct 2014 as noted in our comments at that time. I argue this violates NEPA procedures for allowing public input to the process. At best, this shows incompetence, otherwise, a conspiracy to reduce public input to the process as required by NEPA.

There were insufficient responses given in Appendix B. There were simplistic reasons and a failure to accept responsibility for the Olympic Peninsula's environment beyond allowing trucks to travel and park on the roads of Olympic National Forest until they create ruts deeper than two inches.

For Example:

Concern Seq#35: Question: The USFS should deny the permit because it conflicts with NPS purposes. USFS reply says that no ONP land is involved therefore the question is irrelevant. In the same response it says there will be no increase in the number of flights. The Draft EA gave no information about the number of flights. Does that mean there will be no increase of no flights? I think not. It is an illogical attempt to use both ends of a bogus position.

Concern Seq#48: The USFS response claims that "electronic warfare training in this airspace is ongoing and has been conducted by the Navy in this area for over 40 years." I would ask why then is a permit needed now? Does the need for a permit indicate that there will be changes to the activity? Will the intensity of the activity be going up?

The answer is:

"To sustain and enhance the level and type of EW training currently being conducted as described in the 2010 NWTRC EIS/OEIS and authorized in its Record of Decision. "

"To provide the ability to accommodate growth in future training requirements and to maximize the ability of local units to achieve their training requirements on local ranges.

"My decision accommodates anticipated future training requirements by expanding the current use and activity of the long-established Military Operations Areas in and around the Olympic Peninsula." [p. 5, The Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact, Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range]

" Noise pollution adversely affects the lives of millions of people. Studies have shown that there are direct links between noise and health. Problems related to noise include stress related illnesses, high blood pressure, speech interference, hearing loss, sleep disruption, and lost productivity. Noise Induced Hearing Loss (NIHL) is the most common and often discussed health effect, but research has shown that exposure to constant or high levels of noise can cause countless adverse health affects." [EPA website, downloaded January 11, 2017]

Further, while EPA has been reporting that noise pollution is a significant adverse factor in human health, the Navy has responded with "factual" responses that do not reflect the realities of their activities on the Peninsula. Their decibel reporting appears to be unrealistic and not plausible with the reported activities in which they will engage.

Also the decibels quoted in Navy studies are flawed as to the baseline used, as mentioned above.

The Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact, Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range did not sufficiently answer or explain the items listed in my comments in 2014.

### 1. IMPACT ON PEOPLE & ECONOMY

In 2014, the visitation to Olympic National Park, had increased to 3,243,873 and the value of this visitation has increased to \$365,559,900. Olympic National Park is currently the 6th most visited national park. These values do not include visitors to the Peninsula that do not visit the National Park. Forbes chose to include the Hoh Valley in its Top Ten Coolest Places to Visit in 2017 for reasons of experiencing natural quiet and Evergreen Escapes, a major worldwide provider of ecotours based in Seattle, is gearing up for weekly Quiet Tours to the Hoh Rain Forest. To ignore the noise resulting from the Navy's intense air operations and therefore state these activities will not affect visitation to the Peninsula is an irresponsible position to take. 8-16 hours of jet fighters looking for emitter trucks can only result in a reduction in quality of life and a reduction of tourism on the Peninsula.

The project data has not shown it will add any significant revenue to the economy of the western part of the Olympic Peninsula.

The USFS's insistence on conveniently dividing its responsibilities from the Navy's actions ignores the impact of the project on the Peninsula.

## 2. OPERATION NOISE

### "Noise2

The 2014 EW Range EA addresses the potential impacts of noise on the human terrestrial environment in the vicinity of the EW range in Washington from the sound generated by the selected alternative on noise-sensitive areas (2014 EW Range EA, pp. 3.3-3 through 3.3-8). Noise sensitive areas are those areas where noise interferes with normal activities associated with its use (2014 EW Range EA, pg. 3.3-3). Noise-sensitive areas may include such sites in the immediate vicinity of operations, pursuant to the Noise Control Act of 1972 (49 USC 44715). Users of designated recreational areas are considered sensitive receptors (2014 EW Range EA, pg. 3.3-3). Potential impacts of sound on terrestrial biological resources are addressed in Section 3.2 of the 2014 EW Range EA, and summarized in this document under the Biological Resources section (below).

"Noise from mobile transmitter vehicles and generators will only occur on established NFS roads within the Olympic National Forest. Existing noise levels in the project area are influenced by traffic on Highway 101 and local roads, adjacent transmission lines, local industries and other noise-generating activities. Ambient sounds levels vary by location in forested areas and is expected to range between 30 and 50 dBA on the Olympic Peninsula (2014 EW Range EA, pg. 3.3-4). The contribution of the intermittent transits by the mobile emitter vehicles to the overall noise environment will be no more than incremental and will not be considered a substantial source of sound. Generators selected to power the mobile emitters have specifications that state that they meet National Park Service sound level requirements (60dBA at 50 ft.) (2014 EW Range EA, pg. 3.3-6). Noise from the generators used to power the emitters will create a steady noise during the periods of operation. The sound level at 50 ft. (15.3 m) is estimated at or near ambient noise levels and the sound level at 100 ft. (30.5 m) is estimated to be below the expected ambient noise level. Sound impacts to community noise levels from training activities under Alternative 1 are negligible in areas outside the immediate vicinity of operations because the areas occur on NFS lands and very few members of the public would be exposed to sound from the mobile emitter sites. Overall, no impacts on the acoustic environment would occur under modified Alternative 1 as a result of operations noise." [p. 11, DRAFT, Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact, Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Ranger District, Olympic National Forest]

The statement above is true, IF all would ignore the sound of the jets flying search patterns trying to find the mobile transmitters scattered about the west side of the Olympic Peninsula. The Forest Service proceeds to erase its ignorance with the following footnote 2"

"2 Aircraft use associated with EW training over the Olympic Military Operations Areas was addressed in the 2010 NWTRC EIS/OEIS (Navy, 2010) and reanalyzed in the Navy's 2015 Northwest Training and Testing Final EIS/OEIS (Navy, 2015) which includes an airspace noise analysis for the Olympic Military Operations Areas. The 2015 Northwest Training and Testing EIS (p. 3.0-37) notes that: "Based on the results of that study, sound exposure levels at the sea surface or on land from most air combat maneuver overflights are expected to be less than 85 dBA (based on an EA-18G aircraft flying at an altitude of 5,000 ft. [1,524 m] and at a subsonic airspeed [400 knots]). Exposure to fixed-wing aircraft noise would be brief (seconds) as an aircraft quickly passes overhead." [Footnote, p.11, DRAFT, Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact, Pacific

Northwest Electronic Warfare Range, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Ranger District, Olympic National Forest] .

This is an incomprehensible conclusion. Either there are pilots in jets flying search patterns over the Olympic Peninsula trying to find emitters scattered over ONF lands and, using the airspace over ONF and the rest of the western Peninsula OR there are no jets and the emitter sites are not needed nor is the SUP. The decibels created by this activity will cause physical and mental damage to the people and wildlife living on the Peninsula if this SUP is issued.

Despite being brought to the USFS attention in Draft EA comments, there has been no study done to evaluate the effects on the Peninsula of the Navy activities that will result under this permit. The following was found in the web page Wikipedia, under Aircraft Noise.

"There are health consequences of elevated sound levels. Elevated workplace or other noise can cause hearing impairment, hypertension, ischemic heart disease, annoyance, sleep disturbance, and decreased school performance. Although some hearing loss occurs naturally with age,[2] in many developed nations the impact of noise is sufficient to impair hearing over the course of a lifetime.[3][4] Elevated noise levels can create stress, increase workplace accident rates, and stimulate aggression and other anti-social behaviors.[5]

"German environmental study

A large-scale statistical analysis of the health effects of aircraft noise was undertaken in the late 2000s by Bernhard Greiser for the Umweltbundesamt, Germany's central environmental office. The health data of over one million residents around the Cologne airport were analyzed for health effects correlating with aircraft noise. The results were then corrected for other noise influences in the residential areas, and for socioeconomic factors, to reduce possible skewing of the data.[6]

The German study concluded that aircraft noise clearly and significantly impairs health.[6] For example, a day-time average sound pressure level of 60 decibel increasing coronary heart disease by 61% in men and 80% in women. As another indicator, a night-time average sound pressure level of 55 decibel increased the risk of heart attacks by 66% in men and 139% in women. Statistically significant health effects did however start as early as from an average sound pressure level of 40 decibel.[6]

"FAA advice

The FAA says that a maximum day-night average sound level of 65 dB is incompatible with residential communities.[7] Communities in affected areas may eligible for mitigation such as soundproofing.

"Cognitive effects

Simulated aircraft noise at 65 dB(A) has been shown to negatively affect individuals' memory and recall of auditory information.[10] In one study comparing the effect of aircraft noise to the effect of alcohol on cognitive performance, it was found that simulated aircraft noise at 65 dB(A) had the same effect on individuals' ability to recall auditory information as being intoxicated with a Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) level of at 0.10.[11] A BAC of 0.10 is double the legal limit required to operate a motor vehicle in many developed countries such as Australia.

2. Rosenhall U, Pedersen K, Svanborg A (1990). "Presbycusis and noise-induced hearing loss". *Ear Hear.* 11 (4): 257-63.
3. Schmid, RE (2007-02-18). "Aging nation faces growing hearing loss". CBS News. Archived from the original on November 15, 2007. Retrieved 2007-02-18
4. Senate Public Works Committee, Noise Pollution and Abatement Act of 1972, S. Rep. No. 1160, 92nd Cong. 2nd session
6. T?dlicher L?rm - Spiegel, Nr. 51, 14 Dezember 2009, Page 45 (German)
7. "Noise Monitoring". Massport. Retrieved 31 January 2014.
8. Ozcan HK, Nemlioglu S. In-cabin noise levels during commercial aircraft flights. *Can Acoust* 2006;34:31-5.
9. Standards Australia, AS/NZS 2107. Acoustics-Recommended Design Sound Levels and Reverberation Times for Building Interiors. AUS: Standards Australia, Sydney; 2000
10. Molesworth BR, Burgess M. (2013). Improving intelligibility at a safety critical point: In flight cabin safety. *Safety Science*, 51, 11-16.
11. Molesworth BR, Burgess M, Gunnell B. (2013). Using the effect of alcohol as a comparison to illustrate the detrimental effects of noise on performance. *Noise & Health*, 15, 367-373."

According to these studies, harm to humans can start at 40 decibels. Other studies show cardiac harm at 55 to

65 decibels.

I doubt the accuracy of the decibels reported given that the project will use from 1-4 planes, flying at a time, during these training activities. Congressman Derick Kilmer called for sound monitoring tests to be run. To date the Navy and the Forest Service have ignored the Congressman's request.

### 3. POLLUTION CAUSED

"Clean Air Act (CAA)

The CAA is the comprehensive federal law that regulates air emissions from stationary and mobile sources. This decision will not conflict with attainment and maintenance goals established in State Implementation Plan. A CAA conformity determination will not be required because emissions attributable to the alternatives including the modified Alternative 1 will be below de minimis thresholds." [p. 21, DRAFT, Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact, Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Ranger District, Olympic National Forest]

This statement is incomplete and misleading because it does not include the results of the jet aircraft pollution that will be brought to this area. Some of this pollution will reach the land and habitat of Olympic National Forest under the control of the Olympic National Forest. The rest will fall on the other public and private land and waters of the Peninsula. Again a refusal by the Forest Service and the Navy to acknowledge the reality of the pilot training on the Peninsula environment. I consider this to be a violation of NEPA because it does not disclose the environmental damage that would be caused as a result of issuing the permit.

As stated in Draft Comments submitted in 2014, "I cannot find any reporting on the effects of air pollution that would be created by aircraft, flying up to 12 hours a day and up to 260 days a year, to the people or the environment of the area of the training maneuvers. This seems to be a significant omission and violates NEPA." Another question unanswered in the November 29, 2016 Draft Decision.

### 4. WILDLIFE CONCERNS

I argue that wildlife concerns have not been adequately studied even for endangered species because of deceptive decibel reports. There is no study that has replicated the effects of the intensive flight patterns that will occur under this permit, if issued. This is inadequate to determine the environmental effects of this project on the wildlife of the Olympic National Forest or the west side of the Olympic Peninsula impacted by the training flights.

Because of the noise and air pollution caused by the jet flights which I learned about in the July 2016 USFWS Biological Opinion, I am now concerned about the effect on the Washington Islands Refuges, "Specifically, the problems, concerns, and opportunities for the Washington Islands Refuges include: (1) a lack of public awareness of the Refuges' valuable and sensitive wildlife resources; (2) the need to improve coordination with other managing agencies and Tribes; (3) wildlife disturbances from aircraft overflights and people on or near breeding sites; (4) the need for additional scientific research, surveys, and monitoring; (5) the existing occurrence and potential threat of contaminants and debris; and (6) concerns related to exotic species." [p. 1-3 Washington Islands National Wildlife Refuges, Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, 2007.]

The Washington Islands Refuges already suffer from aircraft overflight. What will be the effect of the flights on the Refuges? What will be the effect of noise and air pollution on the elk in the ONP and ONF? How will these flights effect the bird migrations on the Pacific Flyway?

These questions have not been answered. Furthermore, not one bio acoustician, the only scientist capable of assessing noise impacts on wildlife was consulted in the preparation of the Navy's EA or by the USFS in arriving at its Draft Decision. I argue this lack of study violates NEPA because it makes an inadequate attempt to determine the effects of the Navy's activities upon the wildlife on the Peninsula.

### 5. PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

These training activities have been operating, according to the Draft Decision, for 40 years.

To sustain and enhance the level and type of EW training currently being conducted as described in the 2010

NWTRC EIS/OEIS and authorized in its Record of Decision.

Under the No Action Alternative, limited EW training, without the enhanced capability of fixed and mobile emitters, would continue to be conducted in the NWTRC and intermediate-level EW training for certification would continue to occur at the Mountain Home Air Force Base approximately 400 nautical miles southeast of the Naval Air Station Whidbey Island. I did not select this alternative because it does not reasonably address the project's purpose and need by foregoing the opportunity to sustain, enhance, expand, and accommodate for growth of EW training on lands within my jurisdiction. [p. 5, DRAFT, Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact, Pacific Northwest Electronic Warfare Range, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Ranger District, Olympic National Forest]

The highlighted comment by the USFS gives the reasons for alternative 1 choice based on the Navy applicant's purpose and need but in other statements absolves itself from the consequences of the project. As stated in the comment, the activity the Navy wishes to transfer to the Olympic Peninsula has been, and is being, done at Mountain Home Air Force Base.

#### 6. NAVY EA ELIMINATIONS FROM CONSIDERATION

The Navy EA states, "Certain resource areas were eliminated from detailed study in the EA because research revealed that the Proposed Action is unlikely to have any potential environmental impacts on these resources, or that impacts would be negligible. The resources that were not evaluated in this EA included geology, water, land use, cultural, transportation, socioeconomics, and environmental justice and protection of children." [Executive Summary ES-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS]

I argue that the purpose of NEPA is to evaluate the project and provide proof that NEPA concerns are met. The applicant cannot make that decision by arbitrarily excluding a resource area. It is not for the Navy or Forest Service to make the subjective decision to exclude NEPA concerns. I consider the following deletions from consideration as violations of NEPA.

Further, as stated in my comments in 2014, "The Navy EA states, 'Certain resource areas were eliminated from detailed study in the EA because research revealed that the Proposed Action is unlikely to have any potential environmental impacts on these resources, or that impacts would be negligible. The resources that were not evaluated in this EA included geology, water, land use, cultural, transportation, socioeconomics, and environmental justice and protection of children.' [Executive Summary ES-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS]

It is not for the Navy or Forest Service to make the subjective decision to exclude basic NEPA concerns. I argue this violates NEPA.

The Navy EA has continued to exclude the following important discussions:

\* The Navy has used socioeconomic reasons for the purpose of this permit but has not provided cost comparisons of the permit activities on the environment verses their claimed cost savings.

\* The Navy has excluded discussion of land use of the permit activities verses the current use of the Forest Service lands.

\* The Navy has removed cultural factors from the permit applications despite the fact that several tribal lands could be affected by the permit activities. Cultural also applies to traditional uses of an area by all people. All people living, working, and touring in the area will be impacted by these activities.

\* Protection of children was eliminated. Children are people and all people in the area of the training range will be affected by the activities governed by the permit. As noted under OPERATION NOISE, noise creates "decreased school performance."

#### 7. DEGRADATION TO PENINSULA WILDERNESS

The activities that would come to the Olympic Peninsula as a result of the establishment of this training warfare range violates the purpose of The Wilderness Act of 1964 by invading the wilderness character of Olympic National Park with noise pollution. 95% of Olympic National Park is designated wilderness. Airplane noise generated over, just outside of the park, or the National Forest Wilderness Areas cannot be stopped at their border and therefore destroys the wilderness character.

"A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) has at least five thousand acres of land or is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value." [Wilderness Act 1964]

The sound of freedom should not shatter the solitude of our wilderness, parks, and private lands because it will make our lives more anxious and terrifying. Our people need the refuge of quiet places. Places to escape from the noise of civilization where we can think, dream, and recreate. This project violates the spirit, and therefore, the Wilderness Act of 1964. It violates NEPA because it creates, with the noise pollution, harm to the humans, animals, and birds of the Olympic Peninsula.

Violation of The National Forest Management Act (NFMA)

This activity would interfere with other citizen uses of their public land and is not a valid use of Olympic National Forest's resources. It is not a legal use of Forest Service land based on NFMA.

Conclusions

Because this training is currently being done in Idaho, it will not harm our national defense to remain where it is. It will create a precedence for using the airspace over national parks, refuges, and wilderness areas thereby reducing their value as refuges for humans and wildlife as designated by Congress.

I argue that the stated purpose of this permit does not compare to the damage to the human and wildlife values of the Olympic Peninsula. The value to the people of the United States is far better served by not transferring the warfare training range to the Olympic Peninsula. As proposed it would cause significant economic and environmental harm to the people living on the Peninsula, and the many tourists that visit this area every year. Because this is federal land set aside for the benefit of all United States citizens, this proposal degrades those benefits to all citizens.

The issuance of this Special Use Permit would harm my future enjoyment of the western Olympic Peninsula. It will also rob current and future generations of the tranquility of hearing, uninterrupted, babbling brooks, soft waves clattering the beach gravel, and bird songs.

I also question the soundness of mixing military training operations into areas used by citizens. I fear chance meetings will cause harm to either citizens, military personnel, or both.

Now, because military weapons have greater outreach, it is my hope that the lessons learned in Hawaii, 1941, to not concentrate weapons and training in a place, that we will not concentrate them now despite the economy of doing so.

I ask that the United States Forest Service not issue this permit to the Navy. At minimum, a full EIS is needed before this project proceeds any further.

Sincerely,

Donna Osseward  
13245 40th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98125  
206-949-7020

