

I0073

1 pilots. And another area on the Paxson would be towards Tok
2 that if the area was drawn farther away from the highway, maybe
3 to the foothills of the Alaska Range, so that safe passage could
4 happen along there and maybe have it up to an elevation of the
5 foothills of 5,000 feet or something like that, I'm talking
6 about ground elevation, so that people could fly towards the
7 Canadian border without having air restrictions along that area.
8 If that was pulled in I think it would make it a lot easier for
9 people to travel back and forth, myself included. Thank you
10 very much.

11 [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED]
14 [REDACTED]
15 [REDACTED]
16 [REDACTED]
17 [REDACTED]
18 [REDACTED]
19 [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED]
21 [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED]
24 [REDACTED]
25 [REDACTED]
26 [REDACTED]
27 [REDACTED]
28 [REDACTED]
29 [REDACTED]
30 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I0074

[REDACTED]

11 COLONEL ORR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Mr. Chris
12 White. Right over here, sir.

13 MR. WHITE: My name is Chris White. I've been up in --
14 living here in Alaska for 30 or 40 years and I like to hunt and
15 trap and fish and I'm kind of concerned how this is going to
16 affect the people who hunt and fish in that area. So I hope as
17 soon as you can get that thing sorted out because if you have to
18 restrict that area we'd like to know what these restrictions are
19 before we go along with this thing.

20 Another concern that I have is that if this -- using these
21 drones, it doesn't seem to be too good for the people that get
22 hit by them and it seems there's quite a few where it's been
23 used kids are getting killed because of the inaccuracy of these
24 things. But apparently it gets accurate enough, sometimes it
25 isn't. So people -- my concern would be that when the military

[REDACTED]

I0074

1 starts using this stuff it'll start using them on civilians.
2 When the business communities come together with your military
3 communities we end up getting more authoritarian type government
4 and that's on a road to fascism. You got to be careful with
5 that slide because we don't want to live and lose the republic
6 that way.

7 So that's another concern I have, not just the hunting and
8 the fishing and the trapping, but how big of an area are you
9 going to be taking over in square miles to do these exercises.
10 And we're kind of concerned you might have the people on the
11 other side getting hit with this stuff regard us as terrorists
12 and if we start mirroring that way of doing business with drones
13 just dropping out of the sky, boom, if we start mirroring their
14 behavior. And we've seen this with, you know, our government
15 with torture even. They actually think it was okay at one
16 point. If we start seeing us going that was this is not good
17 for the republic.

18 So besides hunting and fishing and trapping in those areas
19 you're about to use is also the broader issue is this going to
20 harm the republic as we know it. That's my concern, sir.

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

[REDACTED]

I0075

1 [REDACTED]
2 MR. OSBORN: Hi. My name's Phil Osborn. I've been here
3 40....

4 COLONEL ORR: Could you spell it for him please?

5 MR. OSBORN: O-S-B-O-R-N. I've been here 45 years and
6 I've come to love this place a great deal. My concern today is
7 that I believe firmly that our nation is in decline. We are a
8 hair breath away from insolvency in so many areas. I think
9 there's no business whatsoever expanding the military presence
10 in our state at this critical time. We need money for people
11 and what they need, not to fight a phantom enemy which doesn't
12 exist. There's no state actor in today's world that demands our
13 high level of technology. That's a fallacy. So I would say I'm
14 categorically opposed to expanding JPARC and that's a big thumbs
15 down to JPARC.

16 [REDACTED]
17 [REDACTED]
18 [REDACTED]
19 [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED]
21 [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED]
24 [REDACTED]
25 [REDACTED]
26 [REDACTED]
27 [REDACTED]
28 [REDACTED]
29 [REDACTED]
30 [REDACTED]

I0076

[REDACTED]

20 MR. HARRIS: I'm John Harris and I had a few comments to
21 add to my prior comments. I want to remind everyone here that
22 the media grossly misrepresents the use of drones and their use
23 in Pakistan. The evidence that I've been able to gather clearly
24 indicates that the drones are being used for much more than
25 isolated targeting of particular individuals. I believe that

[REDACTED]

[illegible]

[illegible]

I0078

[REDACTED]

23 MR. AMEEN: My name is Rasool Ameen, last name A-M-E-E-N.
24 All right. Good evening everybody, thank you. I guess my main
25 concern is the unmanned drones. That's my main concern. I

[REDACTED]

I0078



1 already know of several places in the United States where drones
2 are being used to gather intelligence on American citizens. Now
3 I understand the need for this as far as military training and
4 everything, but nothing in the world is constant. We don't live
5 in a vacuum and everything that's happening in our country and
6 around the world is connected. We're seeing more and more
7 people overseas who are discontented. We're seeing in our own
8 country discontented people. I mean I was watching PBS news
9 hour last night and the Congress just passed a huge defense
10 bill. Now I understand we need a strong defense, we do, but
11 we're living in a time where we just came through an economic
12 collapse where they're -- many of our fellow citizens are
13 hurting. I mean the latest figures, over 46 million people are
14 out of work. There's a lot of discontented people. We see that
15 on the news, we see that in protests, we see that in things that
16 are happening.

17 So my biggest fear is I understand that this is right now
18 being used militarily, but, you know, it's happened before in
19 history and I see it happening again, that we have a lot of
20 citizens who are discontented and if this technology is already
21 being used to gather intelligence on our fellow citizens who
22 decides -- who is deciding what is a threat. I mean who makes
23 the decision that says an American citizen is a threat? And if
24 we're using this technology on citizens what's to stop us from
25 using other tactics?



I0078

1 I mean I remember reading a story in 2002 about the -- I
2 believe it was Vice President Chaney at the time, I don't -- you
3 know, I don't know, but I read a story about in Buffalo, New
4 York, they were considering sending in Delta Force on American
5 citizens and when I read that I was like wow, this is -- I don't
6 know, this is strange. And I really hope that, you know, we ha
7 -- we as a country do not allow ourselves to become so paranoid
8 that we find it necessary to use this technology on our own
9 citizens because I -- everything that I've seen what's going on
10 in the world, I don't see it getting any better. I don't see
11 our economic situation getting any better. Europe is already
12 desperately in need of help as far as the Euro is concerned and
13 that's just going to come over here. So I mean there's a lot of
14 potential for a lot of bad things to happen and I guess I'm just
15 hoping and praying that these things are not abused 20, 30, 40
16 years down the road, you know, when things do collapse here,

17 I mean take a look at Hurricane Katrina for example. You
18 know, that was a natural disaster and you had cops, you know,
19 pretty much well meaning people, I'm sure when they joined the
20 force, you know, were shooting American citizens. And this was
21 a natural disaster. This wasn't an economic collapse, this
22 wasn't, you know, hey, I can't put gas in my car anymore because
23 there's no more gas flowing. You know, this was a natural
24 disaster so I can only imagine with all of this technology we
25 have when our society does get to that point, you know, do we

I0078

1 have assurances that our own technology will not be turned on
2 our own people. That's what frightens me about all of this.

3 As far as seeing this thing here about a helmet on the
4 head of somebody sitting at a computer controlling drones, you
5 know, is there going to be any psychological tests for the
6 people who are controlling these drones? I mean what are the
7 safeties? What are the stop gaps here?

8 As far as the socioeconomic impact on Alaska, I mean, you
9 know, we've al -- we're -- I mean -- okay.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I0079

[REDACTED]

20 MR. AMEEN: Okay. Just briefly. As far as the -- I'm
21 coming back to the drones again because I'm sure we've all seen
22 it on the news, we've all read the reports. I mean even using
23 it militarily there are mistakes that are made by these drones.
24 And my con -- my big concern about it is we haven't perfected
25 this technology, but we're pushing forward with it. We're still

[REDACTED]

I0079

1 using it and we haven't perfected it. I'm reading on here about
2 this quasar thing that they unveiled where somebody's sitting
3 there controlling these things and I -- my thinking is are there
4 standards that these people have -- that they have to meet to
5 control this? You know, are there psychological tests, you
6 know, like police officers have to take before they're allowed
7 to join the force? I mean what are the safeguards and the
8 assurances that these things are not going to be happening here
9 and that's what concerns me about it.

10 It's -- you know, it seems to me like our society, we're
11 going -- we're getting to the point where we're trying to mask
12 what war is really about. I'm a veteran myself. I was an
13 infantryman and I did one combat tour to Iraq. And it seems to
14 me with all of this, you know, we're about subtracting our
15 manpower, but we're -- it seems to me we're masking the real
16 pain and horror of war. When it gets to the point where it's --
17 where you can talk easily about war then something's wrong, you
18 know, something's wrong in our society. And, you know, war
19 should -- the pain and horror of war should be known because it
20 should be the last resort of any government and it seems to me
21 that we're getting to the point in our society where every --
22 where things are going to be controlled by computers and it's
23 easier not to put a face to that. You know, and that scares me,
24 the fact that war is becoming easy, almost like a video game,
25 like we're sitting around on Xboxes playing Call of Duty or

[illegible]

I0080

[REDACTED]

5 MR. GRAHAM: Yeah, it's Robert Graham, G-R-A-H-A-M, and
6 I'm a missionary pilot up here in Alaska. I fly to and from the
7 villages taking supplies, clothes, diapers, so on and so forth
8 in. I've brought 400 missionaries up since 2008 and I just want
9 to make sure that aviation traffic to the general public
10 wouldn't be shut down and restrict when and where we fly already
11 -- more than what it already is. That's pretty much all I have
12 to say.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I0081

[REDACTED]

18 And I think that covers all our preliminaries and if we
19 could begin the -- with the first speaker, Brian Okonek.

20 MR. OKONEK: My name is Brian Okonek, last name is spelled
21 O-K-O-N-E-K. Thank you for this opportunity to comment. I'm
22 most familiar with the Fox 3 MOA area. I understand the
23 military's need for practice areas, but also feel that the
24 military practice areas or the practicing that's being done on
25 these areas has a huge impact to other users on the ground.


[REDACTED]

I0081

1 There's -- it's very, very hard, even as big as Alaska is,
2 to find areas where there's truly natural soundscape and it's
3 becoming ever more difficult. I used to run a guiding business
4 and we would take people on wilderness backpacking trips and
5 their stereotype image of the wilderness was a place for the
6 most part devoid of human and mechanical noise.

7 We had a business for quite a few years going to an area
8 that we took very small groups. We didn't visit it very often.
9 But as aircraft traffic continued to increase in this state we
10 started getting comments from our visitors that they were
11 surprised by the amount of aircraft noise and finally it got to
12 the point that we got enough negative comments about aircraft
13 noise that we had to quit using certain areas that we had
14 traditionally used because of over flights. It just didn't --
15 it didn't go with their vision of what wilderness is. Quality
16 wilderness really needs quality soundscape.

17 I was very disappointed to see that there were only two
18 real alternatives left for the Fox 3 area, that alternative A and
19 alternative E, and they both had flights -- minimum flight
20 altitudes that went down to 500 feet. That's really low and
21 it's really low when you have fast moving aircraft and aircraft
22 coming like over a ridge top when you're in a valley. It's just
23 amazing the impact it has on the ground. High flying aircraft
24 you slowly hear it coming and the noise gradually gets louder
25 and then as it goes over it's the loudest and then it dissipates




I0081

1 as it flies away, but when you're in a valley and you suddenly
2 have an aircraft, even a 185, pop over a ridge it's a real shock
3 to the whole valley. You don't hear it coming and all of a
4 sudden you've got this full impact of the noise and it really
5 changes an experience when you're on the ground, have this type
6 of activity.

7 I'd really encourage you to go back and reevaluate that
8 minimum altitude. This Fox 3 area is a very popular area for
9 people on the ground, people backpacking, people fishing, people
10 rafting, people hunting. There's a lot of use. Just look on
11 the map of where it's at. It's close to Anchorage, it's close
12 to lots of urban areas. It's between all the highway systems in
13 the state. It's one of the easier places to access and actually
14 get a wilderness experience from a road. But as you go into it
15 you end up getting more and more air traffic.

16 The natural soundscape matters for the animals too.
17 There's -- it's very hard finding definitive sound studies and
18 how they affect animals and birds. I -- I'm on a -- a member of
19 a over flights committee for Denali National Park and we've had
20 access to a long, long list of sound studies and many, many,
21 many are inconclusive and hard to substantiate just the impacts,
22 but some of them do indicate that there's -- puts animals at a
23 high stress level, especially during calving and lambing
24 periods. The Nelchina caribou herd is in this Fox 3 area. One
25 of its main calving areas is right in the middle of your MOA,



I0081

1 your MOA, and there's also a lot of sheep in the Talkeetna
2 mountains and in the Alaska Range and their lambs are very
3 sensitive to disturbance by noise. I encourage you to work
4 very, very closely with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
5 to find out just where these areas are and consult with them
6 each year to find out where the caribou are calving to try to
7 create a bubble over those areas to protect them. It's quite a
8 long period. It's not just the day they drop their calves
9 that's the critical period. It's the first couple months of
10 their life. They're very small young calves trying to stay with
11 the cows and major noise disturbance can separate them and
12 create problems.

13 And like I -- my question I had about the mitigating, many
14 of your mitigating factors are very much educational. I'll just
15 continue just a few minutes here and wrap it up. And I -- and
16 you did explain that there are other ongoing mitigating factors
17 going on, but I think you need to really concentrate on some
18 mitigating factors that will protect critical areas within these
19 -- all these MOAs. Thank you very much.

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

[REDACTED]

I0082

[REDACTED]

20 COLONEL WEISS: Mr. Schapansky.

21 MR. SCHAPANSKY: Thank you. My name is Elwood Schapansky,
22 S-C-H-A-P-A-N-S-K-Y. I'm a retired local glacier pilot so my
23 point of view will be that of a pilot rather than of a person
24 interested in wildlife. I'm also interested in wildlife. We
25 make many trips to see that from the air and do our best not to

[REDACTED]


I0082

1 disturb anything.

2 My main concern tonight is that this is like a planning
3 stage and that our words won't be heard by the FAA. The FAA
4 should be here ultimately and so that's my first comment. I
5 would like to be able to say these words to people that will
6 hear me rather than people that are putting them down on a piece
7 of paper and hoping that the FAA will see them.

8 I have flown all over Alaska during the last 40 years.
9 I've been in the Naknek (ph) MOA, I've been in the MOAs to the
10 west of the Alaska Range, I've been up all along the Tanana
11 Valley. I've only had one negative experience in a MOA. A MOA
12 for a pilot is a place where we can fly, but we have to look out
13 and I've been very, very close to a couple of F-15s in the
14 Galena area. That's the only bad experience I've had in 10
15 years flying the Susitna MOA, not a problem. So I'm not
16 concerned about those areas, I am concerned about the Fox 3 area
17 and I am concerned about expanding that. I would like very,
18 very much to have the Fox 3 area to be like the Buffalo area
19 where there are altitude restrictions. The Buffalo MOA has a
20 impact below 1,500 feet AGL. I'd like to see that moved up to
21 3,000 feet as a minimum. Just north of that there's another MOA
22 that does have the 3,000 foot restriction. I'd like to see that
23 throughout the entire Fox area and I definitely would not like
24 to see that expanded.

25 I would certainly favor the expansion of the restricted



I0082

1 airspace that is used for live targeting in the Fairbanks area.
2 I don't think those people will necessarily appreciate that, but
3 it is a necessary thing for the military to do and I would be in
4 favor of that. We're already used to restricted airspace. It's
5 very well defined, how we deal with it is well defined. The
6 worst thing for me as a pilot is that the restrictions on
7 altitude. The altitude flight rules start at 3,000 feet AGL,
8 that is above ground level. These high speed military aircraft
9 can penetrate that airspace and it's my responsibility to be
10 aware of them. I don't have T Cass (ph), I don't have the
11 ability of seeing them by using my transponder. I don't have
12 the electronics to do that. So it's see and be seen and I am
13 not in favor at all of military aircraft impinging upon the
14 airspace that I'm already used to as an FAA pilot. So 3,000
15 feet AGL puts me or puts the MOAs in the same restricted region
16 or in the same set of rules as the FAA already has and we don't
17 have to worry. We have to look out for other small aircraft,
18 but we don't have to worry about a high speed jet impinging upon
19 that area.

20 So if there's any changes going to be made in these
21 expansions certainly make them so that the FAA rules for, you
22 know, picking your flight altitude above the ground is
23 consistent with the altitudes used in the MOAs. Thank you.

I0083

[REDACTED]

22 We are now ready to begin and our first speaker is Mr.

23 Bill Frey. Mr. Frey.

24 MR. FREY: Thank you. Just want to say thanks for all of

25 the work you guys have done presenting this. It's been very

[REDACTED]

[illegible]

I0084

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

7 COLONEL WEISS: Mr. Orville Gilman, III.

8 MR. GILMAN: My name's Orville Gilman. I live in Wasilla.

9 And I read this document previously on the internet some, it's
10 large, and coming here tonight I appreciate the fact now that
11 it's actually an Environmental Impact Statement and I have the
12 same concerns as other people. I don't want to get locked out
13 of areas we've hunted in for years. I think that as a whole the
14 military needs these training operations, but I also feel that
15 as opposed to locking them out -- I mean personally I think that
16 it'd be safer -- in the issue of live range fires certainly you
17 don't want anybody in there. In other instances I think working
18 among the citizen population say during the hunting season would
19 be more of an opportunity than a hindrance because in
20 Afghanistan and Iraq right now we're definitely working right
21 through civilians. It just makes sense that for good real world
22 training that there's really no need to remove the public from
23 everywhere.

24 And as far as the environmental impact goes, I -- in all
25 the years I've lived here since '68, since I was seven years

[REDACTED]

I0084

old, and I -- I've never really seen that the military's impact on wildlife game populations was any more or less than any other person or group traveling through the country. So I don't hold that as something that I fear as a problem.

I just am more concerned with it seems like every time we have an impact statement, an agreement for something to happen in a certain specific way, a few years later it tends to be that the federal agency or the state agency starts to take total control and it doesn't turn out to be the thing that it started out as. And that's what I'd like to see avoided here, I'd like to see it -- that the military can train, they can operate in the state and that we can all still hunt and fish and enjoy our rights as citizens. Because the bottom line is this is America and each and every one of us is an American and this is our government, not a government above us, but a government of us. It's our decision and I think we can make a reasonable and wise decision. Thank you.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(907) 276-3554

I0085

Submital ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Comment
I0085	Randy Tyler			<p>As a general aviation user of this air space I am especially concerned about the expansion of the FOX3 MOA in. This is in the middle of the most heavily used GA portion of the state, directly in the middle of the main population centers of the state. To expand into more of this area and to go to such low AGL floors will place the military traffic directly in with the GA traffic. This is not good. I fully support the military but this is an action that is akin to being the 800 pound gorilla in the room. I respectfully request that the military truly respect the other users of this airspace and not just use the EIS process to check the required boxes and ram this through. I have a small, slow tube and fabric GA airplane with no transponder; something very common in Alaska. I know from experience that Anchorage Tower has a difficult time identifying me on radar when I transition the terminal area. It will be nearly impossible for a military pilot to see and avoid me while traveling at 450+ knots at very low level and fully focused on terrain avoidance and their training target. I highly doubt that AWACS could positively identify me 100% either. This situation is just a disaster in the making. Not only would I and fellow GA pilots and passengers be dead from collisions or near miss turbulence, there is real possibility that the military traffic could be lost as well. The main thing is that this is not necessary. There are many other more remote MOA's in Alaska the military can expand with much less impact to the public and with the speed of modern military aircraft, the time to location is insignificant. For these reasons I respectfully request that the expansion of the FOX3 MOA and the new Paxson MOA not be done and the necessary expansion of MOA's be done in more remote areas of the state with less conflicting GA traffic use. The proposed Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery area is proposed to expand south ans west into popular hunting and recreational use area with private cabins. It would be better and less impact if this was kept more within the limits of the Tanana flats and not encroach into the foothills of the Alaska Range mountains on the south side of the Tanana flats. The Unmanned Aerial Vehicle area is a growing concern and with this expanded area will be a real concern for GA traffic in the Fairbanks area. Again, I think this is an unnecessary risk the Military is placing on the general public and the UAV use needs to be kept within the Tanana Flats area or more remote MOA's rather than placing them in airspace most heavily used by GA traffic. I thank you for your solicitation of public comments and respectfully request that you consider these changes for the safety of the public and military alike. Thank you , Randy Tyler</p>


I0086

May 29, 2012

Good day,

A sad picture:
This is our second letter opposing the expansion of the Fox and Paxon military Operations (MOAS). Lowering the Fox 3 MOA to 500 feet, to us, is unacceptable. This is our home. Wildlife will suffer. Civil aviation will be impacted. I and my husband picture ourselves working in our subsistence garden and having military flyovers at low levels. Our Alaskan Traditional lifestyle becomes more difficult daily it seems. We have something wonderful and special in Alaska, please help us to retain this gift. Alternative D proposing to keep the boundaries as they currently exist. Please do not expand the military exercises over the Copper River Basin.

Sincerely,
Linda Rutledge
Charlie Rutledge



10087

**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): Curt Anderson Date: 5-25-12

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

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

10087

Comment(s):

WE HAVE A RETIREMENT HOME ON A REMOTE LAKE IN THE EXPANSION AREA FOR 3 MOA. WE HAVE SPENT A GOOD DEAL OF TIME & MONEY BUILDING THIS HOME. WE ARE THERE BECAUSE IT IS REMOTE AND WE ENJOY QUIETNESS.

THESE ARE OUR CONCERNS.

1.) NOISE POLLUTION

2.) WATER POLLUTION.

A) THE LAKE IS AN ONLY SOURCE OF WATER.

3.) AIR SPACE

A) WE ARE AT THE WHIM OF THE WEATHER & FLY WHEN WE CAN. THE 500 FT AGL RESTRICTION COULD BE TROUBLESOME & DANGEROUS.

4.) THIS EXPANSION HAS MOVED INTO A MORE POPULATED AREA. LAKE LOUISE HAS ABOUT 60 PERMANENT RESIDENTS AND MORE PERMANENT PLACES ARE BEING BUILT. THIS EXPANSION HAS GONE IN THE WRONG DIRECTION. WITH MORE & GREATER POPULATION, THE CHANCES OF PEOPLE GETTING ILL OR INJURED INCREASES. HOW WILL MEDICALS BE WORKED OUT?

5.) THERE ARE MOA'S ALL OVER THE STATE & THE YUKON MOA LOOKS VERY LARGE. HOW MUCH SPACE DO YOU NEED? I BET THERE IS MORE MOA SPACE HERE THAN ANY OTHER STATE. I FEEL THE FULL SAVANNAH IS A MUTE POINT.

IN CONCLUSION, WE FEEL THE FOX 3 & DAYCON EXPANSION SHOULD NOT HAPPEN. IT WOULD INTERFERE ON OUR CHOSEN LIFE STYLE AND COULD CAUSE ECONOMIC DEPRESSION TO BUSINESSES AND DECREASE PROPERTY VALUES.

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.

I0088

[REDACTED]

From: susan.monetti [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 25, 2012 1:16 PM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Subject: JPARC

To Alaska Command Public Affairs Officials/Agents,

I have reviewed the JPARC Modernization and Enhancement Draft EIS. This missive is my response and public comment to the document and proposal.

I am completely dismayed at the military's proposal, JPARC Modernization and Enhancement Draft EIS, and it's lack of consideration for Alaskan people, Alaskan environment, national economics, and resources conservation.

This document is the most publicly and personally offensive plan proposed because of its disregard for REAL people with REAL lives, who live in Alaska and would be subject to non-stop noise pollution, aerial interference, reduced quality of life, and the increased safety risk on land and air. The proposed idea to increase training exercises does not justify the cost to all Alaskans.

The only choice suitably presented in the JPARC draft is "No Action Alternative" on every document proposal. Do not add to or increase the military training that already exists in Alaska.

Sincerely,
Susan Monetti
[REDACTED]

I0089

[REDACTED]

From: Corky [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 30, 2012 8:24 PM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Subject: JPARC
Attachments: MOA LLCNPC.docx; MOA Letter Matthews 2.docx

I0089

May 30, 2012

ALCOM Public Affairs

9480 Pease Ave. Suite 120

JBER, Alaska 99506

alcom.i08@elmendorf.af.mil

Subject: Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex

To whom it may concern:

To start this letter, let me be clear, that we do not oppose military training in Alaska.

The expansion of the FOX 3 and Paxson MOAs is totally unacceptable.

We are full time residents of Lake Louise. Both I and my wife are retired, but very active in the public and community. We are both Mat-Su Borough Emergency Medical Responders, my wife is president of the Lake Louise Community Non-Profit Corporation, and I am the Chief of the Lake Louise Volunteer Fire Dept.

The Lake Louise Community comprises of the 3 major area lakes, Lake Louise, Lake Susitna, and Tyone Lake, as well as the surrounding small lakes and land areas. This is a state recreation area and home to about 60 year around residents. People have chosen this area because of its natural beauty, clean waters, abundant wildlife, and road access.

The expansion of the MOAs over populated areas makes absolutely no sense. I understand that to someone sitting in the Pentagon, looking at a map, it looks like a vast wilderness. This is the recreation area for the largest population center in Alaska. This is the most accessible hunting area. This is Alaska's outdoor backyard. We have already experienced some out of area military air traffic that has strayed out of the existing MOA. This unplanned preview has not been a pleasant experience. We can only imagine the accidental air traffic if the MOAs are expanded.

Alaska is a huge area, most of which is under Federal management. To pick an area that is mostly State of Alaska, and Mat-Su Borough lands are unacceptable. Use the vast Federal lands including the National Parks for MOA expansion. We have listened to all of the reasons presented by the various public meetings; none of these make a justifiable case: fuel savings, proximity to airfields, terrain similar to the current war areas.

Respectfully,

Corwin and Beverly Matthews

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I0090

From: John Strassenburgh [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2012 5:46 PM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Subject: Public comment JPARC draft EIS

BELOW ARE MY COMMENTS. PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE THAT YOU HAVE RECEIVED THEM IN GOOD ORDER. THANK YOU.

May 30, 2012

ALCOM Public Affairs
9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120
JBER, AK 99506

Via email: alcom.i08@elmendorf.af.mil

To Whom It May Concern:

These are my comments regarding the Draft EIS of the proposed expansion of the Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex (JPARC) military training area.

I support the NO ACTION alternative, which would keep the existing training areas and regimen in place. Alternative E is a smaller expansion and so would be marginally less detrimental to fish and wildlife and human use and enjoyment of the affected lands than would be Alternative A, but I do not support either of these action alternatives. Both would have an unacceptable level of adverse effect on the health and abundance of wildlife populations, on the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's ability to conduct research and manage fish and wildlife, and the public's use and enjoyment of the area. Both also represent concern with respect to aviation safety.

I am concerned also because the military is fundamentally turning a blind eye to the serious and legitimate impacts of its proposed expansion and modernization. I note that just over a year has passed since the public commented in the scoping phase of this proposal and now. That is not nearly enough time to comprehensively and meaningfully do the research and analysis and otherwise assess the effects on wildlife, the environment, and human use of the areas, so that the proposal can be modified and mitigating measures established accordingly.

Impact mitigation is more than just notifying the public of when and where training exercises will take place. To develop mitigating measures means first knowing what the effect of the training exercises would be, and where. Then it is necessary for the military to actively work with ADF&G and citizen groups at the front end, before the final EIS and Record of Decision, to redesign the proposal and develop specific mitigation measures necessary to avoid impacts or reduce the impacts to an acceptable level. For example, how, specifically, will the caribou calving, Dall Sheep lambing, nesting birds, etc. be impacted and how will they be protected?

The MOAs (especially FOX 3) overlay very productive wildlife areas, including calving grounds for the Nelchina caribou herd and the Nelchina Public Use Area. The areas are very popular with the public for a variety of uses. It is not just about hunting and fishing. Folks enjoy the outdoors and they get out there for many

I0090

reasons... often to find a little quiet solitude. There is flightseeing, mining, trekking, subsistence, lodges, guiding, remote cabins, birding, mountain climbing, agency fixed wing and rotary aircraft (e.g., ADF&G doing research), and so on.

The military is proposing to significantly expand and intensify its training operations. According to information from the Talkeetna meeting on May 22, 2011, there would be training sessions, one in the morning and one in the afternoon, on weekdays. And the military aircraft would be flying as low as 500 feet above ground level (AGL). This is very frequent, repeated, low-level, intense flying. Obviously, this kind of activity would disturb and displace wildlife. The wildlife would be less successful because of the direct disturbance, but also because they would move away, to less productive habitat. Both Action Alternatives, A and E, would clearly put the health and numbers of wildlife populations at risk.

And it not just mammals. Migratory birds would be disturbed during the critical time of nesting and rearing, and preparing for fall migration. The frequency and intensity of the low-level flying (i.e., less than 5000 feet AGL) represent a significant disturbance that would be detrimental to the nesting success rates.

On top of that are the impacts on human use and enjoyment of the area, including public safety concerns associated with private and commercial small aircraft flying. There would be more air traffic and a mixture of military and civilian aircraft, which would increase the chances of mid-air collisions. And there is the direct impairment of human on-the-ground activities, whether it be a backpacker seeking a wilderness experience (a large part of which is a natural soundscape), a hunter faced with less game, or a family camping along the Denali Highway seeking respite from city life.

The Matanuska-Susitna Valley is one of the fastest (if not the fastest) growing areas in the state. That means more people, more remote cabins, more hunting and fishing, more trekking, more mountain climbing, trekking, more flight seeing, more charter flights, and so on.... all of which increases the severity of the JPARC impacts, but also in themselves create pressure on wildlife. The EIS should analyze the effect of the Alternatives in the context of the increase in population and human use of the area, which will, by all accounts, occur. In addition, population increase is foreseeable, and its effect should be analyzed as part of the Cumulative Impacts section of the EIS.

Many of the impacts of the proposed expansion and intensification of the JPARC training area can be significantly reduced or eliminated altogether if the minimum AGL remained at 5000 feet. If I were to make one recommendation, it would be to add a zero to the proposed 500 feet AGL to keep the minimum AGL at 5000 feet.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

John Strassenburgh



I0091

May 24, 2012

These comments are submitted in response to the Environmental Impact Statement for the Modernization and Enhancement of Ranges, Airspace, and Training Areas in the Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex in Alaska.

Comments submitted by Robert Gerlach, 39 year resident of Talkeetna, Alaska, private pilot, guide, hunter, recreationalist, concerned citizen and property owner relatively near the proposed Fox 3 MOA expansion area.

As a private citizen actively utilizing not only ground but also air space affected by this proposal, I have great concerns for the proposed military expansions made in this request.

Before I extend my comments specific to the request, I am compelled to voice a few issues with the ‘public comment process’ I am participating in.

1. It is somewhat outrageous to me that we cannot *easily* decipher “who” is making this request. From the Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex EIS website, it is not at all clear WHO is not only asking for the expanded military use of our State’s air, land and water, but worse, WHO is governing this decision. Digging deeper, we find the EIS report states reference to broad federal agencies involved, but honestly, it is still not clear or forthright for us to clearly understand WHO is actually involved, both on the request side and the decision side of this proposal. In my opinion that leans toward feeling more like this is done and out of our hands, and as such, a sign for how much this whole proposal reaches over the line.
2. Controlling the Public Comment Process. I am writing in response to an exhaustive document that the public has had very little time to understand. I can only imagine the extent of the professional team who created this document, and the exhaustive amount of time they took doing so, yet we as the public are given just 70 days, to not only just read it, but to digest, understand and decipher: what is being proposed, who is proposing it, what are the impacts said proposal will have on the lives, natural resources, communities, economies, fish and game, lifestyles and much more, for the public residing within the affected areas. And, we are expected to decide if the proposal seems feasible to allow. This is FAR too much. I am not even completely certain who I am addressing, precisely who the entities involved are, nor who is deciding the outcome, let alone clear about all the implications this proposal has upon my life and the lives of my fellow Alaskans. And still, I am required to decipher what is reasonable. I can say, THIS in itself is unreasonable.
3. Conflict of Interest. The Public Hearing held in Talkeetna, Alaska, March 22, 2012, was moderated by a military judge, who allowed only four minutes per person to submit public comment. **With all the military personnel hovering about, I was too intimidated to do verbal comments. It felt like an occupying force had taken over.** THAT was unreasonable. Is it not an obvious conflict of interest to utilize military personnel (even uninvolved-to-this-request-military) as

I0091

gatekeepers when collecting data on a project that aims to benefit the military? This meeting was a clear example of ‘the powers that be’ following ‘the letter of the law’ without following the ‘spirit of the law’ in adhering to the requirement to allow public involvement. Sincere interest for including public input would provide EASE and COMFORT in collecting public input. The process I have experienced has seemed more like an effort to control the public comment process, and ultimately limit the “obstacle” of the public, as opposed to actually encouraging public involvement in deciphering what is truly within the best interests of all parties involved while determining the true impacts of this proposal.

Now, despite my displeasure with the process and the uncertainty for exactly who is involved, I DO have some very clear concerns that I am very certain must be expressed with regard to this request for expanded military use of Alaska’s land, air and water spaces.

We Alaskans who live, work and recreate in the areas listed in this proposal are being encroached upon by the military. This place is our home. With the proposed areas listed in this expansion, it feels as if we are being literally squeezed out of our own backyards.

With all due respect, I recognize the military needs space to train and conduct its exercises, and it needs to do so in areas where civilians will not be affected. Yet therein lies the problem. The proposed areas ARE occupied and heavily utilized by the public. The military has taken a lot of space from Alaskans already, and it is my concern that this request is going well over the line.

About 15 years ago, the military came through our State with a similar EIS process, and at that time, they established a wide range of Military Operations Areas. The Fairbanks area and northeast of there is almost continuously air space dedicated to military operations. They have a low level ops area, a high level ops area, live-fire areas and restricted areas. I provide below a list of all the Restricted Areas, Military Operations Areas, and Area refueling tracks for air space alone that are already in use across our State, by the military. There are probably more military use areas that I am not aware of, not even to mention the numerous military bases that occupy our State.

Restricted Area 2203 A
Restricted Area 2203 C
Restricted Area 2211
Restricted Area 2202

Susitna
Naknek 1
Naknek 2
Sparrevohn
Stoney A
Stoney B

10091

Galena
Utopia
Fox 1
Fox 2
Fox 3
Eielson
Birch
Delta Junction
Buffalo
Viper
Yukon 1
Yukon 2
Yukon 3 High
Yukon 3A Low
Yukon 3B
Yukon 4
Yukon 5
Sand Point

In the time since the military's last request roughly 15 years ago when they claimed a good portion of our space then, the population of Alaska has grown considerably. Civilian use of our air and ground space has significantly increased, not decreased. We don't have less public use of our land and air space, we have considerably more.

My concern is that air space already taken by the military (noted above), combined with a considerable increase in civilian population, says we do not have more space to give the military, we have less. The military has already taken enough. As stated in the EIS report itself, the military already occupies 65,000 square miles of our Alaska air space (not to mention additional land and water space already occupied by the military). It is entirely unacceptable to increase these amounts, now.

Though the military may be trying to make it very easy on themselves, to have areas closer to their bases to avoid travel to war game practice locations, such convenience for the military creates far too much additional limitation on the public populations that live, work and recreate in these areas.

The military has taken enough of our space. Asking for more is too much.

BIG CONCERN – Fox 3 and Paxon:

I am extremely concerned with the requested expansion and changes for the Fox 3 MOA and the Paxon MOA addition. Expansion with these two areas are completely out of the question and entirely unacceptable for expanded military use.

These two areas are the bread basket of Alaskan recreation.

I0091

The military may think these areas are perfectly remote for their use. Well they ARE remote, and as such, they are PRIME locations where MANY Alaskans utilize the space – both ground AND air. It is entirely unacceptable for the military to expand there. Alaskans utilize these areas extensively all year long – skiers, snow machiners, hunters, recreational boaters – not to mention the wildlife abundance and the negative impacts any military involvement would bring to the natural resources in those pristine areas.

The Paxon and Fox 3 areas are simply too close to human populations AND they are the cream of the crop for Alaskans utilizing the outdoors. Military use in these areas is entirely unacceptable. There should be NO expansion or changes to altitudes in these areas.

Flying levels.

This proposal has also asked for an extension of air space reaching to 500 AGL (above ground level) flying. This is entirely unacceptable in the Paxon and Fox 3 areas. Have you been on the ground and experienced the noise that comes with military fly overs? In NO WAY is it appropriate or acceptable to allow flying lower than 3000 AGL in ANY of the areas requested – especially not the Fox 3 and Paxon areas – in order to maintain the health and safety of the public, and protect the wild habitats that dwell in these places.

It is with grave concern for the maintenance of our public areas that I present these comments. I cannot stand by and watch our military encroach upon our lands any further than they already have. The requests made within this proposal are simply unacceptable.

I am calling for the NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE for the requests made in this proposal.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert Gerlach

I0092

[REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, June 04, 2012 3:35 PM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Subject: Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex EIS
Attachments: JPARC2.docx

I0092

To Whom It May Concern:

Since both my parents were in the Air Force, I am always interested in what the military has to say, particularly when it perceives it has needs. However, looking at the maps of the proposed JPARC enhancements raises some serious red flags for me:

1. IT WILL BECOME AN AREA TOO LARGE TO MANAGE

I live where we shouldn't be hearing sonic booms, but do, and that makes me concerned that enlarging the MOA will lead to it being too large to supervise adequately. These booms startle me; I've thought 'Earthquake!' until my husband, who grew up around Beale Air Force Base, recognized it as a sonic boom. I was glad to find out about 1-800-JET-NOIS at our local scoping meeting in Glennallen, but if there are enough problems at the present size to need such a number, it will be impossible to manage an even larger area.

2. WILDLIFE

-DURING MATING & BIRTHING SEASONS

If a boom causes me to startle, it will do the same for wildlife. I'm sure there are studies that show both negative and no effects, but my experience indicates it would alarm wildlife. A scene I can imagine is a bird flying off the nest frequently during a training exercise, causing the eggs to cool down so much that they don't hatch. Repeated, this would be disastrous, and since it could affect other wildlife, it will have to be studied for each species, both during mating and birthing seasons.

Much of the area proposed to be included is pristine wilderness. To disturb it would just be wrong, as well as disastrous and very difficult to make right.

-MOOSE IN SPRING

I also worry about moose in the spring when they are weakened from a hard winter with stressors like a lack of food and deep snow. They are just hanging on then, and running a few times from startling noises could be enough to kill them.

3. QUALITY OF LIFE:

-NUISANCE NOISE

-REDUCED PROPERTY VALUES

-PROPERTY DAMAGE

There are rules in the Lower 48 and other countries severely limiting sonic booms because they are so annoying. They lower property values and can cause damage to buildings, as is to be expected from a noise that rattles a house like an earthquake. I object to that happening to my home, and it is especially worrisome that there is a request to lower the flying level to 500 feet, unheard of anywhere else.

4. INCONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL PARK & PRESERVE VALUES

10092

The proposed expansion is between two national parks, and according to the handout, appears to be less than 10 miles from Wrangell-St. Elias. If I am being affected now, the enhancements will surely cause the sound and over-flights to slop over into the parks. The kind of noise and activity that will accompany this extension is antithetical to the preservation of wilderness.

5. AVALANCHES

If snow machines or even skiers can start avalanches, sonic booms certainly could, too, sending them roaring down on unsuspecting backcountry recreationalists. I may be a grandma, but I try to get to the mountains to ski a few times every year.

6. LACK OF PERTINENT STUDIES

How far do sonic booms go in cold? Is that why we heard several recently? Do sonic booms bounce off mountains? There are probably no studies that will allow anyone to say what the true effects of sonic booms are in extreme cold or near high mountains.

7. ECONOMIC DETRIMENTS

Potential economic benefits would likely be at the expense of some existing businesses.

-PRIVATE PILOTS

A larger MOA means the chance for more restrictions for private pilots, who are often the lifeline to remote areas. They have worked hard in rough conditions to develop small businesses, and the possibility of new jobs for someone else does not make negative impacts to their established income and life style any less onerous.

-TOURISM

Why should tourists come all the way to Alaska and its rugged weather, when they can take a shorter, less expensive trip to see beautiful scenery if the Alaskan experience is going to include noise and Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force activity?

I do love the sight of jets. I pay attention hoping to catch sight of them when I go by Eielson AFB-where I did CAP camp during high school -on my way to visit family in Fairbanks. That's where my mother homesteaded in the late '40s while working at Ladd AFB and where she met my father, a WWII pilot stationed there. I appreciate the military and understand that Alaska might seem wide open and under populated, just the kind of place for this increase. But I feel that with all the potential negatives at the same time there are 65,000 square miles in the present JPARC, the military needs to stay within the already generous space it has to use in Alaska.

Thank you,
Felicia Riedel

I0092



January 31, 2011

I0093

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 04, 2012 9:25 PM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Subject: Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex EIS Comment Submission
Attachments: JPARC Public Comments-June 2012.docx

Please see the attachment for public comment of JPARC EIS.

Harry and Jean Holt

I0093

Harry and Jean Holt
[REDACTED]

June 3, 2012

ALCOM Public Affairs
9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120
JPER, Alaska 99506

Dear Sir,

We would like to make written comment on the proposals submitted in the JPARC Modernization and Enhancement Environmental Impact Statement. After review of the executive summary draft study and attending two of the public meetings, let's hope the process with this EIS Study will once again show the military does listen to the public's important concerns of the Lake Louise Area as they did in 1996.

We did notice that the Alternative A to Alternative E Proposal in this draft study is exactly the same "mitigation proposal" that was proposed in 1995. This draft study has not come up with anything new, except to try and throw in an old "mitigation proposal" from 1995. But that ended with the military taking the No Alternative Proposal because of their findings of the impacts to the Lake Louise Area in the Final EIS Study of 1996.

This Alternative E has moved the southern boundary of the proposed expansion 20 miles to the North. The proposed boundary now intersects the North end of Susitna Lake. Clearly, Alternative E does not take into consideration the entire lakes systems. All the proposals within Alternative E still stand from last year preliminary proposals (2011): Lower the flight deck from the existing 5,000 feet to 500 feet AGL, extend night flying hours and increase noise level from 35 to 50dB.

It is clearly defined in the six "significant adverse impacts" to the Fox 3 MOA Expansion Area. These are airspace management and use, noise, safety-flight, land use-land management and use, land use-recreation and socioeconomics. These six "significant adverse impacts" make it no more reasonable today as back in 1995. Thus the Lake Louise Area has met the NEPA implementing regulations criteria to be eliminated from any of the military's proposals.

In talking with the military at the last public hearing, they appear to be receptive to civilian concerns and they mentioned an Over Flight Avoidance Area. Our suggested additional proposed area would be an area, twenty (20) miles north and parallel to the southern border of Alternative E. The flight altitude would be restricted to the existing altitude of 5,000 feet AGL for high speed aircraft. As long as this proposal is added to Alternative E and maintained year round. It appears from the discussion with the military at the hearing, an Over Flight Avoidance Area has no draw backs in the future from my understanding? A clarification to the public would be appropriate before any final decision of the study is made if this option is considered. Otherwise, the other option is: Alternative E but all of the lake systems area should be excluded, further the boundary north and the No Action Alternative should be taken on all proposals within Alternative E.

I0093

It is complicated because of the ramifications of this draft summary. The military saw Lake Louise, as a wonderful recreational area back in the 1950's for their personnel. There has to be a compromise with the stakeholders here, what is necessary for the military and Alaskan's outdoor recreational needs.

Thank you for the opportunity to make comment on this important issue for the Lake Louise Area.

Sincerely,

Harry and Jean Holt

10094

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
10094	karen miller			Airspace Management, 1 – Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA	Comment for Alternative E and my concern around Lake Louise as identified in the area of Fox 3 MOA. I would like to add my voice in agreement with the "Over-Flight Avoidance Area of an additional twenty (20) miles north and parallel to the southern border of Alternative E." The flight altitude in this "additional twenty (20) miles would be restricted to the existing altitude of 5,000 AGL for high speed aircraft. It makes sense that this proposal of an Over-Flight Avoidance Area added to the existing Alternative E boundary and maintained year round, addresses some of the resource concerns about "significant adverse impacts" karen miller Lake susitna cabin owner

10095

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
10095	Danny Billman	Owner/Th e Point Lodge		1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA	I am very much in support of alternate E for the proposed Fox 3 Operation Area (MOA). I appreciate that earlier comments from the Lake Louise area were heard and considered. Many of those earlier comments stated concerns about Lake Louise and I believe most of those commenters consider Sustina and Tyone Lakes to be part of the Lake Louise Area. It seems unfair to not to include these lakes in the proposed alternate E as all 3 lake are part of the Lake Louise community. Please consider a higher floor over these lakes to 5000' or extend the alternate E boundary the few miles to include Sustina and Tyone Lakes.

10096

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
10096	Mary Corcoran			General (to the EIS), Mitigations, Airspace Management, Noise, Safety (Airspace), Safety (Ground), Water Resources, HAZMAT, Biological Resources, Land Use, 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA, 3 - Battle Area Complex Restricted Area Addition, 11 - Missile Live Fire for AIM-9 and AIM-120 in the Gulf of Alaska	<p>General comments: I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the JPARC Draft EIS. I am opposed to increasing JPARC particularly in the Fox MOA expansion, Paxon MOA Addition, ICALF areas to such a large extent both in terms of area and activities. While the subject of the EIS may be convenient for the military, the variety of uses, geographic areas, communities still presents a huge challenge to those who wish to comprehend all proposed changes and comment constructively. I am very concerned for taxpayers about the consequences with this development. The mitigation measures that suggest to "pursue funding" offer no certainty or serious follow-through. To finance this venture, "borrows" from somewhere else. To weigh in fully, we need to have those sources identified. The proposal imposes too many restrictions on traditional uses of public and private lands. I am concerned that levels of activity will increase over these areas in another short time period, with little need for review of the new impacts. Even though Alaska has the appearance of vast expanses of empty land, further expansion of training facilities would displace others. This land and airspace is already used by miners, prospectors, outdoors enthusiasts of many interests, aviators of all capacities, etc. Expansion would restrict public use, current and future and has the appearance of a land grab. The Gulf of Alaska waters are contain a food source that cannot be duplicated and is a relatively unpolluted environment. If training could be done without harm to ecosystems that are necessary to the livelihood of Alaskans or in the ecosystems that we depend on, I would have no objections. Disturbance to sea creatures, pollution from explosives and exploded target drones would result to harm to this area. Unexploded ordnance would be a threat for future users. Making better use of the current training areas and not expanding is really the best real time solution for military training needs. Doing more with existing training areas makes the most sense.</p> <p>Environmental Resource Areas 1. Airspace Operations • Airspace: It appears to me that there are corridors selected and flight levels proposed that will impede private and commercial traffic traditionally using/routed along highways, rivers and access to hunting grounds. Enhanced mitigation regarding publicity should include PSA's on local radio stations and community websites like www.deltanewsb.com</p>

10096

• Noise: Existing training in DTA and BAX has increased markedly over the last few years both in terms of volume, frequency and at all hours of the day. I can hear machine gunfire, bombing and sonic booms from my house. I have large low flying aircraft flying directly over my house. Why not move operations that resemble a warzone to training areas that are not within a couple of miles of residential areas? Supersonic operations continue to be more than an annoyance in populated areas. Mitigation suggests studying effects on animals, but not people who live close to these ranges. Some areas should also restrict MFE's during sheep season (mid August...) Flight levels down to 500 ft. could easily have an adverse effect on a hunt. • Safety (Ground and Air): When training occurs in proximity to residential areas, any accident has the potential to claim more loss. AK citizens are not collateral. 2. Natural Resources • Water: Increased live fire in PWS could pose additional hazards in terms of pollution and safety. Paxson and Fox 3 include at least a half dozen bodies of water that are used regularly by residents and recreators. Mitigation sounds like those citizens will need to schedule their activities on public and private land around training schedules. • Biological: How realistic is it to propose that natural resources (who/what are these? What agency/personnel?) and range managers coordinate training schedules that are not dictated by animals on the move but personnel in an off-site office? Some of the mitigation suggestions name specifically ADFG others do not. Who is responsible for what needs to be firm. 4. Human Resources • Land Use: Paxson and Fox 3 expansion restricts use by residents, recreators and cabin owners. USARAK website is not user friendly for civilians searching for access. For example, maps with range names mean nothing to the civilian who wants to know on a weekend whether an area is open or not. • Recreation and Visual Resources: The extensive target of this proposal has tremendous effect on residents, tourists, hunters, hikers, dog mushers, snowmachiners, in particular #1 Paxson and Fox 3. These areas are used year round by many. 5. Community Infrastructure • Hazardous Materials: The Military does not have an admirable record of keeping track of hazardous substances/ordnance in AK. Introducing more to areas that are so close to the Delta Junction community is disturbing in terms of fire fighting, pollution and future use.

10097

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
10097	Jean Hartman			General (to the EIS), Noise, Biological Resources, Land Use, 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA, 5 - Night Joint Training	<p>I am a resident of the Trapper Creek area and live under the Susitna MOA. I am also a frequent user of the Fox 3 area along the Denali Highway. I am concerned with the Fox 3 expansion and also with the Night Joint Training issue. Night Joint Training: I live under the Susitna MOA and am quite familiar with the noise from overhead practice flights. At times the noise is extremely annoying making it impossible to carry on a conversation or hear the radio. I would definitely not want to hear this noise at night when I am trying to sleep! I understand that this is proposed because of daylight savings time starting and ending so early. It seems a better solution would be to go back to the old dates of daylight savings time. Really, it is annoying to start daylight savings time so early not to mention that daylight savings time in Alaska is totally pointless. Perhaps if congress understood that the current daylight savings time interfered with military training they would be willing to change it. Additionally, I would recommend that the Air Force familiarize itself with the settlement areas under the various MOAs. I live in the Trapper Creek Glen subdivision which is a state land disposal of about 235 lots. Not all lots are developed, but there are a lot of people out here to be annoyed by flying when they are trying to sleep. Fox 3 Expansion: I am a frequent user of the area along the Denali Highway for backpacking, fishing and boating. My husband also uses the area for hunting. I am particularly concerned with the impacts of low altitude training flights in this area. Living under the Susitna MOA, I am familiar with the noise level from planes that are so high that they can't be seen. Frequently the noise makes having a conversation impossible. I can't imagine how loud the noise would be from planes flying at low altitudes. I really don't ever want to have to hear it. The Denali Highway area is an area used for a lot of recreational activities. When people come out to their weekend cabins in my area, they always comment on how quiet it is. I think the quiet is one of the things that people go out into the wilds to enjoy. I think the noise from low altitude flights would totally ruin their experience. This area is one of the few areas easily accessible by road for the average Alaskan or tourist. It is as scenic as Denali Park and offers a lot of diverse recreational activities. I think that the ability of people to enjoy the area should be preserved and that low altitude training would be totally unacceptable in this area.</p>

10097

I am also concerned with the impact of low altitude training flights on the wildlife. I once had a military jet fly low over my barn. It totally scared my animals. A lot of people depend on the caribou herd in the Fox 3 area. It would be a disaster if the herd decided to move to get away from the low flights. It would seem that it could also have serious negative impacts at calving time. The same would be true for other wildlife in the area. I am also concerned with the proposed Paxson MOA addition. The area along the Denali Highway (Tangle Lakes) and along the Richardson Highway also see a lot of recreational use. Again, it is an area easily accessible for a lot of people. I think that it is important to reserve some areas where people can enjoy the wilds without a bunch of annoying, loud aircraft overhead. There is already too much noise from small planes in the area. Perhaps the far eastern edge of this area could be used without disrupting too many people's experience. Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Jean Hartman

10097

10098

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
10098	peter stern			General (to the EIS), Purpose/Need, Cumulative Impacts, Airspace Management, Noise, Safety (Airspace), Safety (Ground), Land Use, Infrastructure and Transportation, Socioeconomics, Air Quality, 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA, 2 - Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery, 5 - Night Joint Training, 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Access	<p>The military in Alaska seems to be on course to try to tie up large areas of air space and land for training purposes. In the case of the proposals to increase FOX 3 MOA and create the Paxson MOA, these areas are accessible to civilians by road as well as general aviation aircraft. They contain some of the most beautiful road accessible wilderness in interior Alaska. There are also areas that support a large number of hunters. Creating large longitudinal training corridors with access from multiple directions may be important, but should not be allowed in this area of the state. The Air Force is trying to move its' last fighter squadron out of Fairbanks so proximity to Fairbanks should not be considered a valid justification. Page 259 Vol 1 paragraphs 3 and 4 describe the quiet and naturalness people seek in going into this country. Page 265 Vol 1 paragraphs 5 & 6 cover the impact of low level high speed operations on people in the area. The EIS proposes to lower the FOX 3 MOA air space to 500 ft AGL and use the same restriction in the Paxson MOA. This is far too low and would seriously impact civilians trying to enjoy this wilderness. The Air Force is trying to transfer the last F-16 squadrons out of Eielson and move them to Elmendorf. This plan undermines the argument that proximity to Fairbanks is important. Dropping thousands of pounds of chaff in the area is written off as having little impact. There is no mention of the biodegradable status of the chaff. Long hours of operation and 240 days a year of exercises mean the area will be heavily used for both low and high level training. The EIS acknowledges more civilian and commercial aircraft will be using GPS navigation at lower altitudes and this impact is unknown on the NEXTGEN system coverage. low level transiting of the passes through the Alaska Range by civilian and commercial aircraft should not have to mix with high speed military aircraft doing low level training. The Air Force should find other places to do low level training of F-22 and F-35 aircraft. I support the 2.1.1.2 No Action Alternative. The Live Ordnance Delivery expansion should be rejected. Live ordnance training areas are problematic locations for wildland fires started either by ordnance or lightning strikes. The EIS says very little about suppression plans for live fire impact areas beyond the military's coordination with BLM and AFS. Wildland fire smoke in Fairbanks and the interior can be substantial, both esthetically and from the health stand points.</p>

10098

There is no discussion in the EIS about this potential problem. I support 2.2.1.2 No action alternative. Expansion of Night Ordinance Use beyond 10pm is not in the best interest of residents of interior Alaska. Residents should not have to listen to explosions or other aircraft operations after 10pm. While it may be difficult to meet the night exercise requirements, they can be met or the goals can be rewritten. I support 2.1.5.2 No Action Alternative. Airspace Corridors for UAV Access appears to be an attempt by the military to jump the gun on reserving airspace when the FAA hasn't yet released a plan for integrating UAV operations with general aviation and commercial aircraft. The proposals are significant in they want to reserve airspace from 1200' AGL to FL 180. This proposal is premature. I support 2.1.6.1.3, 2.1.6.2.3, 2.1.6.3.3, 2.1.6.4.3, 2.1.6.5.3, 2.1.6.6.3, 2.1.7.3 No Action. The EIS and appendices are a hugely long and complex documents. The issues discussed are important. Alaska should oppose the military trying to tie up large areas of the state both for ground and air training. The answer isn't always "more is better". Once these areas become tied up as MOAs it will be very hard to get the military to release them back to general public use. Live fire impact areas will remain off limits probably for a very long time. Unless expansion is opposed, Alaska stands to lose large areas of the state that offer residents and tourists truly unique wilderness experiences both from the ground level and from aerial access.

10098

10099

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0099	Dwayne Bertholl	Mr.		Purpose/Need, Airspace Management, Noise, Safety (Airspace), Physical Resources, Cultural Resources, Subsistence, 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxson MOA	<p>Thank you for the chance to comment on the proposed new Paxson MOA and expanded Fox 3 MOA. The proposed new Paxson MOA will take in hunting and fishing areas which have been used for generations by my family and my wife's family. This area was not used for military training in the past. So the new - low and loud - sounds in the MOA will disturb the wildlife in the area and start unusual behavior in the animals. This is an important calving area for moose, caribou and Dall Sheep. The expanded Fox 3 MOA is over the Nelchina Caribou breeding grounds. That herd has sustained Alaska families for generations - in addition to my family. The Nelchina Caribou herd also provides an excellent sport hunting opportunity for out-of-state military personnel in both MOA areas (which I believe should continue). I don't believe the US Air Force needs more airspace in the Fox 3 MOA. The flat terrain in the expansion area gives no new training options which do not already exist in other existing MOAs. Having spent time in the 82nd Airborne, I know - and understand - the US military has enough training areas without locking up more airspace or land for training in Alaska. The US Air Force has locked up the Naknek 1 & 2, Stony A & B, Susitna areas for MOAs. All of those MOAs are closer than the proposed Paxson MOA. So your reasoning of needing closer aircraft training areas to Elmendorf is not justifiable. And you're moving all fighter aircraft out of Fairbanks, remember? While the US Air Force provides notifications and warnings about flying in MOAs, US Air Force pilots do not feel constrained by designated and published boundaries, routes, altitudes, or times. This observation and statement is from my flying and outdoor recreation experience within the Susitna, Copper, and Tanana basins. I love and believe in our military, but the military is our spoiled child - gimme, gimme, gimme. As parents (or taxpayers and owners of public lands) we have to say no to baseless "gimme's". I say that knowing whatever Alaska residents say, nothing will change what the military is planning to do. Thank for the opportunity to comment anyway. I will read further and try to find a designated corridor within the new Paxson MOA which would allow Alaska pilots unrestricted transit between Glennallen and Delta within the new Paxson MOA. Dwayne Bertholl</p>

I0100

**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): DAVID JOHNSON Title: CITIZEN Date: 28 May 2012

Organization: Home SAPIENS

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

[Redacted Signature Block]

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.)

I0100

THE "REALITY" OF YOUR MILITARY WORLD IS SO COMPLETELY OUT OF SYNC WITH THE NATURAL WORLD THAT — IF I COULD BE KING FOR A DAY — I WOULD SHUT DOWN YOUR WHOLE SHOOTING MATCH — FOREVER. HUMAN KIND HAS BEEN TRYING TO NEGOTIATE CONFLICTS

Comment(s): WITH YOUR METHODS FOR THOUSANDS OF YEARS. IT AIN'T WORKING. THIS ENDLESS ESCALATION OF HUMAN AGGRESSION — ALWAYS BIGGER, BIGGER, STRONGER, FASTER — IS TOTALLY NUTSO. UNDESIRABLE — UNSUSTAINABLE. YOU WILL SUCCEED IN EXTINGUISHING MONOSAPIENS. WE'VE GOT TO FIND A BETTER WAY. LIKE COMPULSORY SERVICE IN THE PEACE CORPS.

BUT FOR NOW, SINCE I'M UNWILLING TO BE KING FOR A DAY.

I SAY NO — TO EXPANDING FOX 3
NO — TO THE PERSON ADDITION.
NO — TO FLYING BELOW 5000'.

I SAY YES — TO REQUIRING YOU TO FUND INDEPENDENT STUDIES OF IMPACTS OF YOUR OPERATIONS ON WILDLIFE — ESPECIALLY IN LIVE ORDNANCE AREAS.

I SAY YES — TO PROHIBITING PUBLIC ACCESS ON MILITARY LANDS / ROADS USING MOTOR VEHICLES

I MUST COMPLEMENT THE THOROUGHNESS OF YOUR PRESENTATION IN THURSDAY. BUT THE VAST VOLUME OF INFORMATION WAS PRESENTED WITH SUCH UNRESENTING INTENSITY AS TO FEEL LIKE AN ASSAULT —. LIKE A STEAMROLLER COMING THROUGH. IT WAS OVERWHELMING. THE NUMBER OF CAMOUFLAGED MILITARY MEN IN THE SAME SPACE WERE INTIMIDATING AS WELL. ONE ON ONE. GOOD GUYS — BUT AS A GROUP. OUT OF TOUCH WITH THEIR EFFECT ON PEOPLE & LIFE OUTSIDE THE MILITARY.

IF WE CITIZENS HERE IN THE LAND OF THE FREE FEEL INTIMIDATED IN OUR OWN TOWN, BY GUYS ON OUR SIDE, I CAN ONLY IMAGINE HOW RURAL FARMERS IN AFGHANISTAN FEEL WHEN DRONES RING IN & TAKE OUT THEIR FAMILIES. NO WONDER AL QUAIDA THRIVES.

THANKS FOR LISTENING!

DAVE JOHNSON AGE 70.

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.

I0101

From: Linda [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2012 3:19 PM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Subject: Fw: Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex EIS Comment Submission

Greetings,

I attended the last meeting held at the Menard Complex in Wasilla. I have some comments regarding the project as it pertains to the vicinity of Lake Louise (including Susitna and Tyone). Everyone is aware of the growing uses in the close vicinity of the lakes in this area and also the much increased use of the surrounding lands for miles in all directions.

These are my comments with alternative:

- 1) I saw the military proposed alternative that moved the southern boundary of the Fox 3 (MOA) expansion. In addition to that boundary move, I believe this boundary line should again be moved more northerly to totally avoid the entire lakes system. Whether you draw a line across the area from east to west or create a square or block area to remove the area all around all the lakes in the southeast part of the training area makes no difference. Let us not also forget about the lakes to the east of Lake Louise, i.e., Crosswind, Ewan, Fish and other small lakes in the immediate vicinity. It would be easy to remove the southeast block of this training area –again, my point is to have the military operations avoid the entire lakes system.
- 2) The meeting brought forward comments regarding an Over Flight Avoidance Area. If, for some reason, the project area is not totally removed to avoid the entire lakes system, then this Over Flight Avoidance Area should be put in place due to impacts regarding noise, land use and flight safety. For this, training flights above ground level should be a minimum of 4000 feet.
- 3) The next comment is for the military's proposed flight level of 500 AGL over the lakes area. This is not acceptable. At no time should the AGL be lowered to 500 feet over the entire lakes system. The noise created by the training at this low level is a huge disturbance itself to both the human population and game. This does not even include the projects proposed increase of a higher noise level from 35 to 50dB. This higher noise request is not acceptable for the entire lakes system.

I do have another comment. I believe there should be minimum 3000 AGL along all the road corridors in all the training areas. This corridor should be a minimum of one (1) mile wide – with special attention given to the Denali Highway and Richardson Highway.

Thank you for opportunity to comment,
Linda Page
[REDACTED]

I0102

[REDACTED]

From: Deborah Brocke and Jeff Robinson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2012 12:10 PM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Subject: JPARC Modernization and Enhancement public comment

To: ALCOM Public Affairs
Re: JPARC Modernization and Enhancement Environmental Impact Statement

From: Deborah Brocke June 7th, 2012

Comment submitted on behalf of private citizen

e-mail address: [REDACTED]

mailing address: [REDACTED]

Comment with regard to noise and biological resources in Fox 3 MOA

Public Comment:

As someone who recreates in the Talkeetna mountains and Denali Highway area for quiet wilderness experiences, I am opposed to a 500 foot AGL of aircraft flight in the FOX 3 MOA. To increase the minimum flight level from 5,000 feet AGL to 500 feet AGL over this huge area is unreasonable. There are many other people who use the area for many purposes which are in conflict with such low-flying, high-speed aircraft. I have experienced an overflight like this in a remote valley, and it is the antithesis of a wilderness experience. Changing the minimum AGL flight level to 3,000 feet could be acceptable.

The Draft EIS for the JPARC Modernization and Enhancement does not consider the effects of low-flying (500 feet AGL) aircraft on wildlife. As a human being, I could quickly determine that the terror of a low-level flight over a ridge just ahead of me was not actually dangerous, just terrifying and heart-stopping when it's completely unexpected. How do calving moose and caribou react? What are the effects of these flights on all kinds of wildlife? The fact that the draft EIS does not consider the impacts on wildlife in these many thousands of square miles of habitat is unacceptable.

Thank you for your consideration.

I0103

From: Doug Millard [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2012 7:58 PM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex EIS

Gentlemen,

As I understand it, the plan is to close Eielson Air force base any move all aircraft to Elmendorf.

While cost reduction is an admirable effort, Is this a wise move from a strategic standpoint?

Consider all military A/C based at one location when an Earthquake hits and renders the runways inoperable and unable to launch.

I remember the damage suffered by Anchorage from an earthquake. Do we really want to trust to fate and put all our "Eggs" in one basket ?

Just a thought,
Doug Millard
Capt. (Ret)
Wien Alaska Airlines

I0104

From: Keith and Sarah Kehoe [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 08, 2012 1:25 AM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Subject: Minimum altitude proposed is too low

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you with my comments regarding the JPARC-EIS. I live in the area that you propose expanding for air space training called Fox 3 MOA and work in the same area as a health care provider.

I have huge concerns about the the overflight altitude being changed from minimum 5,000 feet above ground level (AGL) to minimum 500 feet AGL. The impact of noise on wildlife and human populations is very concerning. Not only will the noise affect where my family, friends and community members live, but also the huge number of tourists who come to our area to enjoy the peace and tranquility of rural remote areas of Alaska. My family and I hike and camp regularly in Denali State Park. Fox 3 MOA threatens these "public" lands and would make it impossible for the myself, my family and the public to enjoy time there.

The EIS does not sufficiently address the impact that the noise level would have on resident wildlife, the animals, birds, and fish. They will be impacted. There are suggestions in EIS to avoid lambing and calving areas and to study bald and golden eagle nesting areas, but these barely touch the vast number of other wildlife populations. If noise over a certain decibel level is a known stressor for humans, even with our ability to intellectually understand it, it follows that the same noise level will create significant stress for wildlife.

I am in favor of the NO ACTION alternative for Fox 3, which would leave the areas at status quo. I could agree to an expansion of the area if flying was set at NO LOWER THAN 3,000 ft but it is my understanding that all other alternatives were withdrawn that left the minimum altitude at a higher level.

Five hundred feet is too low.

Thank you for accepting my comments and for your consideration,

Sarah Kehoe
Physician Assistant
Sunshine Community Health Center
[REDACTED]

10105

**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): Cody Barnett Date: 5/20/12

Title: President

Organization: Alaska Extreme Four Wheelers

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: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Mailing Address: [REDACTED]

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

I0105

Comment(s):

I would like to keep access to the established trails open for public use. These established trails are historic and recreational trails that are used for recreational camping and hunting. Examples of these trails are the Bonafield trail and the Donnelly-Walsh trail.

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.

I0106

From: Kate McKelvey [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2012 7:47 PM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Subject: Comments on JPARC- EIS

Thank you for considering my comments regarding the JPARC- EIS.

1. I agree that the Air Force could be allowed to expand the range of area they can carry out training
2. The Air Force should NOT be allowed to lower the altitude AGL for their operations.
3. Fox 3 needs noise mitigation proposals. I believe the minimum altitude of 5000 feet AGL should be maintained for Fox 1, 2, and 3 in order to address biological, recreation, land use and subsistence problems caused by noise disturbance.
4. Only 2 weeks a year for human recreational users? Why are hunters more important than the many humans who seek quiet recreation on our public lands?
5. Funding is needed to pay for wildlife studies to provide baseline data of current wildlife populations and behaviors.

Sincerely,
Kate McKelvey
[REDACTED]

I0107

[REDACTED]

From: usacitizen1 usacitizen1 [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 10, 2012 8:05 AM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Subject: your failure to give an e mail address makes publci comment just about impossible - dont force us into snail mail which is stupid in this era
Attachments: ATT00001; ATT00001

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Date: Sun, 10 Jun 2012 04:58:54 -0800
Subject: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)

This is an automatically generated Delivery Status Notification.

Delivery to the following recipients failed.

alcomj08@elmendorf.af.mil

--Forwarded Message Attachment--

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: attentino tania bruhan and henry williams - why dont they give email addresses in their federal register notices - dont they recognize public needs to use internet and prez says cabinet to use internet not anail mil
Date: Sun, 10 Jun 2012 08:57:24 -0400

Ppadding:0px

--Forwarded Message Attachment--

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: public comment on federal register FW: it is substantive to say i dont want to enlarge range - is military disrespecting the public
Date: Sat, 9 Jun 2012 15:56:36 -0400

Ppadding:0px

there is no reason at all to "modernize" this range. i believe this is an attempt to kill even more trees and wildlife. it would be better if you stayed on your own old turf, not look into new ones to destroy. there is too much impact from this. these training exercises should be done over afghanistan. stop destroying america. this comment is for the public record. jean public

[Federal Register Volume 77, Number 108 (Tuesday, June 5, 2012)]

I0107

[Notices]

[Page 33202]

From the Federal Register Online via the Government Printing Office [www.gpo.gov]

[FR Doc No: 2012-13570]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

Notice To Extend Public Comment Period for United States Air
Force Modernizations and Enhancement of Ranges, Airspace, and Training
Areas in the Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex in Alaska Environmental
Impact Statement

AGENCY: The United States Air Force, DoD.

ACTION: Notification of extension of public comment period.

SUMMARY: Alaskan Command (ALCOM), on behalf of the U.S. Air Force and
U.S. Army is issuing this notice to advise the public of an extension
to the public comment period. The initial Notice of Availability
published in the Federal Register on March 30, 2012 (Vol. 77, No. 62/
Notices/19282), requested public comments no later than June 7, 2012.
ALCOM has extended the deadline for submitting public comments to July
9, 2012. All substantive comments on the Draft EIS received during the
public comment period will be considered in the preparation of the
Final EIS.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Please direct any written comments or
requests for information to Capt Tania Bryan, ALCOM Public Affairs,
9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506, ph: 907-552-0876.

Henry Williams Jr.,
Acting Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.
[FR Doc. 2012-13570 Filed 6-4-12; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 5001-10-P

I0108

**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): Thomas Gatzke Date: 31 May 20

Title: _____

Organization: Alaska Extreme 4x4

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

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

I0108

Comment(s):

I believe the land should be left open to off road vehicles,
and the trails keep open to off road vehicles

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.

I0109

**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): Sheryl Salasky 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

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

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

I0109

No action alternative

Comment(s):

I live in this area
and do not want defense
maneuvers in the air at low
elevations where all life will
be impacted. Remain at the
current levels

I support a "NO ACTION"
alternative

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.

I0110

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0110	Marge Nord			General (to the EIS), 1 – Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA	<p>Comment on Proposed Action – Expansion of Fox 3 MOA I have been a resident of Cantwell for 30+ years. As the pilot of a small aircraft I am greatly concerned about the proposed lowering of the Fox3 MOA to 500 feet and the increased traffic in the area from the diversion of Stony sortie missions to the Fox 3 MOA. A prime recreation area would be negatively impacted! The Fox 3 MOA encompasses prime recreational and wilderness area. There are only a few road systems in Alaska where private individuals have access to wilderness areas. The Fox 3 MOA overlies an area accessed by the Denali Highway as well as the Parks and Richardson Highways. The area is utilized by recreationalists, the tourist industry and hunters and fishermen. Recreation: Hikers – the general public and the NOLS (National Outdoor Leadership School). The NOLS organization has six or more groups of 10-15 students hiking through various parts of the area through the early summer to the late fall season. Their emphasis is teaching leadership through participating in a wilderness experience. Tourism – Bus tours over the Denali Highway during the summer season. Fishing – Fishing along the Denali Highway and the lakes in the area which are accessed by road, ATV or airplane. Hunting – Because of its access, the area is heavily hunted. Wildlife: Caribou, moose, bears, fox, lynx – startled by more sonic booms – the sound reverberates off the mountains when you're in a low valley -- I know it startles me every time. Birds -- many nesting swans on the numerous pothole lakes -- are disturbed by low-flying aircraft and also represent a collision hazard as do the eagles (I generally encounter an eagle on every flight). Environmental impact: Increase of emissions -- (246,313 tons CO2/yr plus the increased tonnage of chaff) -- that's significant!! GENERAL AVIATION WOULD BE GREATLY RESTRICTED IF THE 500-FOOT FLOOR WERE ESTABLISHED! a. It is often too turbulent to fly below 500 feet in a small aircraft. b. There is no guarantee that military aircraft will remain above the 500-foot floor. (1) They have no warning system to alert them from straying beyond vertical parameter. (2) In simulated battle exercises it will be difficult to maintain situational awareness. The reaction time in these high-speed maneuvers would delay recovery. (3) The altitude restrictions of the existing boundaries are violated (based on personal observations and experiences of other local pilots) so there is considerable doubt that the 500-foot floor would be observed.</p>

I0110

c. There is more general aviation activity in the Fox 3 MOA area than is indicated by Flight Service statistics. Local pilots generally file flight plans with friends or company personnel. No alternative listed when the initial proposal was released there was an option not to include the 500-foot floor. Although many general aviation pilots objected to the lower floor, this option was deleted. Now the only option is to "check and see if the airspace is active" and avoid it. That is like saying, "I'm in your backyard so don't come out of the house". There are only a limited number of days in the summer and fall to fly. That is what keeps us going through the winter so if the weather's good I'm going flying and I hope I don't run into a fast-flying aircraft that I don't have time to avoid. I do support the military but surely there are some more remote areas where there would be less impact.

Margie Nord
Cantwell, AK

I0110

I0111

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0111	matthew wojnowski			Airspace Management	please do not allow low fly area over tyone,susitna or lake louise,alaska area as having ben brought up in northern new york state 30 miles north of now abanded griffis afb i have personally witnessed the sound of low flying aircraft and no respect of people or animals living in the area. i am 63 & remember this very well also have a cabin in this area of lake louise.alaska

I0112

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0112	Matthew Cooper			General (to the EIS), Purpose/Need, Cumulative Impacts, Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), Socioeconomics, 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Access	I support military training in Alaska. However, the proposed UAV corridors (and the proposed corridors to R-2211 in particular) create and undue burden on general and commercial aviation and create a negative impact on the human environment. When active, these corridors combined with the existing restricted airspace will negatively affect all civilian air traffic southeast bound from Fairbanks. General aviation traffic will either have to take circuitous detour around the restricted airspace, leading to increased time and costs for GA pilots, or fly below 1200 feet AGL. Funneling southeast bound general aviation traffic below 1200 feet AGL will create significant safety hazards. In addition, the proposed corridors along with the proposed MOA expansions will negatively affect commercial IFR traffic. I respectfully request that greater consideration be given to the impacts of the his proposed expansion on civilian aviation in Alaska.

I0113

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0113	Don Garrett		none	Purpose/Need, All resource areas, All proposed actions	The Federal government doesn't need 75% of Alaska for their use. It is a state, and belongs to the residents of Alaska and should be controlled by them. Not the military. Not BLM, and not the Park Service. Don Garrett

I0114

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0114	Travis Anderson			General (to the EIS), Cumulative Impacts	I will suggest not putting GA aircraft in such a tight corner around the delta area. Corridors for free movement must be allowed in order for incursions into restricted airspace and MOAs to be minimal. Please keep GA in mind when these changes are implemented.

I0115

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0115	Mark Bartlett	Mr.	N/A	General (to the EIS)	My comments still stand from my last entry. Thank you, Mark A. Bartlett Wasilla

I0116

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0116	norman pickus	american	AAHF	Purpose/Need, Airspace Management, Noise, Safety (Airspace), Land Use, 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, 9 - Joint Air-Ground Integration Complex (JAGIC), 10 - Intermediate Staging Bases (ISBs)	I am an old us army aviator, 7 years active duty, 3 of those years at Ft. ww and have witnessed many unnecessary uses in the proposed areas, I have tried to discuss this with all levels of command and ignored time and time again so why would I think you have any real concerns now, this is just another BS smokescreen to look good to some. We'll see if anyone will discuss any of this with me. I doubt anyone will. Regards, Rusty Pickus.

I0117

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0117	Janelle Eklund			General (to the EIS), 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA	<p>The EIS states that the MOA must have a floor of 500 feet AGL and at the same time says the airspace should minimize the interruption of commercial and general aviation traffic. This does not make sense. I am deeply opposed to the MOA having a floor of 500 feet AGL. It is virtually impossible to have a ceiling of 500 feet and still be safe for low flying general aviation traffic. Especially in this area where there is high small fixed wing traffic use for hunting and recreation. There are bound to be people killed even if there are scheduled use times. The military doesn't even adhere to the 5,000 foot ceiling now, as I have experienced low flying aircraft while recreating in the Tangle Lakes area. It ruins my day. This kind of flight is not only dangerous to humans but also the wildlife - migrating swans, ducks, other birds, caribou, moose, small animals. It will displace and confuse them plus change migrating patterns that are detrimental to their survival. To me the area between Paxon and Cantwell is sacred and should be treated as such. It has a majestic beauty, peace, quiet and solitude that is hard to find in our human impacted world. I go there to hunt, berry pick, canoe and enjoy the quiet, solitude, and beauty. Please do not destroy it by impacting it with low flying aircraft. In one of the meetings the information was that the 500' level has never been implemented in a real war situation but that they want to practice it now because maybe in the future they might use it. I don't think this is justification to practice a 500' ceiling and jeopardize the lives of other people and wildlife.</p>

I0118

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0118	Maurice Byers			All proposed actions	The military has enough training areas world-wide. Our family is firmly against any further JPARC Modernization and Enhancement.

I0119

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0119	Brian Okonek			Mitigations, Noise, Safety (Airspace), 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA	<p>Dear JPARC, EIS team, Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex (JPARC) Modernization and Enhancement Environmental Impact Statement. The area that I am most familiar with is the Fox 3 MOA (Military Operating Area) which extends from the southern side of the Alaska Range between the Parks and Richardson Highways south across the Denali Highway to the northern part of the Talkeetna Mountains. I have backpacked in remote parts of the Talkeetna Mountains for many years. Currently the military practices aircraft maneuvers between 5,000 feet above ground level (AGL) to 18,000' above mean sea level in this area. The only alternative that I find acceptable is the No Action alternative. I am totally against Alternative A for the Fox 3 and Paxon MOA's. The area is too large and the minimum altitude of 500 feet is much too low. Alternative E makes the Fox 3 MOA smaller, but it is still too big and the minimum flight altitude is also 500 feet. I am not in favor of Alternative E. The only way Alternative E could be acceptable is if the minimum altitude is raised to 5,000 feet. The noise created by aircraft flying as low as 500 AGL over this huge area will adversely affect many backcountry users. There are mountaineers climbing in the eastern Alaska Range, many types of recreation takes place along the Richardson and Denali Highways, there are many cabin owners in the Lake Louise area, backpackers hike in the Talkeetna Mountains and hunters and fishers are throughout the entire area. It is becoming increasingly more difficult to find quiet places to recreate. Hearing fighters practicing overhead diminishes wilderness values considerably. I am concerned that low level military aircraft practicing in the region will adversely affect the wildlife. There are Dall sheep lambing in both the Alaska Range and Talkeetna Mountains and caribou calving in the northern Talkeetna Mountains (often in the region of the Oshetna River valley) in the spring, birds nesting including Trumpeter swans and other animals including moose in the region. There are numerous general aviation and air taxi flights throughout the proposed expansion of Fox 3 and Paxon MOA's. Suddenly meeting high speed, low level military planes is both disconcerting and dangerous for these pilots and their passengers. I believe that low level military training flights will be very unsafe. I am totally against Alternative A and E of expanding the Fox 3 MOA and lowering the flight level from 5,000 feet AGL to 500 feet AGL. This size of MOA with such low flight levels would be very disruptive to the activities the public already enjoys in the area and could have detrimental effects to the regions wildlife. I believe the military can come up with creative ways to train in the existing Fox 3 MOA at the existing 5,000 feet AGL to 18,000 feet above mean sea level. It is not acceptable for the military to state that the "No Action" alternative is not satisfactory. Sincerely,</p> <p>Brian Okonek</p>

I0120

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0120	Scott Rufa			General (to the EIS), Purpose/Need, Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA), Cumulative Impacts, All resource areas, Water Resources, HAZMAT, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Land Use, Subsistence, Environmental Justice, All proposed actions	How does this effect the availability of access to local resident hunters and fisherman? What are the environmental impacts expected from the detonation of munitions and training?

I0121

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0121	Susan Wallin			Airspace Management, Noise, Safety (Airspace), HAZMAT, Biological Resources, Air Quality, 2 - Realistic Live Ordinance Delivery, 4 - Expansion of R- 2205 Restricted Area , 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Access, 11 - Missile Live Fire for AIM-9 and AIM- 120 in the Gulf of Alaska	I live in the Susitna strategic air corridor. My main concern is safety for myself and my land. The planes fly so low they rattle the dishes in my cupboards! Jet do refueling maneuvers RIGHT over our hay fields! There are many acres of undeveloped , uninhabited land in this Susitna Strategic air corridor, WHY use our 90 ac of cleared fields??? A pilot friend took me up to show me why, it is a great landmark , easy to find and meet each other but.....come on there are many other spots just as easy to find without family or fortune at risk. I do not know specifics on all these proposed actions...How could I find out details of realistic Live ordinance,UAV access,missile live fire in Gulf of Alaska NO WAY!!! People live and work there. Many food animals live there. Go doink around in some other GULF!

I0122

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0122	Charles McMahan	Chairman	Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Committee	Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxson MOA	I am opposing lowering of the floor of the expanded Fox 3 MOA and new Paxson MOA to 500 feet from 5000 feet. I am also opposing the expansion of these areas, especially if the floor is lowered. I have flown many thousands of hours at lower levels and lower speeds in small planes for the past 40 years in this area for business and recreation and continue to do so. There are many others that fly more and some less than I do. I am certain that safety would be severely compromised if high speed fighter jets were turned loose to train in the same airspace that we routinely fly with small, slow and hard to see planes for game counts and captures, predator control, and recreational hunting and fishing. The chances of a mid-air collision would be unacceptable. Our previous comments have gone unheeded and the probable danger has been disregarded in the EIS. We should not have to comment again now for the same things we said in our previous comments the first go around, and I feel many that commented the first time may not again this time and their previous comments will not be counted. Chuck McMahan

I0123

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0123	Earl Valley	Air Traffic Manager	F.A.A.	Purpose/Need, Airspace Management, All proposed actions	My personal option is this is a land grab. The airspace in use already is larger than the state of Florida. Larger than New England. If the needs cannot be met within this HUGE airspace, something is wrong with airspace management. There is no battle area larger than the airspace currently in use. The proposed plans would have a major impact on general aviation within the interior. Also, the USAF command has shown that their word is no good. Red Flag was promised not to conflict with hunting season. Beginning in 2010 it conflicts, when asked why or if the dates could be changed, the answer was because of other restrictions and no the dates could not be changed. If no concerned is shown for this issue, how can you be believed on other issues?

I0124

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0124	Nick Cassara			General (to the EIS), Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), Safety (Ground), Physical Resources, Biological Resources, Land Use, Infrastructure and Transportation, 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA	"Freedom is not Free" however if the costs of Freedom disenfranchises the rights of the Free...then Freedom is lost. The proposed low level F-16/22 interception flights will have adverse effects on the resident sheep and caribou populations in the Talkeetna Mountains, as well as avian populations. The research has already been done by Alaska Department of Fish and Game, ADF&G, in pass MOA studies. My freedom to fly these mountains in search of game is what Freedom means to me!!!! ADF&G data shows that this area is contains some of the most heavily use areas by Alaskan Hunters, so many others go to these mountains to experience their Freedom also. Please Do Not Destroy My Freedom!

I0125

[REDACTED]

From: Bill and Kim Burgess [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, June 23, 2012 3:32 AM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Subject: JPARC expansion

Greetings,

I am a recreational private pilot operating out of Lake Hood Strip (Z41) and Lake Hood when on skis. I recently attended the Palmer Pancake Breakfast/FAAST meeting where the C17 guys were on the agenda to talk about midair avoidance. I was disappointed to see that the scheduled speaker was unable apparently assigned elsewhere and a substitute was called on short notice with little time for preparation. I was also disappointed to hear that the attitude of the DOD pilots is that it is not inappropriate to mix up C17s and C130s with general aviation (GA) traffic at low levels as long as we are listening to your position reports on the proper frequency. I doubt that you fear the wake turbulence of my C170B and it is unlikely that I will startle you by getting too close for comfort. You probably have me spotted or targeted on radar and a variety of other instruments before I know you are in the area. You are also travelling 2 to 3 times as fast. I would guess you could fly through me and leave a faint red mist and a shower of aluminum with scarcely a bump. My day will not end so well. Perhaps this sounds a bit melodramatic, but it illustrates a point that I believe is accurate. I do not believe DOD is an advocate for GA in Alaska. I do believe that DOD operations increase the risk of GA accidents in the vicinity of Anchorage and the Mat Su Borough. I oppose the JPARC expansion and do not want to see fast and heavy aircraft operating at low levels outside the current MOAs.

Sincerely,
Bill Burgess

[REDACTED]

I0127

[REDACTED]

From: Janet Ownby [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2012 2:37 PM
To: SMART, JOAN M GS-11 USAF ALCOM JTF AK/J08
Subject: Re: Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex Draft EIS Comment Period Extended to July 9, 2012
Attachments: WP_000359.jpg

The photo I am sending is one of the few that I have. This plane had just barely cleared the house. I am standing in front of my two story house, on my lawn. This perspective looks like he is high, but in fact had been very low. Sadly the camera perspective pushes the image away. This plane is one of the six that came through

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

From: Janet Ownby [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, June 25, 2012 6:33 AM
To: SMART, JOAN M GS-11 USAF ALCOM JTF AK/J08
Subject: Re: Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex Draft EIS Comment Period Extended to July 9, 2012

To: Joan Smart
ALCOM Public Affairs

I0127

I am responding to your e mail because I am very disturbed about the consequences of JPARC restricting this areas' air space.

The last two weeks we experienced your. "Red Flag" exercise in this area. It was unbelievable the amount of sonic booms we incurred. One was executed under 5000 feet. Calling the Air Force number in Fairbanks has had no response to complain or express our concerns.

I had called FAA to express my concern with the C170's. They were flying to close to my house, and on the last day of your exercise, it had barely missed my house. I did get pictures and I was very shook up. My neighbors are higher in elevation than I am. They (airplanes) had to take evasive actions to miss their houses, but were out of room by the time he got to my house. Had his landing gear been down, I would not be writing this e mail. He was flying carelessly and in a reckless manner. I am in a residential neighborhood, and the pilots can see that.

If this is what we are in store for when you restrict the air space for training, you will have a detrimental effect and impact on this area. This will have been the second time my house has been a near miss. I fear for a third.

During training, these pilots do not take care of who they will be disturbing, or if sonic booms are way too loud and in need of having ear protection on, if on land.

If my house was almost hit, how close will you be to the pipeline and the pilot cannot divert an obstacle? They are putting themselves, as well as innocent civilians in danger with these training missions. I repeat,,it is reckless endangerment with the tactics they use.

I am forwarding this as well as the pictures to Senator Murkowski, and anyone else who will listen. I do not want to see any of your pilots crash,,and I do not want to be in their line of sight if such a tragedy should occur.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sincerely,

I0127



I0128

[REDACTED]

From: Gary Wilken [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 25, 2012 8:10 PM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Cc: SMART, JOAN M GS-11 USAF ALCOM JTF AK/J08
Subject: JPARC EIS support
Attachments: JPARC support letter June 2012.doc

To Whom it May Concern,

Please accept the attached letter as part of the public comment in regard to the Draft EIS for the JPARC deliberations.

Thank you,

Gary Wilken
Fairbanks Alaska

I0128

Gary R. Wilken
State Senator (Retired)



June 25, 2012

ALCOM Public Affairs
9480 Pease Avenue
Suite 120
Elmendorf AFB, AK
99506

Re: Public Comment
Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex (JPARC) Support

To Whom it May Concern,

Please register this letter to be an indication of strong support for the draft *JPARC Modernization and Enhancement Environmental Impact Statement*.

I am privileged to encourage the Department of Defense to utilize Alaska's assets needed to train America's fighting forces. Alaska offers the geography, the space, the global location, and the isolation to effectively and efficiently train for combat in near real-world situations.

As a participant in the MOA expansion in the mid-nineties, I am aware of the many concerns and promises made during this expansion process. While occasional conflicts have occurred, one can only proclaim the past effort a resounding success. I am confident our military and civilian leaders will make every effort, in this necessary new expansion, to maintain mission joint readiness while keeping safety as the utmost consideration and local impact to the absolute minimum.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input and please advise if I may assist further.

Sincerely,

/s/ Gary Wilken

Gary Wilken
CAB

I0129

[REDACTED]

From: Marcus Wisdorf [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2012 1:08 AM
To: ALCOM J08 Admin Box
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: expansion of airspace/ training area

To the person who will ultimately make the final decision on this.

Regarding the JPARC. I am totally against any expansion. You do not need it. first of all the reality of fighting in the environment you train in is NIL.

the enemy would die just trying to access area's like that, be consumed by mosquito's and black flies, maybe fall in a crevasse.

the second reason is that as you remove airspace , you remove freedom to travel around our state and the continental 48 states...

would you as a military enlisted person, who is supposedly trying to protect OUR freedom, and receives his/her pay from the hardworking people of the US. Would you want to be responsible of taking away more freedom from the Men and Women of this country than you are giving. Think about what you are doing very hard before you make these decisions. No more whittling away at our freedom.

Marc Wisdorf Airline Transport/Commercial pilot
[REDACTED]

I0130

12 June 2012

Dear Sir

I do not support any use of State of Alaska land or air space. The U.S. Federal government has control of 60% of land in Alaska. No more land or space put under your control.

I can not hunt fish trap or most Federal lands now. I will not give you more.

My solution to you is for the Federal government to give back control of Fish and Game to the State of Alaska. Then give us all the land we were entitled to in the State Hood Act.

Use your own Federal land. you claim ownership of 60% Alaska.

I used to Hunt, Fish, Trap or most land in Alaska freely. now the military and Federals all say no to use. Unless I'm willing to tell them how long I'll be on the lock, obtain Federal permits, agree to give up all my rights as a free citizen. Taking of Fish, Game, Fur can not be done except for those chosen few you endorse.

... take the land we will

I0130

never get it back again.

In the years past I have been harassed by military operations during hunting season on state lands.

I live a subsistence life style but its not a Federal subsistence life style. Its a state of Alaska subsistence life style. The State of Alaska has all its citizens given equal access to land and resources. If our Federals give access to only those who you personally choose.

Our founding fathers had the right idea. You new fellows messed it up. Better get out a copy of the constitution and read it over. I'd suggest more than once.

a patriot
Dory L. Cook



ALCOM PUBLIC AFFAIRS
9480 PEASE AVENUE, SUITE 120
JBER, AK 99506

I0131

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0131	Michael and Robin Maher			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 (UAV) Access, 7 - Enhanced Access to Ground Maneuver Space Areas, 8 - Tanana Flats Training Area (TFTA) Access Road, 9 - Joint Air-Ground Integration Complex (JAGIC), 10 - Intermediate Staging Bases (ISBs), 12 - Joint Precision Airdrop System (JPADS) Drop Zones	As local Fairbanks pilots and considering the recent moves of our F16s from Eielson to ANC this proposal for more airspace is way out of line. We oppose this airspace grab and can't begin to understand why you want to remove personnel and increase military airspace use. Please abandon your requests. Thank you

I0132

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0132	W.R. Reed			Biological Resources, Subsistence, 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA, 2 - Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery, 5 - Night Joint Training, 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Access	Fox 3 MOA Expansion: Recommend the No Action Alternative. All other alternatives will result in further loss of access to and use of State lands for recreation and subsistence, more restrictions governing the use of land, and no viable method for communicating the closures of land effectively to stake holders. Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery: Recommend the No Action Alternative. The selection of any other alternatives that expand area will result in loss of Non DoD-owned/managed airspace-restricting pilots from flying this popular corridor. The loss of this airspace in particularly the Lake Louise area would be devastating to both recreational and commercial pilots, as the Lake Louise area is one of the States most popular year-round recreational areas. Limited road access makes flying in by small planes the only viable option for access year-round. Lastly, consideration must be given to the continually declining populations of wildlife in the area. Caribou and moose are two wildlife populations that would be significantly impacted by Live Ordnance training and the losses as a result of this training on formerly State-Owned lands cannot be accurately assessed. Night Joint Training: Recommend Alternative A. Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Access: Recommend Alternative B.

I0133

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0133	Timothy Berg	Golden Heart Aviation		General (to the EIS)	As a member of AOPA, The Alaska Airmen's Association, and the Fairbanks General Aviation Association. I would direct you to these organizations, well thought out responses to the proposal. My own comment is just what you don't want to hear. There should be no more Airspace or land given up by the residents of the state of Alaska for military Training. If you need it, try to get it in the lower 48. See how that works for you? Enough! Tim Berg Fairbanks, Alaska

I0134

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0134	P. William Tappen	MAJ	US Forces - Afghanistan	General (to the EIS), Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), 3 - Battle Area Complex Restricted Area Addition, 4 - Expansion of R-2205 Restricted Area, 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Access	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to more restricted airspace in the Delta Junction area, and along the routes to Fairbanks and Anchorage. I can and do work with the MOAs, but restricted airspace is already too much. More will only make recreation, work, and safe, expeditious travel so much harder for rural Alaskans. Below, I am including a conversation I had this week with the XO of the Predator UAS company that supports us here in Afghanistan. If you will read it, you will see what an experienced Army helicopter pilot thinks after reading about the proposed expansions in Alaska. Finally, I have a farm in Big Delta, my family is still there, and I am a bush pilot that is looking forward to coming home to the Interior. Previously I have worked in the Ground-based Midcourse Defense program at Fort Greely, and hope to be assigned there again. I fly my Cessna 170B in support of our farming, more quickly transporting my family around Alaska, on some TDYs, and recreationally for sightseeing, camping, fishing, hunting, etc. I hope that you will reduce your desired dependence on restricted airspace in the air corridors of Interior Alaska, especially over the Delta Junction area. Thank you, MAJ Paul William Tappen MAJ Tappen, it was a nice tour to hold. Thanks for the pictures. I love seeing the ones from Alaska, although it makes me feel homesick all over again! The article you forwarded was pretty interesting. It seems to me like we military have plenty of airspace without adding more to the Alaskan sectionals. What's more, we don't exclusively use the military airspace anyway. We can go wherever we want! One of the perks of flying in AK, to be sure. I would think more restricted/special use airspace is unneeded. Range control should be able to help coordinate altitudes for UAS when in operation and allow the flyers to be professional in their occupation. As long as the UAS use the current MOAs, range control could easily coordinate with other military users letting them know there is a UAV in the sky. Most Respectfully, PHILIP T. EARWOOD CW2, AV Executive Officer Aggressor 05 A/306 MI BN - TF ODIN</p> <p>-----Original Message----- From: Tappen, Paul MAJ MIL USA USFOR-A Sent: Saturday, June 30, 2012 6:18 PM To: Earwood, Philip T CW2 TF Odin Company XO Subject: (U) Thanks for the Tour UNCLASSIFIED</p> <p>Chief! Below is a story about the proposed additional restricted airspace in Alaska, esp. in the Delta Junction area (my home). Read it and see how much you recognize. Thanks for the tour, photos and answers. I had a great time and my sons were pretty excited by the pictures, esp. the two boys in the Air Force. When I become the USFOR-A C12X in Oct, I plan on calling you guys. And if you need help w/anything here in Kabul, just call. Thanks, MAJ Bill Tappen NKC BSG XO</p>

I0134

I0134

AOPA seeks changes to large military airspace proposal in Alaska By Dan Namowitz Share on google_plusoneShare on twitterShare on emailShare on printMore Sharing Services1.AOPA is urging the Department of Defense to work with the aviation community to solve access and routing problems posed for general aviation by a revised special-use airspace plan for the Joint Alaska Pacific Range Complex (JPARC). Members may comment on the plan by July 9. In formal comments filed June 26, on the plan's draft environmental impact statement, AOPA called for solutions to numerous concerns pilots have raised about proposed new uses, boundaries, and altitudes of the complex of land, sea, and air training areas that support military exercises in Alaska—known as the JPARC plan. The association opposed various parts of the plan and urged "utmost caution" in modifying other portions of the airspace, depended on by a \$3.5 billion state aviation industry, and providing access that "enables many small communities to exist." "This range is already the largest military airspace complex in the country," said Melissa McCaffrey, AOPA senior government analyst for air traffic. "Pilots should examine how the proposed changes would affect their ability to fly."

AOPA objected to a proposed significant expansion and lowering of the floor of a military operations area (MOA) in an area "frequently used by general aviation pilots and air taxi operators" to conduct air tours, support businesses, and provide access to recreational areas. Expansion of the Fox MOA should be minimized to avoid raising the risk of midair collisions near population centers including Anchorage, Fairbanks, and the Matanuska-Susitna (Mat-Su) Borough, AOPA said. Also, any expansion should be accompanied by increased coverage by the special-use airspace information service, which provides pilots with information about MOA use. AOPA expressed concern about lack of assurances that funding for program infrastructure would remain sufficient. Although existing T-routes and the instrument approaches provided by the Wide Area Augmentation System have increased IFR access, such gains could be "seriously degraded" by expanded MOAs, AOPA said, requesting in the formal comments that expansions be deferred until real-time IFR access through active MOAs can be effected.

I0134

I0134

Another concern was the proposal to establish restricted airspace over the Battle Area Complex, near Delta Junction where winds and variable weather and the need to access a mountain pass already limit pilots' navigational options. Proposed restricted corridors for the sole purpose of unmanned aerial vehicle operations—which the FAA has customarily rejected—“would clearly interfere with the safe and efficient access between Fairbanks, the Richardson Highway Corridor and the Alaska Range,” AOPA said. The association has been calling for development of a reliable sense-and-avoid capability for UAVs, rather than creation of segregated airspace for their development. AOPA said the JPARC proposal provides an opportunity to study the Stony, Naknek, Susitna, and Galena MOAs “to determine if they are still required to meet modern training needs.” The results of the evaluation should be included in the environmental impact statement and made available for public comment. Members may comment on the proposal online, by email, or by mail to ALCOM Public Affairs, 9480 Pease Avenue, Suite 120, JBER, AK 99506. Please share your comments with AOPA.

I0135

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0135	Robert Prescott			Purpose/Need, Cumulative Impacts, Airspace Management, Noise, Land Use, All proposed actions	I am still very concerned with the proposal to use Fish and Game management area #13 as a place for your exercises!! This area is vital for Caribou calving and migration as well as an area of large moose population. Low flying aircraft in certain areas at certain times can change the calving production, and also migration routes!! Use of live fire ordinance will close those areas off for personal use by Alaska citizens. Building roads and facilities in this area will close off more of the area. There are plenty of areas that are not used as extensively for fishing, hunting, recreation as Game management area #13!!!! Please find a area that meets your criteria and does not ruin the land for the animals and humans!!!! Your proposal is completely wrong for this area!!!! Bob

I0136

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0136	John Hester			General (to the EIS), 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA	I think extending the MOA area and dropping its lower limit to 500 AGL is absolutely crazy. The Talkeetna mountains are heavily trafficked by private aircraft and with these proposed extensions, a very dangerous situation is being set up. Alaska is a huge state and it would make far more sense to have low level military training done far away from populated areas. In addition, the idea of taking fighters out of Eilson and basing them at JBER is a decision obviously made by people who missed history class. Putting all of the top cover in northern U.S. at one base is a bad decision. Ask them if they have ever heard of what happened at Pearl Harbor in 1941.

I0137

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0137	Scott Chesney			General (to the EIS), Purpose/Need, Cumulative Impacts, Mitigations, All proposed actions	I am opposed to ANY expansion of training areas in Alaska. I am constantly amazed, when I hear on the one hand (around red flag times) about how the training areas in Alaska are the largest and best available to the US and many of its training partners, and on the other hand (when the DOD wants yet more), whining about how the DOD can't do the training it wants to do because of limited training space. You can't have it both ways, at least mere mortals can't. I reiterate the same comments I made in the first time around. 1. DOD controls enough land and air space in Alaska. 2. DOD has no respect for the land, air, or water it controls. 3. DOD has a proven track record of befouling the land, air, and water it controls despite promises to not do so. NO ADDITIONAL SPACE IN ALASKA UNDER DOD CONTROL!

I0138

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0138	Terry Cartee	CW4 Retired		General (to the EIS), Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA, 3 - Battle Area Complex Restricted Area Addition, 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Access	To Whom it may concern My name is Terry Cartee, a born and raised Alaskan, retired CW4 with 36 years of aviation service in the Alaska National Guard. The proposed JPARC Range increase shows a blatant disregard for the lifestyle and safety of the Alaskan people. Mixing high speed jet traffic with known civilian VFR corridors is irresponsible and bordering on criminal negligence. The proposed Fox 3 MOA Expansion covers homes, businesses and known VFR traffic routes and to lower the floor to 500 feet is a extreme safety hazard. The proposed Paxton MOA down to 500 feet is again in the only VFR corridor between Gulkana and Fairbanks. Mixing high speed jet traffic and slow civilian air traffic is irresponsible. The proposed Battle Area Complex Restricted Area is going against a signed agreement with the Big Delta that it would not be expanded. This also is he only VFR corridor for civilian air traffic and to make it more restrictive is putting these pilots in harms way. Th UAV corridors and use do not currently meet the FAA requirement to "See and avoid". UAV Corridors near a major city, is again irresponsible. Build an airstrip in the already Restricted Areas and fly them in that area. Please feel free to E-Mail me if you have any questions regarding this statement. Terry Cartee CW4 Retired

I0139

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0139	Becky Long		Alaska Survival	General (to the EIS), Purpose/Need, Cumulative Impacts, All resource areas, Airspace Management, Noise, Safety (Airspace), Safety (Ground), Physical Resources, HAZMAT, Land Use, Socioeconomics, Subsistence, Air Quality, All proposed actions, 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA	COMMENTS ON DRAFT EIS MODERNIZATION AND ENHANCEMENT FOR IPARC 7/5/12 This is to support the NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE. IPARC has not made a case for expansion of MOA's and Above Ground Level (AGL) dimensions. I also support the Matanuska Susitna Borough Assembly Resolution 12-076 that passed unanimously 6/28/12. It is an excellent resolution that expresses many of my comments on the draft EIS. I also support the concerns of the Lake Louise Community Non-profit Corporation and the comments of the Talkeetna Community Council, Inc. Other concerns that were not dealt with adequately in the draft EIS are: • The introduction of hazardous substances and the creation of hazardous waste sites in the MOA areas. The military leaves hazardous waste sites wherever its presence is felt. The clean-up is a long time in the future with public funds being used. Can we afford this? • Air pollution from the increased flights and the pollution from the chaff used must be considered more fully. • Increase in military accidents and military and civilian aircraft collision accidents were not considered along with the creation of new access roads to get to the crash sites. When the F-22 crashed in the winter of 2011, a whole new access road was built which will be there forever. Low altitudes to 500 feet AGL combined with supersonic flights are not compatible with civilian quality of life and will cause negative impacts to wildlife. This will impact recreationists, hunters, subsistence resource users, berry pickers, ATV travelers along the Richardson and Denali Highways, cabin owners in the Lake Louise area, and backpackers in the Talkeetna Mountains and near the Denali Highway, and hunters, fishers, and trappers throughout the expanded MOA areas. For many reasons, I support the NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE, NO REDUCTION IN FLIGHT ALTITUDE LEVELS, NO INCREASES IN ORDINANCE AND TRAINING AREAS. Becky Long

I0140

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0140	Peter Marshall	M.D.	Self Employed Physician	General (to the EIS), Cumulative Impacts, Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), Land Use, Infrastructure and Transportation, Socioeconomics, All proposed actions	<p>I am a USAF veteran, an Alaskan resident for the past 37 years and a private pilot and single engine aircraft owner for 30 of those years. It is commonplace for Alaskans to state that small aircraft, both commercial and private are the life blood of Alaska. The proposed regulations seeking to add to the military use airspace will in my opinion severely and negatively impact civilian aviation throughout our state. These effects will be felt in every sector including Fish and Game surveys, mail delivery, passenger transportation and commercial enterprise such as fuel delivery. My greatest concern, however is the burden of unsafe flying conditions that will be generated by the 500 feet ceiling imposed in much of the area under consideration. This leaves pilots of small aircraft very little margin for safety in the situation of high winds, adverse turbulence or other unforeseen weather events that are commonly encountered throughout Alaska but are particularly prevalent in the Alaska Range. For example, I have experienced two incidents flying through Windy Pass where I encountered severe un-forecast turbulence and had to climb to 10,000 ft to get to safety. In another incident I encountered such strong headwinds in Windy Pass and another time above Black Rapids that my 94 mph Arctic Tern was actually traveling backwards. One again my only recourse was to climb. None of these alternatives would have been available if the proposed new rules are put in place! My understanding of the proposed expansion is that the existing and well established routes of flight between Fairbanks and Anchorage and Fairbanks and Delta/Tok/Tanacross will be restricted in ways that will compromise air safety. This is, in my opinion unacceptable and will impose an unprecedented burden on the general aviation users in Alaska. As a supporter of the USAF I am embarrassed that the branch of service that brought me to Alaska would embark on such a reckless and draconian action! Sincerely, Peter Marshall, M.D.</p>

I0141

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0141	Joanna Oudal			General (to the EIS), Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), Safety (Ground), 1 – Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA	This is a highly traveled area by general aviation pilots. Using this area for training by the military is bound to cause an accident with a small airplane and I think it is irresponsible to think otherwise. Alaska is a large state with many unpopulated areas that the military can use for their training and I strongly request they look at those unpopulated areas for their training.

I0142

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0142	Debra Oskolkoff			General (to the EIS), All resource areas, All proposed actions	I am not in favor of the proposed actions. I am in favor of a professional & well-trained military, but the cost to Alaskans through the impacts - real & possible - convince me that Alaska is not the optimum choice for this proposed expansion. As a Native Alaskan, Nimiichik Native Association shareholder, Cook Inlet Region, Inc. shareholder & Kenaitze Indian Tribe member, my heritage is in Alaska and I speak from the heart. Furthermore, access to Alaska by nations to the West/Southwest, is much easier than access to, Oklahoma, for example. Should a 'situation' arise, this huge military training area would become a prime target & would be more vulnerable than one otherwise situated. Any proposal which puts our country & our military in a more vulnerable position than necessary, is not a good proposal.

I0143

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0143	Lewis Beck			All proposed actions	As a former USAF single-seat fast-mover I am intimately familiar with what is required to train our pilots. As a current commercial pilot flying in and around Alaska, in aircraft whose performance limitations make all weather and high altitude flying impossible, I see the proposed airspace restrictions a threat to the safety of flight. I am adamantly opposed to the proposed airspace restrictions.

I0144

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0144	Mark Binggeli			Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA, 4 - Expansion of R-2205 Restricted Area	As a long time Alaskan and winter and summer visitor of the Tanana Flats and Alaska Range, I am highly concerned about increasing the restricted areas in the Interior of Alaska. As a private pilot the plan to confine the routes to corridors increases risks and reduces safety. The new Paxon MOA is of great concern. With the reductions of Air Force activity in the Interior other than periodic Red flag exercises should not justify the increase in the changes proposed. There are little to no permanent Air Force fighters or bombers stationed in interior Alaska. The 'Fighter Wing' is not a real fighter unit, only an exercise unit. Units from outside Alaska should seek training areas in the Lower 48 and not encroach on and reduce our State's available resources. Or better yet do the flying over the National Parks (Denali & Wrangell St Elias) for the "Training"

I0145

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0145	Robert Kelly			Safety (Airspace)	First let me say, I am in full support of the military and our need for them and their need to train. I know what it takes to stay proficient and recognize the need for special airspace for the military to do this. It is my understanding that the last time the military increased the airspace for training, it was stated "We will never need any more than this." Well that was several years ago and here you are back asking for more. If we give up all our liberty's and all our rights, then of what use is this country. You have enough airspace and "We the People" say the rest is ours, as well as what we allow you to use when we are not needing to use what we have already allowed you access to.

I0146

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0146	Maureen English			General (to the EIS), All resource areas, All proposed actions	<p>The training areas in Alaska are already the largest in the US. The claim is that they are also the best in the US. Why does the DOD claim to need more? I am opposed to any and all of the proposed expansions. Yes, Alaska is the Last Frontier, but it will not stay that way if the DOD is allowed to continually control more and more land and air space. The DOD has already proven that it has no respect for the land, air and water it already controls. For example, no firefighting is done on land where unexploded bombs exist...land where animals do still exist, and where unsuspecting children have been maimed and killed. Respectful landowners clean up their mess! The current proposed actions affect too many people who live in and enjoy Alaska. The proposals will limit access to private pilots, hunters and other recreational users. The noise alone will affect numerous residential areas – I still remember how our house shook with each explosion during the Fall Stryker training exercises at Ft. Wainwright (or Eielson AFB). The explosions continued well past 2am. From the list of resource areas, it looks like it's well known who and what will be affected by the expansions. Please recognize that more harm than good will come out of allowing the DOD to continue with this plan. NO to #1 NO to #2 NO to #3 NO to #4 NO to #5 NO to #6 NO to #7 NO to #8 NO to #9 NO to #10 NO to #11 NO to #12</p>

I0147

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0147	John Brown	GA Pilot	Self	Purpose/Need, Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA), Cumulative Impacts, Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), Air Quality, 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA, 3 - Battle Area Complex Restricted Area Addition, 4 - Expansion of R-2205 Restricted Area	IFR routes should be made available between FAI VORTAC and ORT during all airspace activity. The loss of these routes a few years ago has resulted in aircraft operators conducting an increased number of VFR flights across this route. It has also resulted in hundreds of Air Carrier aircraft being rerouted into the already busy ANC-FAI arrival flow and suffering increased expenses associated with the longer routing. This has also caused rerouted traffic to conflict with exercise tankers that depart EIL with ENN as their first enroute fix. Increasing VFR traffic is a net safety reduction, IFR aircraft are in continuous communication with ATC and fly at known altitudes and speeds. VFR aircraft have no communication requirement and may be operating on random routes at any VFR altitude. There should be two altitudes available for unpressurized aircraft and two above FL180 so high performance aircraft can operate safely within positive controlled airspace. ATCAAs should be published on IFR High charts to allow flight crews a chance to understand their alternatives.

I0148

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0148	BRIAN HARLAN	MR		General (to the EIS)	Comments in regards to the expansion of the R-2202 restricted areas across the Little Delta River. These areas are all have long histories of recreational use for Alaskan sporting activities by both individuals and guiding services. Expansion of these areas would block essential SAFE flight corridors for many small aircraft users transitioning through the region. The R areas have already taken away many quality recreational areas within reasonable distance from the Fairbanks area. By further deleting these long standing public use areas the military will create an unnecessary division with many local community members all for the name of "land control". Are these expansion REALLY necessary to complete the mission? Or is this just a matter of expanding an empire at the cost of the subjects that pay the taxes that support the empire. The bottom line should be the greatest availability of resources with the least impact on the greatest number of citizens.

I0149

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0149	Steven Poirot			General (to the EIS), 6 – Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Access	<p>Most of these extensions conflict directly with heavily used airspace. My son and I just flew through one of these proposed areas yesterday. Lowering the floor in the MatSu area to 500' forces us to fly too low to get to some of the most scenic areas of Alaska and increases congestion therefore reducing safety. Further, increasing route lengths by cutting off access to so much airspace will make some trips impossible for those of us with limited range. Do you propose that only more expensive planes with longer ranges should be allowed to fly now, or that we should go over-gross by carrying more fuel? Either way, it will cost Alaskans more money to travel. I thought the point of having a military force was to protect citizens, not put them in danger, which these proposals do? Alaska has always been very supportive of the military here, but I can easily see how that could change if you start trying to grab all of our airspace and put us in danger. I am however, very supportive of UAVs, I would support proposals to use UAVs in a number of areas for a number of purposes.</p>

I0150

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0150	Charles Pearson			General (to the EIS), Purpose/Need, Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA), Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), All proposed actions, 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA, 3 - Battle Area Complex Restricted Area Addition, 4 - Expansion of R-2205 Restricted Area, 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Access, 12 - Joint Precision Airdrop System (JPADS) Drop Zones	<p>I am disappointed to learn of recent plans by the USAF with respect to Alaskan airspace. The rugged airspace and meteorological challenges in Alaska tends to funnel all users into fairly narrow and predictable patterns. Restricting access to locations critical to transportation and commerce comes at a tremendous cost financially with a corresponding adverse impact to aviation safety (in the area with the greatest challenge with respect to aviation safety in the country). This despite being assured by the USAF five years ago not to be concerned about airspace requirements encroaching upon VFR corridors or low altitude IFR traffic connecting Alaska and Canada. Furthermore, opening up UAV airspace where "see and avoid" is the rule of the day and many of the user aircraft are not equipped with transponders and surveillance radar is not available (below 3,000') is quite frankly unconscionable. I have personally been advised by the USAF that operations such as C17s doing uncharted low level training is OK because "practice airdrops at Ft Rich are necessary since the troops don't get to maintain their currency in the sandbox. You need to be watchful and stay out of their (C17s) way."</p> <p>There is no other place in the country where military aircraft develop "in house" training routes that are not published, not NOTAMed, or otherwise disseminated. I can't believe this practice occurs at Maguire or Travis, but in Alaska you develop in the ready room low level routes between Wasilla and Ft Rich transiting some of the most heavily utilized airspace in the world with large jets doing 250kts (which means overtake of on average 150kts) because it is inconvenient to fly an hour to train? Many of the general aviation aircraft based in the MatSu/Anchorage area are not transponder equipped (not required), not ADS-B equipped, and no window out the back to see if a C-17 is bearing down on them. A squadron Ops Officer told me "too bad, they should have transponders so we can see them on our system." I am a huge supporter of the military and have a fair appreciation of the competing interests you face. I was a tactical aviator for most my 27 years of service. However, I can't help but think this steamroller missed much of the "risk assessment" process required by military aviation doctrine. Alaska is a huge place, why are you demanding the General Aviation community (part 91/135) assume the significant cost and risk associated with this plan?</p>

I0151

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0151	Guy Lopez			All proposed actions	The military should not take additional civilian airspace. It is unnecessary and puts all parties in greater jeopardy.

I0152

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0152	robert wesley	mr.	self	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 (UAV) Access, 7 - Enhanced Access to Ground Maneuver Space Areas, 8 - Tanana Flats Training Area (TFTA) Access Road, 9 - Joint Air-Ground Integration Complex (JAGIC), 10 - Intermediate Staging Bases (ISBs), 11 - Missile Live Fire for AIM-9 and AIM-120 in the Gulf of Alaska, 12 - Joint Precision Airdrop System (JPADS) Drop Zones	<p>* The proposed Fox 3 MOA additions extend laterally and vertically in to an area of Alaska highly used by the general public for business and recreation, due to its close proximity to major population centers of the MatSu Valley, Anchorage and Fairbanks. Lowering the ceiling to 500ft increases the probability of mid-air collisions for commercial pilots conducting tour activities and general aviation pilots engaging in hunting, mining, recreation or other activities.</p> <p>* The low-altitude portion of the proposed Paxson MOA includes a major VFR route connecting northern Alaska with the south central and eastern regions of the state. Other portions of this proposed MOA are used for mining and recreation. Confining VFR traffic to corridors through this area concentrates traffic, potentially creating an unsafe condition for civil aviation. This area is not conducive for a low altitude MOA.</p> <p>* Under current FAA rules, active MOAs block access by IFR aircraft, other than emergency and lifeguard flights. This lack of access limits economic viability and reduces safety to pilots and the public in the communities that our underneath or near this airspace. Establishing MOAs that block IFR airways is directly counter to the work done by the FAA in recent years to increase IFR access with GPS approaches and airways. No new MOAs should be approved that block IFR airways until the FAA and military have developed procedures to allow IFR access to civil aircraft.</p> <p>* The military constructed the Battle Area Complex south east of Delta Junction knowing that this area is important to civil aviation to access Isabel Pass. No restricted airspace should be established over this complex.</p> <p>* Restricted areas west of Delta (2202 and 2211) already limit access between Delta, Fairbanks and the Richardson Highway corridor. We oppose alternatives that completely connect these existing restricted areas, and further block access for mining, hunting and recreation.</p> <p>* Allowing Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV's) to transit between Ft. Wainwright, Eielson and Ft. Greely and the restricted areas where they conduct training limits access, potentially creating a safety hazard for civil aircraft operating to and from Fairbanks, Delta and the Richardson Highway corridor. No segregated airspace should be established in these areas.</p> <p>* The recently proposed relocation of the F-16's from Eielson AFB to IBER appears to have a direct impact on the airspace and airports in Anchorage and the Mat Su Valley. This needs to be quantified and addressed as part of the cumulative impact of the Draft EIS.</p> <p>* Existing MOAs including Susitna, Stony, Naknek and Galena, are not addressed. They should be studied to see if they fit the purpose and need of the JPARC mission.</p>

I0153

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0153	John Parrott			Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA), All proposed actions	<p>I am a 20 year USAF aviator who spent 2 of those years flying in AK and now live here to enjoy all this state has to offer including a robust aviation culture. I am an ardent supporter of the military as well as the general aviation community. I fully understand the need for adequate training airspace. Having attended one of the public presentations concerning the JPARC EIS I must admit I had many unanswered questions that I felt should have been addressed. How is the current airspace inadequate? Is it too small, too far away or otherwise unsuitable? If it is not going to support the future training needs, will it be removed from military use? If existing airspace isn't useful it shouldn't be kept for military use and should be returned to the NAS. Restricting IFR traffic into and out of FAI should not be pursued. Attempting to make the argument that the training airspace needs to be near the control complex is silly while the air war Afghanistan can be controlled from the US. UAS integration into the NAS remains a challenge. See and avoid is not practical and there does not appear to be a plan that will make "sense and avoid" a reality. All in all, JPARC looks like a great greenfield concept that DOD is attempting to impose on a brownfield without taking into account the negative impacts to the existing users. Offering to pursue funding or study possible mitigation appears to be paying lip service to the existing users. I think there are viable solutions and am disappointed that something more tangible has not been developed.</p> <p>Regards, John Parrott, USAF [REDACTED]</p>

I0154

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0154	Chris Hodel			1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxson MOA	While most of us welcome the military in Alaska and don't mind sharing the air with military aircraft, the proposed expansion of the MOA and possible expansion of activity beyond established flight routes around Anchorage is disturbing. Civilian aircraft must have room to operate, especially in MVFR conditions and any change to current MOAs and flight rights could prove dangerous. Please reconsider your plans and give serious consideration to the needs of Alaskan general aviation. Thank you, Chris Hodel

I0155

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0155	Chris Catalone	Owner/ Chief Instructor	Fairbanks Flight Train	General (to the EIS), Safety (Airspace), 1 - Fox 3 Military Operations Area (MOA) Expansion and New Paxon MOA, 4 - Expansion of R-2205 Restricted Area, 6 - Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Access	Numerous flights Fairbanks vor direct Gulkana then direct Valdez or Cordova or Mc Carthy over 35 years have convinced me the ability to pick up a IFR clearance enroute (or file IFR) must be there!! Without that you will be endangering many flights trying to maintain VFR in rapidly changing weather over the Alaska Range. I know that a clearance is not available in a MOA. You will be causing accidents and fatalities. Do your MOA stuff further north in less busy Airspace. Chris Catalone ATP, CFII, MEI, SES over 20,000 hours Alaska time

I0156

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0156	Robert Gastrock			Cumulative Impacts, Airspace Management, Safety (Airspace), Infrastructure and Transportation, All proposed actions	<p>As a military, general aviation, and commercial pilot who has resided in Alaska and flown throughout the state since 1968, I feel qualified to comment on the proposed alteration and expansion of JPARC military training areas. As a retired military pilot with many years and thousands of hours flying C-130s in a tactical airlift role, I understand and acknowledge the need for effective training areas for military aircrew. Some realistic conditions can never be replicated by simulators, and Alaska offers unique geographic and topographic venues that cannot be duplicated elsewhere. As a private and commercial pilot with much experience in Part 91, 121, and 135 operations, I also understand the impact created by MOAs and other Special Use Airspace. These areas can impose significant challenges for pilots and operators seeking efficiency and safety in their flight operations. As an aviation safety professional with experience as both an Air Force Safety Officer and Program Manager for the Medallion Foundation, I am quite concerned that the JPARC proposal would expand the "reach" of designated military training areas to the detriment of the civilian aviation community, both commercial and private. Moreover, it would impinge on aviation safety as civilian aviators would be pressed into operating with much more restriction, especially in key corridors such as along the Richardson Highway. Given the challenges of Alaska's often harsh weather and terrain, additional constraints imposed by artificial vertical and horizontal boundaries associated with MOAs and Restricted Areas create real threats to safe flying. While there may be a valid need for tactical training areas for new generation aircraft in both high and low altitude environments, the size and scope of those reservations must be kept to a minimum. They must be located to maximize de-confliction with other airspace users and, to the maximum extent practicable, have designated corridors or "floors" that permit safe transit by civilian aviators. Respectfully submitted, Robert C. Gastrock</p>

I0157

Submittal ID	Commenter	Title	Organization	Topic List	Comment
I0157	allen barrette			General (to the EIS), Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA), Cumulative Impacts, Land Use, Socioeconomics, Subsistence, 2 - Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery	<p>Allen F. Barrette 380 Peger Rd. Fairbanks, AK. 99709 907-452-6047 Re: Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery (Blair Lakes and Donnelly Training Area) My comments are pertaining to the State land in Proposal 2, Realistic Live Ordnance Delivery Area, proposed restricted area. I do not support any restriction to access to State lands and or closing of State land to Alaskans to further training of our valued Armed Forces. Alaska has very well written and interruption through the Alaskan Supreme Court a Constitution. The Alaskan Constitution Article 8, the Natural Resource article grants Alaskans many protections and guarantees. Sections 1-4, and 13, 14, and 16 point out my concerns and you should be aware of them. I also don't believe the EIS addressed the economical and recreational value of the possible 305,000 acres of State land that could have access restrictions levied on it. This area is highly valued and used by many Alaskans to gather their wild food resources on annual bases. Even though the EIS made note of State or private airstrips, it did not consider the many Super Cub type airstrips that are used (these are not noted on any maps, but they exist) The same is true of many traditional hunt camps. I did not see in the EIS the possible loss of income from all the guides that are registered to provide guided hunts for this area. With only a minimum of 2 week notice for exercises, how does one book guided hunts, and fulfill contracts with clients if they cannot be in the field? What about air transporters. How will the anticipated 90 to 150 days use by the military effect their businesses? The same could be asked of the miners. Trapper is this area will also be economically affected. If trappers are restricted from being in the area the result could be loss of reasonable opportunity to harvest furbearers, loss of furbearers being in the trap to long, furbearers having to be in traps long than what is reasonably expected. Maintaining a trap line has social, moral and ethical components to it also. Note: Trapping season is November – April. Even though this is not a State designated Subsistence area (by definition) many Alaskans use it as such, they treat the wild food they gather as a necessity for life.</p> <p>The 305,000 acres and predicted 90 to 150 days of use by the military would have a great impact on those who rely on those resources. Moose in this area are managed under State intensive Management (IM) practices. This means "high levels of human harvest" restricting this area at any time during September-November would impact the IM plan. Sheep, caribou, bears are not designated as IM, but many Alaskans do pursue them as a valuable wild food source and some consider them as somewhat of a trophy. The taking of sheep and caribou happens August through September. Black bears have a "no closed" season but the majority of the bears are harvested during the months of June and August and September.</p>

I0157

Grizzly bears are harvest in the months May and April, and the gain in September till they go into the den sometime mid to late October. So it is very hard for me to see how Alaskan could co-exist with this current proposal on State land, and not impact us greatly. To put in some sort of perspective Alaska only has control of 33% of land within the State. You the Federal Government have the rest. NOTES: I find it somewhat odd that the U.S. Military's EIS on aircraft noise has little effect on game population and their movements. Also that aircraft noise does not affect the values of a person's wilderness experience. Yet the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska, National Wildlife Refuge and the National Forest and Conservation Areas all say and have made policies or regulations or are in the process of doing so, to make restrictions on aircraft use with in their jurisdictions. Who is correct about aircraft noise, and how it affects game and wilderness values? Is the State of Alaska and the JPARC EIS correct, or are all the other Federal Agency correct? RECOMMENDATION: Is to not allow any live ordnance release over State controlled land that would restrict access to those lands. Thank you for allowing me comment. Al Barrette

I0157