


I0017

52

1 society. And to see an EIS in a magnitude of outlay of this in
2 such a credible body of -- there are so few credible bodies of
3 commentary anymore that are not talking and dodging points that
4 to see such a credible body as our military of which we have
5 conveyed the greatest hope and trust in not have an EIS
6 reference I think is -- needs to be addressed as a concern in
7 your next EIS.

8 And I think without getting -- doing some kind of sideshow
9 up here I should probably sit down and thank you for the
10 opportunity. I just can't stress enough that our societies are
11 going to be based upon energy and as complex and as cascading as
12 the problems are nest -- now that have become nested problems
13 with the proper amount of energy you can hold your family secure
14 while we take five to 10 years to settle these problems out.
15 You cannot do that with money, ladies and gentlemen. You cannot
16 eat the gold, you cannot eat the silver, you cannot eat the
17 money. Those are false constructs of pursuits which disconnect
18 you from understanding that all around you it is the wonders of
19 the universe which was our mission and we lost that mission.
20 And you are about to see that transform almost overnight if
21 these units come online in the next 18 months. And I assure you
22 there's more, but I can't get into the realm of that because of
23 the time constraints and -- but I -- but due to the -- your
24 accommodating me with your -- due to your generous
25 accommodation, I mean I'm beginning to feel particularly



15 MR. KENDALL:I'll stop. Thank you very much.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I0018*PALMER HEALING*

**Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex Modernization and Enhancement
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Written Comment Form

**For more information and to submit comments online, please go to:
www.jpisceis.com**

Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for the Final EIS distribution. Failure to provide such information will result in your name not being included on the distribution list.

Name (First and Last): Lisa Moorhead Date: 5-14-12

Title: _____

Organization: _____

Is this a government agency (choose one): ☐ yes ☐ no

Comment submitted on behalf of (choose one):

- ☐ your organization/business/agency
☒ yourself as a private citizen

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Mailing: _____

If you know, please check the boxes below that relate to your comment. This will assist us in organizing and reviewing your comment.

Comment Topic(s):

- ☐ General (to the EIS)
☐ NEPA Process
☐ Purpose/Need
☐ Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)
☐ Cumulative Impacts
☐ Mitigations

Resource Areas:

- ☐ All resource areas
☐ Airspace Management
☒ Noise
☐ Safety (Airspace)
☐ Safety (Ground)
☒ Air Quality
☐ Physical Resources
☐ Land Use
☐ Infrastructure and Transportation
☒ Water Resources
☐ Hazardous Materials
☒ Biological Resources
☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Socioeconomics
☐ Subsistence
☐ Environmental Justice

Proposed Actions:

- ☐ All proposed actions
☒ 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA
☐ 2 - Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery
☐ 3 - Battle Area Complex Restricted Area Addition
☐ 4 - Expansion of R-2205 Restricted Area
☒ 5 - Night Joint Training
☐ 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Access
☐ 7 - Enhanced Access to Ground Maneuver Space Areas
☐ 8 - Tanana Flats Training Area Access Road
☐ 9 - Joint Air-Ground Integration Complex
☐ 10 - Intermediate Staging Bases
☐ 11 - Missile Live Fire for AIM-9 and AIM-120 in the Gulf of Alaska
☐ 12 - Joint Precision Airdrop System Drop Zones

Please provide your comment(s) on the back of this form and turn it in at a public hearing, or submit

by June 7, 2012, to: ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506;

Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil

I0018

Comment(s):

① Fox 3 MOA Expansion: I support no action alternative. Our recreational cabin would be encompassed (or nearly) by the proposed expansion (Alternatives A and E). We already hear military training (sonic booms). We do not want to hear them any closer or louder. We go out there for peace and quiet and spend a lot of time there. Expansion would negatively impact our quality of life.

② Night Joint Training: I support no action alternative ^{to minimize} ~~for~~ The noise impacts on wildlife.

All other proposals: my comments are not specific to alternatives as I don't have time to study them, but I do have concern about air and ground impacts on the biological resources, air quality and water resources involved.

Use additional sheets as needed.

Please turn in this form at a public hearing or submit by June 7, 2012, to:
ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506
Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil

Thank you for your input.

I0019*PALMER HEARING*

**Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex Modernization and Enhancement
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Written Comment Form

**For more information and to submit comments online, please go to:
www.jparceis.com**

Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for the Final EIS distribution. Failure to provide such information will result in your name not being included on the distribution list.

Name (First and Last): Self, Guy Turner Date: 5/14/12

Title: _____

Organization: _____

Is this a government agency (choose one): ☐ yes ☒ no

Comment submitted on behalf of (choose one):

- ☐ your organization/business/agency
☒ yourself as a private citizen

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Mailing Address: _____

If you know, please check the boxes below that relate to your comment. This will assist us in organizing and reviewing your comment.

Comment Topic(s):

- ☒ General (to the EIS)
☐ NEPA Process
☐ Purpose/Need
☐ Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)
☒ Cumulative Impacts
☐ Mitigations

Proposed Actions:

- ☒ All proposed actions
☐ 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA
☐ 2 - Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery
☐ 3 - Battle Area Complex Restricted Area Addition
☐ 4 - Expansion of R-2205 Restricted Area
☐ 5 - Night Joint Training
☐ 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Access
☐ 7 - Enhanced Access to Ground Maneuver Space Areas
☐ 8 - Tanana Flats Training Area Access Road
☐ 9 - Joint Air-Ground Integration Complex
☐ 10 - Intermediate Staging Bases
☐ 11 - Missile Live Fire for AIM-9 and AIM-120 in the Gulf of Alaska
☐ 12 - Joint Precision Airdrop System Drop Zones

Resource Areas:

- ☒ All resource areas
☐ Airspace Management
☐ Noise
☐ Safety (Airspace)
☐ Safety (Ground)
☐ Air Quality
☐ Physical Resources
☐ Land Use
☐ Infrastructure and Transportation
☐ Water Resources
☐ Hazardous Materials
☐ Biological Resources
☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Socioeconomics
☐ Subsistence
☐ Environmental Justice

Please provide your comment(s) on the back of this form and turn it in at a public hearing, or submit

by June 7, 2012, to: ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, IBER, AK 99506;

Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil

I0019

Comment(s):

I feel safety issue of
flight levels is a concern for
separation between Alaska's general
aviation and govt aircraft
(Gov) Military aircraft over mountains 1000
feet higher than the mountain plain over
flat land 2,000' AGL to help
in separation.

Use additional sheets as needed.

Please turn in this form at a public hearing or submit by June 7, 2012, to:
ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506
Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil

Thank you for your input.

I0020

3

[REDACTED]

19 MR. WOOD: Thank you again. Mike Wood, W-O-O-D.
20 Initially I asked the question about restricted areas that were
21 proposed just south of Delta and to the east of the highway.
22 Proposal A leaves a fairly wide corridor for VFR traffic going
23 north and south. It's the main route, we all know that, we've
24 (indiscernible) that area. Proposal B butts right up against
25 the highway, comes right close to the pipeline and it follows

[REDACTED]

I0020

4

1 VFR traffic into an extremely small corridor that goes north or
2 south. If you've ever been in that area you more than know that
3 a lot of aircraft do not have radios. They go through there in
4 marginal weather and to put everyone in that small little
5 corridor is basically giving a high risk for the possibility of
6 a midair. I would like to see proposal B give an extra buffer
7 to take it further to the east of approximately maybe one
8 kilometer or even two kilometers. This way people who do follow
9 highways, and a lot do, will be able to know that they're well
10 clear of any restricted area.

11 As far as flying the pipeline, it is clear for us, however
12 I would still like to see it either 2202 (indiscernible),
13 proposed east restricted areas (indiscernible) so at least you
14 could go either to the west and stay away from the east
15 restricted area or vice versa.

16 As far as the MOA is concerned at Paxon, this area is not
17 supposed to be active as a MOA except under certain
18 circumstances. However, I believe 500 AGL for the base of it
19 when it is active is far, far too low. Many aircraft transit in
20 that area between Glenallen, Black Rapids, through the Alaska
21 Range or in through Tok and giving us only 500 feet when it is
22 active for all of us is just not enough. I would like to see a
23 base of 2,000 feet, but I would accept 1,000. And we must have
24 some form of radio communication such as there is to the north
25 where we can call up radar on -- on range rather on 125-3. They



10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.



I0021

5

[REDACTED]

11 COLONEL ORR: Our next speaker is Mr. William, I think he
12 goes by Bill, Folsom. Is he here?

13 MR. FOLSOM: Bill Folsom. I have several reasons that I
14 don't think that any of the MOAs in this corridor of the rail
15 belt should be activated, only on the military bases. There's
16 way too many reasons. We have a large population in the rail
17 belt now and there's a lot of hunting activity and fishing
18 activity and camping activity and what have you that goes on
19 that be accessed by the largest population area. You know,
20 hunting season from August 15th to October 15th would probably
21 be the outside parameters.

22 You currently have an MOA for a 5,000 foot fly zone in
23 part of the area that you're proposing. I've had friends that
24 have had some of the pilots come, they're not sure, 100 feet
25 above the top of them. And they don't see them, they hear them.

[REDACTED]


I0021

6

1 I mean it's just kind of a shock when they go over. And so if
2 they are -- if they're breaking the 5,000 feet down to 100 foot
3 or whatever, the 500 feet is going to be put aside I'm sure.

4 Fish and Game I'm sure has all kinds of activities that
5 they would like to do in this area. When they are taking
6 surveys and their windows for taking surveys on game are very
7 narrow and to have them disrupted because of activity. I wrote
8 some of these down. You know, six events for 10 days each or 60
9 a year and then there was the Army would have 242 days if I
10 heard that right. And then there's 14 days per battalion. I
11 don't know how many battalions there are. So I'm not even sure
12 of the -- whether there's a weekend open in this thing. But I
13 think the whole operation except for your bases, if you want to
14 have a fly zone to do these things should be moved east now. I
15 was thinking west before, but east to the Wrangell St. Elias.
16 That's federal land and we can't go in there without a note from
17 God. So that would be a good place for you to take that
18 operation I think.

19 So I think that's about all I have. I just don't think
20 that it's advisable to put this right in the populated areas
21 accessible by the largest group of people in the rail belt. I
22 am the local chair of the Fish and Game Advisory for the Mat
23 Valley, however, and I think most of them will agree with
24 everything I've said, but we're going to get some consensus as a
25 group and put in some comments later. So I guess that's all I



I0021

7

i had to say. Thanks.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I0022

7

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
2 COLONEL ORR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Mr. Jim
3 Stocker. Is he here?

4 MR. STOCKER: Thank you, Colonel. For the record, my name
5 is Jim Stocker. And before I start my testimony or my comment
6 period I want to make something really clear to all the military
7 personnel here. Anything that I say please don't take it
8 personally. I have a high degree for all of you and for the
9 military itself and I know that this didn't come out of your
10 think tank. This probably came out of Washington somewhere,
11 somebody sitting at a desk that doesn't live here, doesn't
12 really understand the area, doesn't understand the issues.

13 But with that said, I've been here for 40 years. I've
14 been a pilot for 40 years. I have extensive time flying in this
15 proposed MOA or Military Operation Area 3 up in the Talkeetna
16 mountains, game management units 13 and 14. And when I first
17 heard about this, and I'll be up front about this, I don't know
18 a lot about it and I should know more about it. When you take
19 into consideration that the largest population of Alaska sits
20 right here in the Mat Su Valley in Anchorage and the playground
21 for the -- the epicenter of Alaska is the Kenai Peninsula and
22 the Talkeetna mountains. It's accessible -- let's talk about
23 the Talkeetna mountains, MOA 3 area and that little area that's
24 to the east of it there, that magenta area. It's accessible by
25 airplane, it's accessible by foot, it's accessible by boat, it's

[REDACTED]

I0022

8

1 accessible for four-wheelers and by vehicles. That's the
2 playground for Alaskans right there and for somebody in
3 Washington to come down and want to put a military operation
4 right over the top of it is absolutely ludicrous. I cannot
5 believe that somebody would be so arrogant to do that. There's
6 areas in the state that would do just as fine as that area right
7 there. And Bill Folsom, you stole some of my thunder. The
8 Wrangell St. Elias National Park, I've been in it. There's
9 nobody there. It's empty. The Wrangell St. Elias gate to the
10 arctic, you've got the parks out to the west, the Lake Clark
11 Park, you have Mt. McKinley Park. You have all these federal
12 areas. This is a state -- mostly state property. Why don't you
13 think about taking those areas out to a federal park or taking
14 it out of this area. It doesn't belong here, this is wrong.
15 This is just totally wrong.

16 And I don't mean to be so outspoken, but I've been here
17 for a long time. I've been a guide. I know what goes on here.
18 I know how many caribou permits are given out, how many moose
19 are taken. I've been on the Board. I used to be the Fish and
20 Game advisory chairman here at one time and I've worked with
21 Fish and Game, I've worked with the biologists, I've worked and
22 done counts. This area right here is a very sacred area for
23 people that live in Alaska and, like I said, this is the
24 epicenter right here as far as hunting and fishing. Sure,
25 Alaska's big, but as we all know, if you want to hunt in the



I0022

9

1 Brooks Range or you want to hunt out west or you want to hunt
2 down on the Alaska Peninsula it's a logistical nightmare, it
3 costs a fortune and it's not practical for a lot of people.
4 This area here should be left to Alaska, it should be left to
5 Alaskans. And again, nothing against the military, but this is
6 wrong and I would like to have the group of people here that
7 proposed this, you know, the people that really came up with
8 this idea in the first place because I'd really like to talk to
9 them.

10 But anyway, with that said, this is wrong and I don't
11 think it should be here. I think it should be moved and I think
12 this whole idea, this whole area of the military operation, MOA,
13 I see it on my flight map all the time, in this case three, Fox
14 3, and that other area should be changed and I think there
15 should be a great deal of consideration given to that. Thank
16 you.

■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I0023

9

[REDACTED]

17 COLONEL ORR: Thank you. The next speaker is Mr. Rod
18 Arno.

19 MR. ARNO: Thank you for the opportunity to testify. My
20 name is Rod Arno, A-R-N-O. I'm the Executive Director of the
21 Alaska Outdoor Council which is a group of over 10,000 Alaskan
22 outdoors folks.

23 The Outdoor Council has looked over this plan and been
24 part of the process since the beginning. Our concerns remain
25 the same. It's been well pointed out that GMU-13 is one of the

[REDACTED]

I0023

10

1 close accessible state land. The State only has about 24
2 percent of the land and this state is managed by the State.
3 Sixty-four percent of it is federal and 12 is private ANCSA
4 land. So this is extremely important to our membership for
5 hunting, fishing, trapping and recreational use of the Nelchina
6 basin.

7 The 500 foot lower level, you know, that's just totally
8 not going to work out just because of the way the Alaskans use
9 the aircraft for access up here. You know, what happens up in
10 GMU-20, which is another really important part of game
11 management and state land, well, you know, the military lands
12 there, you're -- you know, obviously you can do what you want on
13 those. But on this one little piece of state land here it's
14 extremely important for Alaskans to be able to access that.

15 Another point I'd like to make is in the last couple
16 decades I've participated in a number of EISs that the federal
17 government's put up, BLM, their resource management plans and
18 comprehensive conservation plans for refuges and I hope the same
19 standards are used by the military on their EIS as the standards
20 that are put on the Alaskans when we try to participate and
21 actively be on federal lands. Thank you.

■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I0024

10

[REDACTED]

22 COLONEL ORR: Our next speaker is Ms. Lisa Moorehead.

23 MS. MOOREHEAD: Lisa Moorehead, M-O-O-R-E-H-E-A-D. And I

24 have a cabin just south of the existing MOA 3. Is that what

25 it's called? Fox 3 Military Operations Area. Our recreational

[REDACTED]

[illegible]

I0025

11

1 [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED]
3 [REDACTED]
4 [REDACTED]
5 [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED]

8 COLONEL ORR: Thank you. The next speaker is Mr. Peter
9 Probasco.

10 MR. PROBASCO: Yeah, I'm Peter M. Probasco and I have a
11 couple comments. The first one is about communications and I
12 have the draft copy of this plan and it is a very, very
13 difficult study I think from the perspective of many of us that
14 are civilians. I got out of the Air Force in 1960 and I was
15 never that familiar with that many acronyms then. But there are
16 five pages of acronyms that go with this draft copy and if you
17 start studying it, I took them out so I could refer to them all
18 the time, but it's very, very confusing. And I think when you
19 want to communicate something you need to do it with some
20 clarity and recognition to the audience you're trying to
21 communicate with and I thought that was very confusing. I think
22 there is more clarity with this meeting than the one we had last
23 fall in Wasilla at the Menard Center.

24 Another thing, the comments that the individuals have made
25 about this being the playground center and the aspects of this

[REDACTED]

I0025

12

1 and the amount of it that's state land I think is very, very
2 significant. And I think state land is different from federal
3 land and is different from park land. Park land is federal
4 land. And I agree totally that there should be park land that's
5 part of this. Some of the park land is never even looked at by
6 anybody and it's not going to have any impact as far as
7 populations or probably not going to have any great impact on
8 our wildlife populations. But state land are -- have to be
9 managed supposedly in compliance with the Alaska Constitution
10 and so you need to take into consideration sovereignty of the
11 state,

12 And I think coordination was mentioned in one of the
13 presentations about coordination with FAA and a couple of other
14 entities. I think a coordination group should be actively
15 involved should be the department of Alaska Fish and Game
16 because game populations are very dynamic and the things that
17 game populations do is dynamic and what could be reasonably
18 acceptable one year may not be totally out of line the next year
19 because of changes in population, migrations, route and
20 everything else.

21 So I think all of these things -- I think it'd be very
22 important if there were clear statements in there that this has
23 been evaluated and assessments made by the Alaska Department of
24 Fish and Game.

25 Another concern, and coordination was a big one, but you



I0026

13

[REDACTED]

20 COLONEL ORR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Mr. Bob
21 Dittrick.

22 MR. DITTRICK: Thank you for letting me go on record. I'm
23 Bob Dittrick, D-I-T-T-R-I-C-K again.

24 COLONEL ORR: Okay.

25 MR. DITTRICK: And I was -- with my question earlier about

[REDACTED]

I0027

14

[REDACTED]

24 MR. KREGER: My name is Frank Kreger, K-R-E-G-E-R, and
25 today I live in Wasilla. I don't have anything new to say.

[REDACTED]

I0028

15

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

8 MS. HOLT: Hello. My name's Jean Holt, H-O-L-T, and I
9 just want to be put on the record that alternative E is not
10 enough. The border needs to move further north and -- because
11 there's too much at stake here and it is a recreational area and
12 that's what it has been and it should continue. But it should
13 -- the -- alternative E, the border needs to be moved further
14 north. Thank you.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I0029

15

[REDACTED]

17 MS. MATTHEWS: My name is Beverly Matthews and I live at
18 Lake Louise and we have about 200 -- over 250 cabins up there.
19 Now in the summertime lots of people fly and they -- I don't
20 know that they fly 500 feet, but they're coming back and forth
21 to their cabins and this just isn't going to work. That's why
22 they like having property on the lake. It's a beautiful place
23 and we just got to get the military up higher.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I0030

15

[REDACTED]

25 MS. KREGER: My name is Ann Kreger, K-R-E-G-E-R, and I

[REDACTED]

I0031

16

[REDACTED]

16 MR. STOCKER: Thank you, Colonel. Once again, for the
17 record, my name is Jim Stocker. There's something that I
18 omitted that I wanted to bring up. And it was a few months ago,
19 I don't know, five or six months ago the Air Force lost a jet up
20 in the Talkeetna mountains. Correct? As a pilot it shut me
21 down. You guys -- and again, nothing personal, but you put a
22 big corridor around that area, blocked everything off, and if
23 that's just one example of what might happen when there's, you
24 know, training exercises on the ground or other exercises or if
25 you have an accident and accidents happen. And I don't have any

[REDACTED]

I0031

17

1 problem with that. Accidents happen, we burn fuel. That's one
2 of my concerns. When that happened it really kind of threw my
3 plans into a tailspin and I don't want to be worrying all the
4 time if I'm flying in the wrong airspace or if I'm going to have
5 some jet come up and escort me down or I'm going to get turned
6 into the FAA and have a hassle with them. I don't need that.
7 You know, I'm 60 years old, I don't need anymore hassles. It's
8 a nice simple place to go. The rules right now are pretty
9 simple, you know, mostly class E airspace, everything's fine.

10 Another comment I wanted to make, as far as the fuel's
11 concerned, I can tell some of you military folks in the back
12 exactly how much fuel was used in Iraq per day. It was a lot
13 and I don't have a problem with that. If you need to use it,
14 use it, burn it up. But for us to say that -- or for you guys
15 to say, or the people that are, you know, proposing this, to say
16 that we're going to have to save some fuel, that doesn't work,
17 that doesn't work for me at all. You know, we move militaries
18 to Iraq, to Afghanistan. If we have to do it we do it, fuel's
19 not an issue, and I don't think it should be an issue here. The
20 issue here is the people in Alaska. In another state this
21 wouldn't happen, you wouldn't get away with it, not even maybe.

22 But with that said -- and I could stand here for hours and
23 hours and I appreciate the second opportunity to give a few
24 comments. I just basically wanted to state what happened here a
25 few months ago with shut down airspace, big inconvenience to



[illegible]

(907) 276-3554



I0033

19

1 concerns, but then you continue to do exactly what you intend to
2 do with maybe a few little modifications. It does not belong in
3 the rail belt other than your bases. It just is not going to
4 work.

5 Now you have a small representation of people here, but as
6 soon as all this hits the fan and it actually starts happening
7 then people are going to come out of the woodwork and I mean
8 there'll be hundreds and hundreds of people that are going to be
9 upset. And so I hope that the whole thing is reversed except
10 for whatever you do on your existing bases and get all the MOAs
11 out of this rail belt area, these other expansions,

12 THE REPORTER: Sir, could you please state your name for
13 the record again?

14 MR. FOLSOM: Oh, yeah, Bill Folsom.

■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]



I0034

20

1 acronyms that really don't -- even JPARC really doesn't mean
2 anything to me until I was alerted to the issue and did some of
3 my own research. And so I think people will be blindsided and I
4 think what we can do is to spread the word in our community that
5 people should be educated about this proposal, but it feels like
6 time is of the essence. We have less than a month to comment.
7 So I would encourage all of us here to tell everyone you know at
8 least about this and let them form their own opinion, but at
9 least make it more widely known what this obscure acronym means.
10 And there are great materials here and it seems like there is a
11 lot of information online, but I would say clearly by the
12 numbers here it is not very well known to the general public
13 that will be impacted by JPARC. Thank you.

14 THE REPORTER: Could you please spell your last name for
15 the record?

16 MS HUTCHINS: Hutchins, H-U-T-C-H-I-N-S.

■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]



I0035

21

1 even looked at. And this was brought up to Don and he thought
2 that was one thing that possibly that there could be some
3 changes made is to recognize that there is a lot of land
4 available there not being utilized that isn't going to hurt
5 people if we do use it.

6 One of the comments was made that this area up here, Unit
7 13, is the breadbasket of Alaska. Don did come back and very
8 rightfully so say that to much of Alaska military payrolls are a
9 breadbasket also. So we do need to be very conscious of the
10 role that military plays in our economy. But that park land up
11 there that's available to get away from using state land, there
12 is no reason why they can't do many of these things over. It's
13 not going to hurt it at all and it's not even going to hurt our
14 game populations because none of those probably migrate into
15 areas where we can utilize them as prescribed by the Alaska
16 Constitution. So I think that's -- Don was sensitive to that
17 and maybe there is an outlet to do something.

18 COLONEL ORR: Thank you. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
(907) 276-3554

10036

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
10036	Joe Gerwig			General (to the EIS), Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), Safety (Ground), Physical Resources, Land Use, Infrastructure and Transportation, Subsistence, All proposed actions, 1 – Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxton MOA	I have grown up in the Chickaloon area and realize how much recreation goes on in the area, and how important it is, in the air and on the ground. I also realize that we have a safe country because of what our military does. I don't want our military to have insufficient training, but I want recreation and economic bases to continue. I don't think that the military realizes how much recreation and revenue there is in the areas behind Eureka and Lake Louise. The idea of the Fox 3 MOA expansion is that the general public could still use it hot or cold for VFR, but you are asking for more airspace now, what will keep you from getting more later? What will keep you from making it a cold only entry? Making it extend to the ground? The government rarely gives land back to the public after they obtain it, so even if the military does not use the airspace in the future, it would never be the same. I have flown in the area a lot and know that both Fox 3 expansions are over lots of private facilities, and the Paxton one as well. I am not trying to be a selfish recreator or aviator, just trying to get the word out. I know I am only one of many who feel this way. I want the military to be properly trained too, but I don't see a practical need for them to get that much more airspace in an area of such high public traffic, making it much more inconvenient for all the private activities that go on their. Thank you.

10037

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
10037	Franklin Chythlook	Treadmill Repairman	ExEquip Service	Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), Water Resources, Cultural Resources, Subsistence, 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Access, 11 - Missile Live Fire for AIM-9 and AIM-120 in the Gulf of Alaska	I do not favor having live missiles tested or used in the Gulf of Alaska, I don't think the casings are biodegradable, nor I like the idea of errant projectiles interfering with fisheries activities and whale habitat. I do not favor unmanned vehicles flying near Fairbanks either. The last thing I need is a robot plane hitting a goose and crashing into my house. Also, the idea of "Eyes in the Skies" above private citizens doesn't appeal to me.

10038

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
10038	Mary Odden			Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA), Cumulative Impacts, Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), Infrastructure and Transportation, Socioeconomics, All proposed actions, 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA	<p>Dear IPARC Proposers: Alternative E for the Fox 3 and Paxon MOAs is a substantial improvement over Alternative A. It does not however adequately mitigate impacts to airspace safety caused by the planned low-level flight activities. Keep low-level (500' - 5000') military flights out of the Fox 3 and Paxon MOAs March through October to avoid substantial conflicts. Also there is a socioeconomic "intangible" ignored by your document. Strangely in a document representing an effort to increase the protection of American freedoms through flight training, no mention is made of the substantial reduction in civilian freedoms that the establishment and expansions of yet more Alaska military operations areas represents. You, the planners, and if, the document, absolutely do not understand what it means that you are taking away the sky. There are large ragged holes all over the state in our ability to travel, to access our homes, to look for and manage mineral and biological resources, to expand our badly-in-need-of-expansion economic opportunities. You are restricting the very freedoms you have sacrificed so much to defend. And you have put the burden on us to find out what you have taken away from us. Saving gas, a stated goal of this expansion, is a worthwhile goal, but it does not justify the losses that will result. Are you even aware of what this loss of the sky means to all of us? President John Adams (who by the way established the US Navy) once disbanded the standing US Army because he believed soldiers should never again be garrisoned in American homes. Because of President Adams, this concern is part of our Bill of Rights. What would he think about you taking the sky? This big picture concern for the IPARC expansion has no expression in this EIS document. You should put it there, and allow it to amend these proposals. The EIS also does not take into account this loss of airspace as part of the cumulative effects of past losses caused by the establishment of the large National Parks and their restrictions of airspace use and recreation, nor present losses of climate change, nor future plans for a Susitna Dam and mineral development around the Denali Highway. We are being "pinched" between these elements, and yet your EIS does not take them into account.</p>

10038

You have created a 1400 page document which we are invited to pick apart, and yet it is blind and incoherent on the issue of freedoms being lost. We are grateful that the southern boundary of the proposed Fox 3 MOA has been withdrawn somewhat from the highest civilian activity level areas (in alternative E), but the problems presented by low level flights remain. The Nelchina Public Use Area and the Copper Basin should remain free of low-level military flights March-October to avoid conflict with bird and animal breeding and migration, wildlife and other resource management activities, transportation and access, recreation and hunting. What you have said to us in the meetings and in writing, as evidenced in this EIS process, indicates that you still do not understand how active this sky is, or how the importance of your military service depends on the integrity of civilian lives. What will you be fighting for when you take away our freedoms? We are fighting, too. Whether you know it or not, we are fighting for this place and the people who live here. Respect us. Sincerely, Mary Odden Nelchina (Glennallen) Alaska Resident of Alaska since 1980 Citizen of the United States of America

10038

I0039

Untitled

JPARC Comments
Submitted by:
Whit Hicks, resident
[REDACTED]

Points for clarification

- How much fuel will be consumed by military aircraft flying under 30,000 feet over areas that do not currently have exhaust emissions? Will there be a Title V air pollution permit for the impacted region instead of the point of takeoff?
- What studies have been conducted related to the effect of sonic concussion on wildlife, on livestock, on people?
- Have there been economic impact studies conducted to assess the impact on private, native, and State property values within proposed training range?
- What is the impact of sonic concussion on marine mammals? Are there permits required for this impact?
- Who has priority use of the areas encompassed by the range? If the people of Alaska have open access to State lands and air space, then how will the Department of Defense request permission to operate to avoid conflicts and assure safety?

Major Concerns

- An environmental permit is not a deed to the land and air space. The Alaska Constitution assures Alaskan residents equal access to resources or compensation otherwise:
 - § 16. Protection of Rights
- No person shall be involuntarily divested of his right to the use of waters, his interests in lands, or improvements affecting either, except for a superior beneficial use or public purpose and then only with just compensation and by operation of law.
- More and more often we hear "the main reason we are leaving is the increasing activities and restrictions of military in the area." I am not sure what all of the environmental impacts will be, nor do I think anyone will until the impacts are obvious; however, I do think that there is a huge potential for a negative effect on residential and recreational property values and quality of life due to the JPARC designation.

Ideas for Consideration and Comment

- Restrict training activities to no longer than two week periods, and not more than once per quarter of the year. Publicize the times and plans and take public comment before the training activities.
- Restrict to sub-sonic air speeds within 50 miles of any residence and 100 miles from any designated community.
- Publish all radio frequencies bands and power levels that will be used within the training area.
- Restrict drone flight to uninhabited areas only.
- Disclose any possibility or occurrences of surveillance on any Alaskan, whether intentional or unintentional by any Department of Defense related technology deployed in the region encompassed by JPARC, whether defined by FISA or otherwise.
- Relocate the activity to the Arctic and off shore. It would be wise to increase our presence there and it would not devalue our State and private land due to noise, safety, and the potential for inadvertent surveillance on US citizens.

10040

Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex Modernization and Enhancement
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Written Comment Form

For more information and to submit comments online, please go to:
www.jpisceis.com

Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for the Final EIS distribution. Failure to provide such information will result in your name not being included on the distribution list.

Name (First and Last): PIANA FARRAR Date: May 2012

Title: _____

Organization: _____

Is this a government agency (choose one): ☐ yes ☐ no

Comment submitted on behalf of (choose one):

- ☐ your organization/business/agency
☒ yourself as a private citizen

Email: _____

If you know, please check the boxes below that relate to your comment. This will assist us in organizing and reviewing your comment.

Comment Topic(s):

- ☐ General (to the EIS)
☐ NEPA Process
☐ Purpose/Need
☐ Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)
☐ Cumulative Impacts
☐ Mitigations

Resource Areas:

- ☐ All resource areas
☐ Airspace Management
☒ Noise
☐ Safety (Airspace)
☐ Safety (Ground)
☐ Air Quality
☐ Physical Resources
☒ Land Use
☐ Infrastructure and Transportation
☒ Water Resources
☒ Hazardous Materials
☒ Biological Resources
☒ Cultural Resources
☐ Socioeconomics
☒ Subsistence
☐ Environmental Justice

Proposed Actions:

- ☐ All proposed actions
☐ 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA
☒ 2 - Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery
☒ 3 - Battle Area Complex Restricted Area Addition
☐ 4 - Expansion of R-2205 Restricted Area
☒ 5 - Night Joint Training
☐ 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Access
☐ 7 - Enhanced Access to Ground Maneuver Space Areas
☐ 8 - Tanana Flats Training Area Access Road
☐ 9 - Joint Air-Ground Integration Complex
☐ 10 - Intermediate Staging Bases
☒ 11 - Missile Live Fire for AIM-9 and AIM-120 in the Gulf of Alaska
☐ 12 - Joint Precision Airdrop System Drop Zones

Please provide your comment(s) on the back of this form and turn it in at a public hearing, or submit

by June 7, 2012, to: ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506;

Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil

I0040

Comment(s):

I am concerned with access and use of the Granite Mountain area between the Richardson Hwy. and Alaska Hwy. This is a great subsistence and Recreational use area, that should remain open to the public and area Residents. It is my strongest hope that Restricted areas south of Ft. Greely and east of the Delta River NOT be expanded any further. The Coal Mine Road Recreational use area is one of the Best local trails/Lakes etc.

Noise on the Ranges and in the air (sonic booms) effect our quality of Life. Fire potential and Resulting air quality is of utmost importance. All precautions and possibly delay of planned exercises need to be considered depending on prevailing FIRE (wild fire) conditions.

Use additional sheets as needed.

Please turn in this form at a public hearing or submit by June 7, 2012, to:
ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506
Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil

Thank you for your input.

I0041

**Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex Modernization and Enhancement
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Written Comment Form

For more information and to submit comments online, please go to:
www.jparceis.com

Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for the Final EIS distribution. Failure to provide such information will result in your name not being included on the distribution list.

Name (First and Last): John Beckley Date: 5/9/12

Title: _____

Organization: _____

Is this a government agency (choose one): ☐ yes ☒ no

Comment submitted on behalf of (choose one):

- ☐ your organization/business/agency
☒ yourself as a private citizen

If you know, please check the boxes below that relate to your comment. This will assist us in organizing and reviewing your comment.

Comment Topic(s):

- ☐ General (to the EIS)
☐ NEPA Process
☐ Purpose/Need
☐ Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)
☐ Cumulative Impacts
☐ Mitigations

Resource Areas:

- ☐ All resource areas
☐ Airspace Management
☒ Noise
☒ Safety (Airspace)
☒ Safety (Ground)
☐ Air Quality
☐ Physical Resources
☒ Land Use
☐ Infrastructure and Transportation
☐ Water Resources
☐ Hazardous Materials
☐ Biological Resources
☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Socioeconomics
☐ Subsistence
☐ Environmental Justice

Proposed Actions:

- ☐ All proposed actions
☐ 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxson MOA
☒ 2 - Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery
☒ 3 - Battle Area Complex Restricted Area Addition
☐ 4 - Expansion of R-2205 Restricted Area
☐ 5 - Night Joint Training
☐ 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Access
☐ 7 - Enhanced Access to Ground Maneuver Space Areas
☐ 8 - Tanana Flats Training Area Access Road
☐ 9 - Joint Air-Ground Integration Complex
☐ 10 - Intermediate Staging Bases
☐ 11 - Missile Live Fire for AIM-9 and AIM-120 in the Gulf of Alaska
☐ 12 - Joint Precision Airdrop System Drop Zones

Please provide your comment(s) on the back of this form and turn it in at a public hearing, or submit by June 7, 2012, to: ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506;
Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil

I0041

Comment(s):

I am particularly concerned with access to Coal Mine Rd camping and the old CAT trail down to the JARVIS CREEK area. This open forum shows there will be no changes in that particular area - land or airspace. If that is correct, fine. I appreciate the opportunity to examine this information and be a part of the planning process.

ps. I also think the land road into Tanana flats is a good idea, hopefully to minimize ATV's tearing up the trails. Again, of course if it doesn't impact hunters or hunting seasons.

Thanks

John Beckley

Use additional sheets as needed.

Please turn in this form at a public hearing or submit by June 7, 2012, to:
ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506
Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil

Thank you for your input.

10042

Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex Modernization and Enhancement
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Written Comment Form

For more information and to submit comments online, please go to:
www.jparceis.com

Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for the Final EIS distribution. Failure to provide such information will result in your name not being included on the distribution list.

Name (First and Last): TERRY KEZER Date: 16 May 2012

Title: _____

Organization: _____

Is this a government agency (choose one): ☐ yes ☐ no

Comment submitted on behalf of (choose one):

- ☐ your organization/business/agency
☒ yourself as a private citizen

If you know, please check the boxes below that relate to your comment. This will assist us in organizing and reviewing your comment.

Comment Topic(s):

- ☒ General (to the EIS)
☐ NEPA Process
☐ Purpose/Need
☐ Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)
☒ Cumulative Impacts
☐ Mitigations

Resource Areas:

- ☒ All resource areas
☐ Airspace Management
☐ Noise
☐ Safety (Airspace)
☐ Safety (Ground)
☐ Air Quality
☐ Physical Resources
☐ Land Use
☐ Infrastructure and Transportation
☐ Water Resources
☐ Hazardous Materials
☐ Biological Resources
☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Socioeconomics
☐ Subsistence
☐ Environmental Justice

Proposed Actions:

- ☐ All proposed actions
☐ 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA
☐ 2 - Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery
☐ 3 - Battle Area Complex Restricted Area Addition
☐ 4 - Expansion of R-2205 Restricted Area
☐ 5 - Night Joint Training
☐ 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Access
☐ 7 - Enhanced Access to Ground Maneuver Space Areas
☐ 8 - Tanana Flats Training Area Access Road
☐ 9 - Joint Air-Ground Integration Complex
☐ 10 - Intermediate Staging Bases
☐ 11 - Missile Live Fire for AIM-9 and AIM-120 in the Gulf of Alaska
☐ 12 - Joint Precision Airdrop System Drop Zones

Please provide your comment(s) on the back of this form and turn it in at a public hearing, or submit

by June 7, 2012, to: ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506;

Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil

10042

Comment(s):

- 1st I am Retired from the Army / Army Reserve with 37 YRS, 11 Mo, 22 days, starting as a draft volunteer and retiring as a MAJOR.
- 2nd I am opposed to the proposed land-use as presented. I would like to see a minimum 5,000 Ft. Alt. Ceiling, and no restrictions to the current use of the land for RCR, subsistence and Recreation.
- 3rd. The reasons for the recommended changes are:
- Pilots will NOT keep a 500 ft ceiling when game, mostly CARIBOU AND MOOSE, are visible for "BUZZING". I have personally known too many pilots to allow this, and pilots have not changed since I have had them try to blow me off a motorcycle between El Paso and Alamogordo.
 - The noise level will stress game, in particular CARIBOU during CALVING AND early growth. The CARIBOU have been tightly managed to continue a healthy herd, and added stress by low level jets would adversely impact their health.
 - Subsistence and game harvesting use will become restricted if access to the lands is denied/impacted. Recreational use should not be denied, nor the ability to acquire meat for families. Costs here are extremely high, and many if not most of the residents of the area depend on this land for food.
 - I have worked in Joint Operations commands and as a Tech. Surveillance officer have witnessed in TSO's, hence I have some familiarity with Air operations. While I recognize the need for training, I believe there are sufficient areas for low level training without denying us access to the land we currently use.
- 4th In Closing, I recommend no restrictions be placed on the land not now explored to prevent civilian usage. I recommend limiting the ceiling to above 5,000 feet. I recommend NO training during the CALVING season, and limited use during subsistence and game harvesting seasons.

James E. Hertz
Major, U.S. Army (Ret)

Use additional sheets as needed.

Please turn in this form at a public hearing or submit by June 7, 2012, to:
ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506
Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil

Thank you for your input.

I0043

[REDACTED]
5-18-12

To Whom It May Concern:

RE: Expansion of Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex
(Fox 3 expansion, the new Paxon MOA, the lowering of
the MOA to 500 feet AGL)

I would like to express my concern about the possible expansion of JPARC. I do not think it would be good idea. In fact, it would be very dangerous.

There are too many air taxi operators in the area where this is proposed. Military aircraft flying at 500 feet above ground level would be a danger to these pilots, their aircrafts, and their passengers. The speed at which military aircraft fly would be a deadly combination with slow flying Super Cubs, 185's, Beavers, and Otters. The November 16, 2010 F-22 Raptor crash is an example of how things can go wrong. With more low flying high speed aircraft in the area with slow flying aircraft, there would be even greater chances of accidents occurring.

This same region is a major hunting, camping, and recreational area. I have hunted in the region for over 40 years. Many people of all ages go there to pick berries. It is a huge wildlife area, especially being a caribou migration/calving area and a moose calving area. Migratory birds (such as Trumpeter swans) pass through the area and have their nesting grounds here. Most of the hunters from Mat-Su, Anchorage and Fairbanks use this area to hunt moose and caribou. This would completely disturb this traditional hunting area. Many people who hunt live a subsistence life style. It is distracting enough with the MOA the way it is now. This would infringe upon the rights of Alaskans. We did not choose to live amid noise. We came here for quiet and solitude.

I oppose the expansion of JPARC (Fox 3 expansion, the new Paxon MOA, the lowering of the MOA to 500 feet AGL) in every way. War games should not interfere with the rights of Alaskans.

Sincerely,

Donnie Billington
[REDACTED]

I0043

cc:

www.markudall.senate.gov

www.bennet.senate.gov

www.perlmutter.house.gov

www.polis.house.gov

— www.bishop.house.gov —

— www.hankjohnson.house.gov ~

www.inouye.senate.gov

www.murkowski.senate.gov

www.begich.senate.gov

www.donyoung.house.gov

*wouldn't take comments
outside of Georgia*

I0044

[REDACTED]
5-18-12

To Whom It May Concern:

RE: Expansion of Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex
(Fox 3 expansion, the new Paxon MOA, the lowering of
the MOA to 500 feet AGL)

I would like to express my deep concern about the possibility of expanding JPARC. I do not think it is a wise idea. In fact, it could be very hazardous.

There are countless air taxi operators in the area where this is proposed. Military aircraft flying at 500 feet above ground level would endanger these pilots, their aircrafts, and their passengers. The speed at which military aircraft fly would be a lethal combination with slow flying Super Cubs, 185's, Beavers, and Otters. The November 16, 2010 F-22 Raptor crash is an example of things gone wrong. With more low flying high speed aircraft in the area with slow flying aircraft, the odds are even greater for accidents.

In addition to this hazard, this same region is a major hunting, camping, berry picking, and recreational area. It is a huge area for wildlife, especially being a caribou migration/calving area and a moose calving area. Migratory birds (such as Trumpeter swans) pass through the area and have their nesting grounds here. Most of the hunters from Mat-Su, Anchorage and Fairbanks use this area to hunt moose and caribou. This would completely disturb this traditional hunting area. Many people who hunt live a subsistence life style. This would infringe upon the rights of Alaskans. Peace, solitude, and quiet are things that Alaskans treasure. It is why we live here.

I completely oppose the expansion of JPARC (Fox 3 expansion, the new Paxon MOA, the lowering of the MOA to 500 feet AGL).

Sincerely,

Cathy Teich
[REDACTED]

*I will follow
this up with more specific
comments after
hearing the presentation.*
[Signature]

I0044

cc:

www.markudall.senate.gov

www.bennet.senate.gov

www.perlmutter.house.gov

www.polis.house.gov

~~www.bishop.house.gov~~ —

~~www.hankjohnson.house.gov~~ —

www.inouye.senate.gov

www.murkowski.senate.gov

www.begich.senate.gov

www.donyoung.house.gov

*Wouldn't take
arguments outside of
Georgia —*

10045

Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex Modernization and Enhancement
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Written Comment Form

For more information and to submit comments online, please go to:
www.jpisceis.com

Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for the Final EIS distribution. Failure to provide such information will result in your name not being included on the distribution list.

Name (First and Last): Beth Freud Date: 5/23/2012

Title: _____

Organization: _____

Is this a government agency (choose one): ☐ yes ☒ no

Comment submitted on behalf of (choose one):

☐ your organization/business/agency

☒ yourself as a private citizen

If you know, please check the boxes below that relate to your comment. This will assist us in organizing and reviewing your comment.

Comment Topic(s):

- ☐ General (to the EIS)
- ☐ NEPA Process
- ☐ Purpose/Need
- ☒ Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)
- ☐ Cumulative Impacts
- ☐ Mitigations

Resource Areas:

- ☒ All resource areas
- ☐ Airspace Management
- ☐ Noise
- ☐ Safety (Airspace)
- ☐ Safety (Ground)
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Physical Resources
- ☐ Land Use
- ☐ Infrastructure and Transportation
- ☐ Water Resources
- ☐ Hazardous Materials
- ☐ Biological Resources
- ☐ Cultural Resources
- ☐ Socioeconomics
- ☐ Subsistence
- ☐ Environmental Justice

Proposed Actions:

- ☒ All proposed actions
- ☐ 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA
- ☐ 2 - Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery
- ☐ 3 - Battle Area Complex Restricted Area Addition
- ☐ 4 - Expansion of R-2205 Restricted Area
- ☐ 5 - Night Joint Training
- ☐ 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Access
- ☐ 7 - Enhanced Access to Ground Maneuver Space Areas
- ☐ 8 - Tanana Flats Training Area Access Road
- ☐ 9 - Joint Air-Ground Integration Complex
- ☐ 10 - Intermediate Staging Bases
- ☐ 11 - Missile Live Fire for AIM-9 and AIM-120 in the Gulf of Alaska
- ☐ 12 - Joint Precision Airdrop System Drop Zones

Please provide your comment(s) on the back of this form and turn it in at a public hearing, or submit by June 7, 2012, to: ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506;
Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil

I0045

Comment(s):

More specificity as to Actual required rest times
would be extremely helpful. For example -
Flight training will abuse the airspace for
2 hrs 2x per training day.

Use additional sheets as needed.

Please turn in this form at a public hearing or submit by June 7, 2012, to:
ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506
Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil

Thank you for your input.

10046

15 MAY 2012

Dear Sir;

I am a long time Alaskan. The Federal Government has taken over the majority of land here in Alaska. After the take over this land was closed to use by most Alaskans. It was closed for subsistence only on Federal land to those that were chosen by the Federal Government. The Federals took over management of Fish and Game on all Federal land in Alaska. You do not respect Alaska or our State Constitution. Why should we trust you after all of your broken promises. I am not willing as an Alaska resident to give you any more land or air space here in our State. If you could earn back some of our respect again if you turn over management of Fish and Game on all Federal land as stated in the Statehood agreement. Why do we allow foreign nations to come into our State and train their military? All training should be done to benefit and train only U.S. military personnel. I support the military but not the Federal land grab here in Alaska. The Federal Government is using the military to grab more land. It will never end, you will never be satisfied. I do not trust you.

GRAY L. CORLE

Gray L. Corle

God Bless America, God Bless Alaska, Alaskans

I0047

From: CANFIELD, MIKAL R MSgt USAF ALCOM JTF AK/J08
Sent: Thursday, May 24, 2012 10:36 AM
To: SMART, JOAN M GS-11 USAF ALCOM JTF AK/J08
Subject: FW: APAR Comments
Attachments: JPAR comments 1 001.jpg; JPAR Comments 2 001.jpg
Signed By: [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2012 3:14 PM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Subject: APAR Comments

Here are my comments concerning the military expansion.
thanks
Peg Foster

10047

Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex Modernization and Enhancement
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Written Comment Form

For more information and to submit comments online, please go to:
www.jpisceis.com

Public comments are requested pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code 4321, et seq. All written comments received during the comment period will be considered during Final EIS preparation. Your provision of private address information with your comment is voluntary. Your private address information will not be released in the Final EIS or for any other purpose, unless required by law. However, your private address information will be used to compile the mailing list for the Final EIS distribution. Failure to provide such information will result in your name not being included on the distribution list.

Name (First and Last): Peg Foster Date: 5/22/2012

Title: _____

Organization: Concerned Citizen

Is this a government agency (choose one): ☐ yes ☒ no

Comment submitted on behalf of (choose one):

☐ your organization/business/agency

☒ yourself as a private citizen

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Mailing: _____

Please turn in this form at a public hearing or submit by June 7, 2012, to: ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480
Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506; Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil

Comment Topic(s):

- ☐ General (to the EIS)
- ☐ NEPA Process
- ☒ Purpose/Need
- ☐ Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)
- ☐ Cumulative Impacts
- ☐ Mitigations

Resource Areas:

- ☒ All resource areas
- ☐ Airspace Management
- ☒ Noise
- ☒ Safety (Airspace)
- ☒ Safety (Ground)
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☒ Physical Resources
- ☒ Land Use
- ☐ Infrastructure and Transportation
- ☐ Water Resources
- ☐ Hazardous Materials
- ☐ Biological Resources
- ☐ Cultural Resources
- ☐ Socioeconomics
- ☐ Subsistence
- ☐ Environmental Justice

Proposed Actions:

- ☐ All proposed actions
- ☒ 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxson MOA
- ☐ 2 - Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery
- ☐ 3 - Battle Area Complex Restricted Area Addition
- ☐ 4 - Expansion of R-2205 Restricted Area
- ☒ 5 - Night Joint Training
- ☐ 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Access
- ☐ 7 - Enhanced Access to Ground Maneuver Space Areas
- ☐ 8 - Tanana Flats Training Area Access Road
- ☐ 9 - Joint Air-Ground Integration Complex
- ☐ 10 - Intermediate Staging Bases
- ☐ 11 - Missile Live Fire for AIM-9 and AIM-120 in the Gulf of Alaska
- ☐ 12 - Joint Precision Airdrop System Drop Zones

(Please provide your comments on the next page.)

10047

Comment(s):

I would like to express my opposition to expanding the JPCA area.

I believe the noise, sonic booms, night flights will have a negative effect on the local wildlife & migrating wild birds.

We use this areas for hunting and recreation. And live in Unit [REDACTED]. We ~~also~~ believe that the areas MOA Fox 3 are not necessary.

~~We ~~also~~ believe that~~

We would like to see Fox 3 MOA eliminated from your proposed expansion.

Use additional sheets as needed.

Please turn in this form at a public hearing or submit by June 7, 2012, to:
ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, IBER, AK 99506
Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil

Thank you for your input.

10048

**Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex Modernization and Enhancement
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Email or Phone Comment Form

For more information and to submit comments online, please go to:
www.jpisceis.com

Individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name or address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comments. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals or officials representing organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.

Name (First and Last): John Dickens

Title: Individual

Organization: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Is this a government agency? [Choose an item.](#)

Are you commenting on behalf of your organization? [Choose an item.](#)

Email: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Phone: [REDACTED]

Mailing Address: [Click here to enter text.](#)

**Please turn in this form at a public hearing or submit by June 7, 2012, to: ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480
Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506; Fax: 907-552-5411; Email: alcom.j08@elmendorf.af.mil**

Comment Topic(s):

- ☒ General (to the EIS)
- ☐ NEPA Process
- ☐ Purpose/Need
- ☐ Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA)
- ☐ Cumulative Impacts
- ☐ Mitigations

Resource Areas:

- ☒ All resource areas
- ☐ Airspace Management
- ☐ Noise
- ☐ Safety (Airspace)
- ☐ Safety (Ground)
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Physical Resources
- ☐ Land Use
- ☐ Infrastructure and Transportation
- ☐ Water Resources
- ☐ Hazardous Materials
- ☐ Biological Resources
- ☐ Cultural Resources
- ☐ Socioeconomics
- ☐ Subsistence
- ☐ Environmental Justice

Proposed Actions:

- ☒ All proposed actions
- ☐ 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA
- ☐ 2 - Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery
- ☐ 3 - Battle Area Complex Restricted Area Addition
- ☐ 4 - Expansion of R-2205 Restricted Area
- ☐ 5 - Night Joint Training
- ☐ 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Access
- ☐ 7 - Enhanced Access to Ground Maneuver Space Areas
- ☐ 8 - Tanana Flats Training Area Access Road
- ☐ 9 - Joint Air-Ground Integration Complex
- ☐ 10 - Intermediate Staging Bases
- ☐ 11 - Missile Live Fire for AIM-9 and AIM-120 in the Gulf of Alaska
- ☐ 12 - Joint Precision Airdrop System Drop Zones

(Please provide your comments on the next page.)

I0048

Comment(s):

John Dickens called on 2 April at 1538. He said, “Good afternoon this is John Dickens calling from [REDACTED]. I just got the environmental impact statement for JPARC from you and wanted to thank you. Also to tell you that if you got any public meetings that you need somebody that’s really on your side, give me a heads up as I’m on your side. That’s John Dickens at [REDACTED]. I totally support what you are doing and let me know what I can do to help you.”

I0048

Thank you for your input.

10049

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
10049	Heather Heusser			1 – Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA	<p>Our family has a cabin on Lake Louise that has been in the family since my husband's grandfather homesteaded the land in the 1950s. The family has been enjoying the area ever since. It is a wonderful recreation area, decently populated, but not the busy party place that Big Lake was during my childhood. I want to see the area remain a family recreational area so that our children and grandchildren can enjoy the area just as my husband and his parents have. It's hard to enjoy the solitude of a nice calm, quiet lake when a high-speed aircraft, such as an F-22, flies over you at low altitude. Not to mention the moose and caribou, which are well documented in the area, may be driven out of the area due to the noise. We are strong supporters of the military, having friends and family who serve. We understand that training is important, but feel that a proposal exists that will meet both military and civilian needs. It comes down to concurrent use. While I understand that the EIS process is a Federal process, I personally believe the State of Alaska, Article 8 Constitutional Mandate "encourage the settlement of its land and the development of its resources by making them available for maximum use consistent with the public interest" is a statement that should be followed with all public land and resources. And that is exactly what we have here, a resource that needs to be shared. I feel that Alternative E, with an additional stipulation to add an Overflight Avoidance Area of an additional 20 miles north and parallel to the southern border of Alternative E. This would move the southern boarder back and additional 20 miles from the proposed Alternative E boundary and when maintained year round would address resource concerns. In short with the additional stipulation to Alternative E would benefit both parties – the military to do their training maneuvers and the public to have recreational and subsistence uses.</p>

10050

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
10050	Noel Robinson			Land Use	My cabin is approximately 18 miles south of Ft. Greely. It is U.S. Survey 5357. It is a short distance from the pipeline. No one lives there at present but we intend to fix it up and have it available for family. One of my concerns is that rockets frequently go astray and explode in vulnerable places. Have any added precautions been put in place to prevent this?

I0051

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0051	Noel Robinson			Land Use	The lot and cabin are east of the highway. Thank you, Noel Robinson Richardson Highway behind the

I0052

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0052	Tom Braund	Civilian		Purpose/Need, Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA), Cumulative Impacts, Physical Resources, Water Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Land Use, All proposed actions	Dear decision makers, The vast expansion of the military training ranges in Alaska under the Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex proposal to use the 25,000 square miles of land in the Talkeetna, Lake Louise, Paxson, and Cantwell areas greatly disturbs me. Although I am a staunch supporter of our military and its needs, of all places in Alaska, I don't want it there. To me, that has to be the worst choice of location in Alaska. It is my favorite camping, hunting, and fishing recreational area that is within range of my home. It's loaded with fish and game. Given the size of Alaska and the wide array of suitable terrain available in Alaska, please, put it somewhere else and don't destroy our opportunities there. No matter where you put it, the military can get there. That's my two cents. Thank you. Respectfully submitted, Tom Braund

I0053

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0053	Harry Gay	Individual	n/a	General (to the EIS), All resource areas, All proposed actions	<p>I am a strong supporter of our Military and the need for training. I must submit a strong resistance to this expansion of land consumption by the Military. I live in Delta Junction and have first hand experience and knowledge of the misuse and mismanagement of the land ahead under "Training areas". The military could use better management and do all needed training in half the space they already have. The military does not clean up it's mess and just expects to move on to new land. The Military abuses the rules and regulations of their own making. Until the military is willing to clean up it's left behind pollution and problems, I do not wish to have then consume more land that I use to hunt and fish on. I strongly oppose this expansion and will voice my feeling to all that I come in contact with.</p> <p>Sincerely Harry Mitchell Gay</p>

I0054

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0054	John Schandelmeier	Chair	Paxson Fish and Game Advisory	General (to the EIS), Purpose/Need, Cumulative Impacts, Noise, Socioeconomics, 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA	The proposed MOA expansion near Paxson is outrageous. At the present time, the Air Force doesn't monitor it's own activities—frequent violations of their own rules regarding flight levels, MOA boundaries and sonic booms along the Denali Highway and in the Paxson area are a testimony to this. Instead they ask the public to call in, after the fact. There is no need to expand the current MOA. Instead, I would ask for 10 mile wide corridors along both the Richardson and Denali Highways. To have low-level F-16 traffic in populated areas is not only disrupting, it is unsafe. In an area with poor communications, there is little opportunity for local citizens and the many out-of State and out-of-country visitors to the area to be informed when the MOA is live.

I0055

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0055	Dwayne Bertholl	Mr.		General (to the EIS), Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA, 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Access, 9 - Joint Air-Ground Integration Complex (JAGIC), 12 - Joint Precision Airdrop System (JPADS) Drop Zones	I am just learning and understanding the changes and additions.

I0056

From: Don Smith [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 28, 2012 11:38 AM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Subject: JPARC initiative

I am requesting an extension of the JPARC initiative. The volume and complexity of the JPARC initiative should necessitate a minimum of 90 days for public comment. To move forward without ample public review opportunity would be contrary to the spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act and will have a continued negative impact on the relationship between the public and military.

Sincerely,
Donald M Smith III
FAA Licensed pilot
AOPA member

MS. ODDEN: Okay. Well, I hope to give a better more detailed and objective statement written. This is a perhaps emotional reaction or perhaps socioeconomic, whatever you want to call it. We are mostly concerned with the Fox 3 MOA expansion and especially with the low level and the effects on commercial aviation, general aviation, people getting to their

I0057



1 homes, wildlife management. But we're concerned in general
2 about the appropriation of land and sky resources in Alaska in
3 general and we're not unappreciative of what the military is
4 doing for us, so please don't think that we are.

5 John Adams, second President, father of the U.S. Navy,
6 established the U.S. Navy, once disbanded the standing U.S. Army
7 of the United States even under the threat of conflict with
8 France at that time because he believed the soldiers should
9 never again be garrisoned in our homes. He thought that was a
10 substantial reduction of our freedoms that Americans should
11 never be subjected to and because of his concerns that is in our
12 Bill of Rights today. We do not have soldiers garrisoned in our
13 homes, Americans do not. What would John Adams think about the
14 military taking our sky above our homes in so many areas? What
15 should we think about it, what should you think about it as
16 members of the military?

17 You've heard about what we think is a treasure chest of
18 resources in our area. Some of the only recreation area, the
19 public -- Nelchina public use area that we've worked hard since
20 the 1970s to maintain for snow machines, for airplanes, for
21 hunting, for the exploration for oil and gas, for many levels of
22 public use and we didn't want the restrictions that were put
23 elsewhere by the national park. We didn't want the restrictions
24 on people's basic freedom to do those things. We wanted to
25 share the use. It's not empty space. We've worked hard to keep

I0057



1 that space free for the development -- economic development,
2 maintenance of our wildlife stocks, our fish.

3 You've heard about the noise levels at Paxson Hatchery,
4 that they can't slam a door at certain times a year, they cannot
5 play music in the fish hatchery where this very important red
6 fishery hatchery for the whole Copper River loses the fry. We
7 have deep concerns about the expansions of these MOAs.

8 This is the age of digital reality. We don't want you to
9 kill young pilots. We want you to have the simulations, we want
10 you to be able to go over the terrain. We've worked in Alaska,
11 since the 1970s we've worked around the MOAs out at McGrath, up
12 north at Fort Yukon. We know that you spend the same amount of
13 gas when airplanes go like this or if they go like this. That's
14 the same amount of gas. The reality is that the MOA does not
15 have to come over the top of us. You can keep it north, you can
16 keep it further north than 20 miles and we believe that you
17 should stay above, caution, 5,000 feet.

18 Okay. You who have given much to us to protect, our
19 freedom, and we know what that means. There's people in this
20 area that have lost their kids to the wars overseas. Do not
21 proceed with plans which reduce our freedoms. We've lived here
22 a long time. This is important to us. Be careful, careful how
23 you do this. Thank you.

24 COLONEL ORR: Ma'am, before you sit down, I do this in
25 court a lot. When people use their hands it doesn't translate

I0057

1 onto the -- so can you describe what you were doing with your
2 hands?

3 MS. ODDEN: You have an air.....

4 COLONEL ORR: Take as long as you'd like.

5 MS. ODDEN: You have an airplane at point A and point B
6 and they want to do an exercise between them. They spend the
7 same amount of gas if they meet in the middle or if airplane A
8 stays where it is and point -- and airplane at point B goes to
9 meet it. Does that adequately -- does that get it?

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I understand it.

11 COLONEL ORR: Okay.

12 MS. ODDEN: Okay.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

14 MS. ODDEN: Thank you very much.

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

I0058

■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]

11 COLONEL ORR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Gloria
12 Slick.

13 MS. STICKWAN: Stick.

14 COLONEL ORR: Stick?

15 MS. STICKWAN: Stickwan.

16 COLONEL ORR: Okay.

17 MS. STICKWAN: I've just begun to read this EIS. A lot of
18 this is new to me, so I'm trying to read through it and
19 understand what I'm reading through. I want to first say that I
20 have family members that are in the Navy and in the Army and I'm
21 proud of them. I respect the military. I respect what you're
22 doing for our country.

23 I just want to say that I have a concern about the low
24 level flights, especially when we're out camping, hunting,
25 fishing, you know, how it'll affect our subsistence, customary

[REDACTED]

I0058



1 and traditional use of the areas when we're out there. You
2 know, how it's going to affect the caribou and the moose and
3 other wildlife. Those are my concerns.

4 The other one I'm concerned about is the hunting and
5 fishing season dates. Every year the Board of Game meets and
6 they change the season dates. So when you say late August, you
7 know, that doesn't -- that isn't in -- doesn't time with our
8 seasons. It should be August 1st through the end of September
9 in the report or the EIS.

10 Those are my concerns mostly is the hunting and fishing
11 and being able to continue that and -- without interruption or a
12 lot of noise and to the wildlife management, being able to make
13 sure those wildlife stay out there and they're healthy and
14 they're not being destroyed, or damaged, or ruined, or taken
15 away from us. Thank you.

■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

6 COLONEL ORR: Thank you. [REDACTED]

[illegible]

[REDACTED]

I0060

[REDACTED]

21 MR. ALCOTT: What's up with that. My name's Gary Alcott
22 and I get some very....
23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: (Indiscernible).
24 MR. ALCOTT: All right. A-L-C-O-T-T. Louise May was my
25 mom. Yeah, Gary. So probably my biggest concern is with the

[REDACTED]

I0060

1 hatchery and stuff too because I think that's such a huge deal.
2 But I really feel the need, you know, to have these live
3 exercises and stuff and -- but probably don't want it right here
4 where it's going to damage the hatchery. But I definitely --
5 you know, you can fly over my house down in there anytime you
6 want, you know. I get my pacemaker struck up there a little
7 bit.

8 But the other thing I'm thinking is I know -- now, you
9 know, our pilots I'm sure would not violate any, you know, drop
10 down and go for it, but we also have other pilots, right, that
11 do these things from all over the world, you know, England and
12 whatever. So, you know, maybe our guys might get in a little
13 bit of trouble if they did something like that, but you might
14 not be able to control the people from the other countries. And
15 so, you know, it just takes one jet, go down there go right over
16 the hatchery and just like wasn't that a blast. But -- you
17 know, and then that's done.

18 So anyway, I really want all the training because you look
19 at what our Air Force does and stuff in the world and dominates
20 like that. Well, they don't do that on computers, you know,
21 they got to have it. So -- but I guess the hatchery's my
22 biggest thing I'm worried about because it is such a huge thing
23 and it doesn't even look like it, you know. So a lot of people
24 don't even know it. So anyway, I guess that's it. Oh, sorry.

I0061

■ [REDACTED] ■
■ [REDACTED] ■
■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]

5 MS. RODINA: My name is Jenny Rodina, spelled R-O-D-I-N-A.
6 And this is a comment period, but it's kind of a question also.
7 My question comment is about the alternative E for the Paxson
8 MOA. It's stating that there's the potential for moving the
9 southern boundary of the Paxson MOA north by approximately 20
10 miles because residents around Lake Louise complained about
11 potential noise and there are also impacts to residents, tourism
12 companies and other organizations in that area. And the
13 alternative E was proposed after the public comment -- the first
14 public comment period. Well, my question is a number of us here
15 in the Paxson community also made public comments about noise
16 and impacts to residents and tourism companies in this area. So
17 my question is if you're listening to the people in Lake Louise
18 and moving the southern boundary of the Paxson MOA by 20 miles
19 why not move it 20 miles north of Paxson as well.

20 You already state in your literature that there are
21 significant adverse impacts for socioeconomics, land use and
22 noise. You already know that these are potentially big problems
23 and we know it too. So I'll just make the comment again
24 verbally that we'd like for you to listen to us here in Paxson
25 just the same as you listened to the folks down by Lake Louise.

[REDACTED]

10061

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

March 2013

I0063

[REDACTED]

15 MS. MACCALLUM: Yeah, I might as well,

16 COLONEL ORR: All right.

17 MS. MACCALLUM: Oh. My concern too is with the hatchery.

18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Your first name, spell....

19 MS. MACCALLUM: Oh, Nancy MacCallum. M-A-C capital C-A-L-
20 -L-U-M.

21 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

22 MS. MACCALLUM: My concern -- my first concern is with the
23 hatchery. They are -- they do a wonderful job and they're a
24 very necessary part and they're a great part of our community.
25 And I also look as a lodge owner. As you can look around and

[REDACTED]

7 But again, I go back to the hatchery. The hatcheries are
8 wonderful neighbors of ours. They rent from us. They're great
9 people, they do a wonderful, wonderful job and I do not want to
10 see anything happen to their fish. Thank you.

[illegible]

██████████

I0064

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

6 COLONEL ORR: Our next speaker is Ms. Judy Olson Hicks.

7 Got it?

8 MS. OLSON HICKS: Uh-huh (affirmative). I am Judy Olson

9 Hicks and I represent just me. But as a citizen of Delta I know

10 that tonight is a major scheduling conflict for our small town

11 in that it is high school graduation and so many of the leaders

12 in our community are not available to come here tonight. I also

13 noticed that there were no signs posted up at our grocery store

14 where everyone goes or at our post office about this meeting.

15 There was nothing published on our website about this meeting or

16 in our local newspaper. So I feel as if trying to engage the

17 public in this very important meeting was not really done in

18 earnest or not done with truly getting to know who we are.

19 Thank you.

20 COLONEL ORR: And could you spell your name.....

21 MS. OLSON HICKS: Yes.

22 COLONEL ORR:for the.....

23 MS. OLSON HICKS: J-U-D-Y, O-L-S-O-N, H-I-C-K-S.

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I0065

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]


8 MR. QUARBERG: My name is Don Quarberg, Q-U-A-R-B-E-R-G.
9 I'm a private pilot and a hunter and I'm here to represent
10 myself. But maybe what I have is a request and some
11 observations, but, you know, I preface this with saying that we
12 appreciate everything you fellows do. Not only fellows, Armed
13 Forces Service. We don't want to jeopardize your mission and
14 training and we want you to be the best prepared that there are
15 when we ask you to step into harm's way and so we all appreciate
16 that.

17 Game Management 20A which is out here to the west of Delta
18 and south of Fairbanks is one of the most intensively managed
19 game management units in the state. It currently has a very
20 healthy population of most -- in fact you could probably pick up
21 a Sports Afield or a Petersen's Hunting magazine and read about
22 20A in there. As I look at the EIS and what is planned for that
23 activity, and I've hunted over there for over 30 years. It's
24 beautiful, nestled in between Mount Hayes and Mount Moffit where
25 I go and it looks like it's over. Unless we look at all the

[REDACTED]

I0065

1 opposition, if you will, I don't even know what's controlled
2 opposition, people that have concerns as Representative Feige
3 mentioned over on Lake Louise and the pilots and things like
4 that. This area is accessed by a number of air taxis and
5 transporters, it's accessed by a number of guides, it's accessed
6 by a whole array of private hunters and recreators of which the
7 military is well represented. I hate to lose that and I wish we
8 could share it and I think we can. And the way we can share
9 that is if there was some way we can impress upon the military
10 to maybe adjust their scheduling just -- because I would guess
11 that 90 some percent of the use over there, recreational use, is
12 during the month of September, maybe from August 15th on. And
13 Range Manager Sharp that retired from Fort Greely was a hunter,
14 like probably all of you are. He had the ability to schedule
15 maintenance on the range during September. An OCA who was in a
16 Cub could putz around out there, you know, and go hunting and
17 whatever we had to do and we didn't conflict with anybody. Past
18 couple of years we've had a little bit of an off flavor with the
19 scheduling because we've had people that schedule years in
20 advance, for example, especially with commercial operators.
21 With me it's my relatives coming up when we go hunting. And
22 they're sitting there with airline tickets and all of a sudden
23 they close it, the air space is closed. And that's the way we
24 get in there. Most of that's all fly in. And then of course we
25 call Representative Feige or Murkowski or whatever happens and



4 And I don't know who to ask, but I think there's some
5 pretty good minds in here that could probably get that to the
6 right place. And so if there's any way possible to schedule
7 this. You know, in addition to us flying around, at that time
8 there's lots of cranes and waterfowl and things like that and
9 it's a little bit hazardous too, even for us, you know. We
10 don't -- they can almost out fly me, so they can get out of my
11 way but not with an F-16 or a 22. I guess that's, you know, the
12 gist of my request is look at scheduling, see if there isn't
13 some way we can accommodate both of us. Thank you.

[illegible]

I0066

[REDACTED]

16 THE REPORTER: Could I ask you to spell your name for the
17 record?

18 MR. MUSGROVE: Yeah. Jay W. Musgrove, M-U-S-G-R-O-V-E.
19 I'd like to echo Don Quarberg. We're glad that -- for the
20 opportunity to make a comment and all the effort that they have
21 obviously put into this. Some people don't agree with pieces
22 and parts of it, but I personally appreciate the fact that we
23 have a military and we want them to keep strong and capable.
24 And of course at any -- sometime in the future what they may
25 need as far as equipment will change and that's something that

[REDACTED]

10 COLONEL ORR: Thank you.

[illegible]

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

I0067

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

12 COLONEL ORR: Any additional comments? Yes, sir.

13 MR. QUARBERG: May I make a request?

14 COLONEL ORR: You may.

15 MR. QUARBERG: (Indiscernible). As long as I don't have
16 to do anything. This is Don Quarberg again. My request this
17 time is to the Army and it -- I made some comments earlier about
18 the Eielson range control and that special use airspace
19 information service that they have where we can call an 800
20 number and talk to them in the air. And, you know, they'll
21 really accommodate us pilots that are flying around because if
22 the 16s or 15s or whatever it is are out of the way they'll tell
23 us how long is it going to take you to get across there and I
24 tell them 35 minutes. You can hear them gasp a little, you
25 know, but they'll say go ahead but call us when you get there

[REDACTED]

I0067

1 and of course you don't ever forget that because they'll -- be
2 out there with them.

3 But the -- what I really want -- would like from the Army
4 is they will take -- a prime example is restricted area 2202
5 alpha out here and that's where they're apparently flying these
6 UAVs. And they will inform the Air Force that this -- they're
7 going to be hot, active, tonight from 5:00 o'clock to forever
8 and it'll be that way sometimes through Monday or Tuesday. You
9 know, and I realize I can't hear one, can't hear much anyway,
10 but -- and you can't see them. So after awhile it's kind of
11 like hollering wolf, you know, I don't think anybody's out
12 there. But the Air Force will let us through, you know, they
13 know the current status. And I don't know what the
14 complications are to be able to provide the same kind of
15 service, but if you could do that it would be deeply
16 appreciated. Thank you.

■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]


[REDACTED]

[illegible]

I0068

1 you know, directives. And I do appreciate the military and I
2 thank the young men for their service to our country, but I
3 would like to feel that we had more respect for each other in
4 these kind of proceedings that what we say will actually be
5 heard. I have some of the same concerns that other people
6 mentioned tonight and wildfires are definitely one of them. At
7 times the military will choose not to fight a wildfire that they
8 may or may not have caused across the river with ordinance fire
9 and that's -- it's not threatening the town or anything, but it
10 can -- it impacts our air quality and over the course of a
11 summer, depending on how many fires happen, air quality can be a
12 significant thing in Alaska. You don't -- you know, you don't
13 think about that, but wildfire season is -- can be pretty
14 hazardous for people with any young children or respiratory
15 problems, allergies and stuff.

16 I'm concerned with access and use of the -- to the Granite
17 Mountain area between the Richardson Highway and the Alaska
18 Highway. This is a great subsistence and recreational use area
19 that I hope will remain open to the public and area residents.
20 It's really my strongest hope that this -- the reservation of
21 Fort Greely not expand anymore southward into that area because
22 it's already pretty close. And, you know, we're out there in
23 the fall, I'm out there berry picking and fishing when Don's
24 hunting. So it's just a great area. Noise is some concern, but
25 I would have to say it would be access and wildfire for me.



10068

Thank you very much.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I0069

■ [REDACTED] ■
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED] ■
■ [REDACTED] The first speaker this
5 afternoon is Mr. Jay Harris.

6 MR. HARRIS: Is this the microphone? Yes.

7 COLONEL ORR: It doesn't amplify, it just records.

8 MR. HARRIS: It doesn't amplify? Okay. Yes, I'm here
9 today in protest of civilians being killed by drone attacks in
10 Pakistan. I think that this should be addressed in this forum.
11 My concern is that much of the testing that is being done isn't
12 taking into account the need to protect civilians in battle
13 zones and it's really my opinion that sometimes drones are
14 misused to actually depopulate areas of northern Pakistan and I
15 hope that this will be addressed today. Thank you.

■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]

10070

[REDACTED]

20 COLONEL ORR: All right. Mr. Al Barrette.
21 MR. BARRETTE: Thank you for this opportunity. I would
22 just like to point out that the federal government owns 67
23 percent of the lands in Alaska currently and I understand that
24 the whole ordeal about having this added access is because the
25 federal government and those people that manage those lands do

[REDACTED]

[illegible]

I0071

■ [REDACTED] ■
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]

9 COLONEL ORR: All right. Our next speaker is Ms. Anna
10 Godduhn.

11 MS. GODDUHN: Thank you. Do appreciate the opportunity.
12 Hello? Okay. The mic's not working, so I'll just talk loud.

13 COLONEL ORR: No, it doesn't amplify, it just records.

14 MS. GODDUHN: Oh, it's a recorder. Okay.

15 COLONEL ORR: Right.

16 MS. GODDUHN: You probably said that before. I don't have
17 comments prepared and I regret that because I understood and
18 last year for the scoping meetings the public comments were
19 taken in a closet, so I wasn't inspired by that. So I didn't
20 write these comments down, but I do object to this expansion on
21 both local and global grounds. I personally find the sounds of
22 fighter jets and bombs dropping very, very deeply disturbing.
23 And I can hear them from my house way out in northwestern
24 Fairbanks and I'm on the other side of campus, you know, well
25 away from Wainwright. But I can hear those bombs and it is

[REDACTED]

[illegible]

I0072

[REDACTED]

14 COLONEL ORR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Mr. Robert
15 Mulford.

16 MR. MULFORD: Thank you. I have spent much of the last
17 two and a half years or so attending conferences as a systems
18 integrator engineer at The Institute for Defense and Government
19 Advancement conferences. I've been briefed by generals like
20 General Peter Chiarelli, General Michael Vane, heads of DARPA,
21 et cetera, on some of the new technologies that I think your
22 JPARC expansion is going to be using.

23 You talk in your preamble about these technologies. These
24 are pretty horrific technologies. They're very invasive and
25 they're also very destructive and there's no way to protect

[REDACTED]

I0072

1 civilians from them. And they also find use inside Homeland
2 Security in the United States. I've heard the head of the
3 Department of Homeland Security's commercialization department
4 say to a group of Lockheed Martin and Raytheon (ph) people, hey,
5 you write a 10 page white paper, you can get \$20 million to
6 design some of these anti-terrorism systems. This is all linked
7 together.

8 And your weapons, your drone operators, your drone
9 navigation operations and your drone sensor controls, all this
10 are all based on commercial off the shelf technologies. These
11 are technologies that anybody, a kid with facial jewelry, can
12 learn how to program. You know that it's going to be -- there's
13 going to be proliferation of these technologies and I'll bet you
14 that is why we now have a cyber command in the United States.
15 This is going to come home to us in the United States. This
16 network centric warfare that your -- Admiral Cebrowski started
17 years ago and what your doctrine is all about is going to come
18 home to bite the people in this country. And I'm sure opposed
19 to it and if I can stop you any way and how I'm going to. Thank
20 you.

■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I0073

[REDACTED]

14 COLONEL ORR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Mr. Tom
15 Lamal.

16 MR. LAMAL: My name is Tom Lamal and the comments I have
17 to make are mostly on the Paxson area for pilots. And I would
18 like to see for this area for safety reasons two corridors in
19 the area, one down the Richardson Highway that's high enough
20 that if there's turbulence that private pilots can get out of
21 that and also wide enough that if there's snow squalls or
22 thunderstorms that they have enough room to maneuver around
23 those. Also another corridor I'd like to see is on the Denali
24 Highway going more east and west from Paxson over to Denali Park
25 and also wide and high enough for safe flying for private

[REDACTED]